

Mr. McKINNEY.

Mrs. DWYER in four instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. McKEVITT.

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

Mr. ASPIN in 10 instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. EILBERG in five instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. BURTON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. HANNA in three instances.

Mr. BEVILL.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1972, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1897. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of increases in tariffs on certain ceramic table and kitchen articles, pursuant to section 3151 (a) (2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1898. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the fourth annual report on medicare, covering fiscal year 1970, pursuant to section 1875(b) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 92-284); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1899. A letter from the treasurer, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the society for calendar year 1971, together with an audit report for the same period, pursuant to section 8 of Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1900. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for

the construction of certain highways and public mass transportation facilities in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, to establish an urban transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1901. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966, title 23, United States Code, section 401 et seq.; to the Committee on Public Works.

1902. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 14582. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 1174. Joint resolution making an appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-1016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14573. A bill to facilitate compliance with the Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed November 23, 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 14574. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for a South Atlantic Basin environmental conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. DWYER, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 14575. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Clara Barton House National Historic Site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 14576. A bill to make appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants under section 303(a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 14577. A bill to make appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants under section 130 of the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 14578. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50 cent pieces and \$1 pieces in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14579. A bill to provide for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14580. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 3 months duration-of-relationship requirement which is presently applicable in certain cases involving survivor benefits (where the insured individual's death was accidental or occurred in line of duty while he was a serviceman); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 14582. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 1174. Joint resolution making an appropriation for special payments to international financial institutions for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Con. Res. 590. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States, through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, to take steps to have placed on the agenda of the United Nations the issue of self-determination for the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SISK presented a bill (H.R. 14581) for the relief of Yvonne L. Larsen and Scott Greene Larsen, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

216. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Leo A. Boller, Little Neck, N.Y., relative to declaring 1 minute of prayer for prisoners of war on Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

217. Also, petition of Mrs. Edward L. Jacobi, Martinsburg, Mo., relative to crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NUCLEAR POWER CRISIS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have been working with the people of Midland, Mich., in my congressional district, to realize their goal of building a nuclear powerplant to

furnish badly needed electrical energy to the central and northern Michigan area. I was pleased to join the majority of my colleagues on Monday of last week as we passed H.R. 13752, providing for the interim licensing of the operation of certain thermoelectric generating plants. The passage of this legislation indicates the seriousness with which my colleagues take the recent warnings we have received regarding the power shortage which threatens our country. It also

gives hope to the citizens of communities like Midland who have been waiting literally years for the approval of their plans for providing additional electrical energy for their communities and their industries.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation's industrial community cannot tolerate much longer the delays which they are encountering in obtaining adequate power and resources to meet the demands which are placed on them by the American

consumer. The Nation cannot tolerate much longer the continued spewing into the atmosphere of tons of waste from aged and inefficient power systems. Midland, as the home of the Dow Chemical Co. is a prime example of the critical point which we have reached.

The Dow Chemical Co., as all chemical companies, requires massive amounts of process steam in order to manufacture its products. Currently that steam, and a part of the power required to operate the plant, are produced by 10 fossil fuel fired boilers at the Dow complex. Because of the age of these facilities they must be upgraded in order to comply with current environmental standards. Even when the required modifications are complete the facilities will spew 66 tons of waste into the air each day—66 tons, Mr. Speaker—that is 2 pounds of pollutants for every man, woman, and child in Midland County.

Mr. Speaker, the technology to avoid this pollution level is available. Extensive hearings are being held to be certain that the nuclear-fueled operations will be safe. I welcome those efforts at insuring the safety of these units. I cannot, however, condone the endless delays, the frequently obstructive tactics, and the apparent disregard for the rights of the majority of the American people, which have characterized many of the hearings proceedings. If these people were genuinely interested in the cause of general safety they would cooperate with the authorities of the various Federal Government agencies instead of working to find ways to delay and confuse.

For, if genuine progress could be made, Midland and the United States would have not only one of the larger nuclear plants which have been planned, but the only one which has been planned to meet a dual purpose. The Midland plant, when it was first on the drawing boards over 5 years ago, was to be the first of its kind in the world: a power-producing facility which utilized waste heat in an efficient manner to produce high-grade process steam for manufacturing purposes.

The people of Midland and the country deserve action, Mr. Speaker, not only because it is the will of the people that this plant be built, but because the economic base of the area is threatened by the continued obstruction and delay. The Dow Chemical Co. is a vital, growing concern. Like all such facilities it must make business decisions daily which will affect its vitality, and that of its community for years to come. Unfortunately, the Midland area must suffer for the lack of adequate action on the nuclear issue. The Dow Chemical Co. is making decisions today, Mr. Speaker, and those decisions reflect today's circumstances.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article describing the Dow-Midland situation which appeared in the Detroit News a short time ago. I believe that the article adequately states the crisis faced by the people of Midland and the Dow Chemical Co. The problem need not persist, Mr. Speaker. We here in the Congress must, as we began to do on Monday, take a hard

look at the situation and move to resolve the problems surrounding the nuclear plant issue.

I highly recommend to my colleagues the following article—and ask that they reflect for a moment on the responsibility which we bear:

FUEL CRISIS HURTS DOW: SOME OPERATIONS ALREADY HAVE LEFT MIDLAND—DOW'S HOME FOR 75 YEARS

(By Vincent R. Courtenay)

MIDLAND.—The home of Dow Chemical Co. for the past 75 years has been this small community in central Michigan. Although Dow still has a substantial investment here, it gradually has shifted many operations out of the state.

And unless the company is able to overcome serious problems of obtaining fuel for steam heat, the exodus will continue.

For most of those 75 years, the Dow industrial complex at Midland has been its largest.

But now more of Dow's products are being produced in Texas than Michigan. And Dow is building many of its new plants and equipment in states other than Michigan.

Dow Chemical is still a major force in the State, and will continue to be so even with the growing expansion elsewhere.

But it is interesting to ponder whether more of the company's new growth would have remained in Michigan had its fuel problems been solved.

A chemical company needs a tremendous amount of steam heat to operate the distilling plants that produce the chemicals. In the case of Dow, that steam heat is necessary in the manufacturing processes of more than 1,100 products.

But Michigan has an acute fuel—oil, gas, and coal—shortage. The fuels to fire Dow's steam boilers are available only at premium prices that render many processes non-competitive.

Dow had hoped to get out of this energy bind through participation with Consumers Power Co. in construction of a huge nuclear electric plant.

But that joint venture is stymied by environmentalist groups.

The vast supply of steam that would be generated by the nuclear plant could supply Dow's entire network of chemical plants here.

It would completely take care of Dow's heating problems and enable the company to shut down all of its own power plants. Company officials say the steam would be economical enough for the Midland plants to remain competitive with chemical plants located in states where cheap natural fuel already is available.

The nuclear plant was scheduled for completion in 1974, but environmentalist groups have blocked the program so that a construction permit has not been issued yet.

The environmental opponents are concerned not only about the radiation effects of a nuclear plant but also about heating of the water in the Tittabawassee River.

Even without further hitches, the nuclear plant could not be ready to produce steam for at least another five years.

It seems certain that the future of Dow's operations in Michigan depend on the building of that nuclear power plant.

High company executives have stated that without the nuclear plant, the firm will not start any new chemical manufacturing processes in Michigan that require high heat energy. That encompasses a substantial portion of Dow's products—and many of these are still being made in Midland.

In the chemical industry, the wholesale price of chemicals generally has slumped for more than a decade, while total manufacturing costs—especially labor expenses—have soared.

To keep competitive, chemical companies must continually update manufacturing

operations, building plants that will produce far greater quantities of chemicals with fewer workers.

Many of Dow's plants at Midland are becoming obsolete.

Some buildings date back to the turn of the century.

Dow must decide whether to rebuild those other Midland plants or replace them with new plants built on the Gulf Coast.

As with any industry, the primary responsibility of Dow's directors is to act in the best profit interests of the shareholders.

This year in Freeport, Tex., Dow will open a new plant to produce 1 billion pounds of styrene a year. Styrene is used in the production of such things as auto taillights, and other plastic products.

The Texas plant will result in the shutdown of five other Dow styrene plants.

It will operate with the same number of personnel required to run just one of the present plants, yet will produce more than three times the combined production of those five plants.

Styrene is still produced by Dow in Midland, and it isn't clear whether any Midland plants will be shut down as a result.

Dow's fuel shortage in Michigan plagued the company for a long time.

The production of magnesium—the lightweight metal used in making aluminum alloys—was switched from Midland to Texas during World War II.

Dow is America's only sizable producer of this metal and has virtually the entire domestic market.

To produce magnesium, salts are extracted from brine using a high concentration of electricity. In Texas, readily available natural gas is used to power the electric turbines at economical cost. Dow pumps ordinary seawater to its plants from the Gulf of Mexico.

If there were adequate electric turbine fuels in Michigan, all—or at least part—of the massive magnesium operation might still be located at Midland.

Dow also developed its process for making ethylene and propylene glycols in Michigan. These products are the basis of anti-freeze, which Dow sells in large quantity to the automotive industry.

Although these products are sold primarily to the auto makers in Detroit, it is more economical for Dow to produce both in Texas and Louisiana and ship anti-freeze by rail to Michigan.

Both ethylene and propylene are petroleum derivatives. Because petroleum is so expensive in Michigan, it is doubly advantageous to make such products on the Gulf Coast where raw materials for both production fuel and product base are abundant.

Dow executives don't like to talk about their problems and the necessity for shuffling operations to the south. They point out that when founder Herbert Dow converted an old butter tub mill to the company's first chemical distillery 75 years ago production economics in Midland were ideal.

At that time, there were both a great underground sea from which to draw brine and wooden chips to fire the distillery boilers from nearby lumbering operations.

Midland's underground salt water sea is still intact and has enough brine to take care of Dow's chemical needs for a century—if there is a way to heat it.

Instead of bailing out of Midland lock, stock and butter tub, Dow has established many new chemical operations there which do not depend on high levels of heat energy.

New plastics, agricultural chemicals and other products have been developed at Midland and are produced there.

Dow also maintains most of its research facilities at Midland and top decisions for Dow's operations all over the world are made there.

But about one-third of the sizable research and development budget Dow ear-

marks each year, is devoted not to producing new products, but to find better ways of making old products.

That means finding newer, cheaper ways of producing many chemicals Dow presently makes at Midland.

Whether or not these new processes will be applied to plants in Midland depends largely on whether the nuclear power plant gets built.

Dow's earnings last year were up about 18 percent over the previous year at \$154.7 million, or \$3.41 per share on net world sales of \$2 billion.

In 1963, Dow set a profit increase target of 10 percent annually. According to Dow financial officials, the profit growth curve comes very close to that objective, with an anticipated profit increase of about 15 percent projected for 1972 and a similar increase expected in 1973.

MRS. IWALANI MOTTI OF HONOLULU CHOSEN AMERICA'S "COUNSELOR OF THE YEAR"

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Iwalani Mottl, a counselor at the Palolo Elementary School in Honolulu, Hawaii, for the last 18 years, was recently selected to be "Counselor of the Year" by the American School Counselor Association.

Mrs. Mottl, affectionately called "Auntie" by students at Palolo Elementary School, was chosen for this honor in a nationwide competition which is based on outstanding achievement, service, certification, and background among elementary and secondary school counselors in all 50 States. Her selection reflects, I believe, her deep love for children and for her community. She has for years been an active member of many community service organizations including the Palolo Community Council—an organization of Palolo Valley residents dedicated to the improvement of their neighborhood.

By way of congratulating Mrs. Mottl, and with the thought that my colleagues will find Mrs. Mottl's story of interest, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of a recent Honolulu Advertiser article about her selection as "Counselor of the Year":

PALOLO TEACHER JUDGED NATION'S BEST COUNSELOR

"Auntie" Iwalani Mottl, a counselor at Palolo Elementary School for the last 18 years, has been selected national counselor of the year by the American School Counselor Association.

This is the first year Hawaii has entered the national association's competition, which is based on outstanding achievement, service, certification, and background among elementary and secondary school counselors in all 50 States.

Mrs. Mottl, who received word of the selection last week, has been with the Department of Education 20 years, of which two were spent teaching.

"At Palolo, I've seen lots of kids come and go—lots of them," she said.

"Some of the youngsters I remember from 15 and 20 years ago are now sending their

own children to Palolo School. It's amazing how certain personality traits carry over into one's own children.

"That's one of the things I've enjoyed, being here as long as I have."

Mrs. Mottl was cited for her participation in a number of community and service organizations, especially in Palolo Valley. Among other things, she has been active in the Palolo Community Council.

She holds a bachelor's degree in education from the University of Hawaii and a master's degree in child welfare from the University of Chicago.

About three years ago she was the first recipient of the Frances Clarke Award for outstanding work in guidance, counseling, and personnel in Hawaii. The award was presented by the Hawaii Personnel and Guidance Association.

TRANSPORTATION FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, nowhere are the problems of American life magnified the way they are as by the plight of the elderly. It is difficult to decide in which area their outrageous burdens are most severe—in maintaining a decent income, obtaining adequate health care, securing safe and comfortable housing, or in satisfying their spiritual and social desires. None of these needs can be ignored and none is more important than another.

If one link in the chain of the life of the elderly is weak, then every facet of their lives suffers. Perhaps the necessity for adequate transportation illustrates this best. Unless the elderly have adequate transportation, many of their most pressing needs go unfulfilled. For example, unless senior citizens can easily and inexpensively travel to physicians, pharmacies, and hospitals, their health obviously will deteriorate. If reaching churches and synagogues, friends and relatives is not simple and safe, the inevitable result is the crushing isolation many of our 20 million elderly now endure.

The lack of adequate transportation for the elderly is receiving increasing recognition. The National Council on Aging reported:

The frequency of transportation difficulties expressed as a major problem of elderly poor . . . appears, indeed, to be a major problem, since not only food but health and medical care, church attendance, cultural activities, recreation and social contacts depend on adequate transportation facilities.

The White House Conference on Aging labeled poor transportation a "vital concern" because "to the extent the aged are denied transportation services, they are denied participation in meaningful community life."

Mr. Speaker, I am committed to insuring that transportation for the elderly is accessible enough, safe enough, and economical enough to suit their particular needs. They are entitled to remain

self-sufficient yet involved members of the community.

So that the elderly can easily benefit from our railroads and airlines, I have sponsored major legislation to allow the transportation companies to grant reduced or free fares to the elderly. These fare reductions would prove beneficial to all concerned—the elderly would be able to travel more due to lower fares and the airlines, buslines, and railroads would fill large numbers of now empty seats.

We know how tremendously successful the reduced-fare program for the elderly is on New York City's public transit system, and I feel the results would be as good or better if similar ideas were applied to rail and air transport. The use of subways and buses in New York City has increased by at least 30 percent and studies show a renewed involvement by the elderly in the affairs of New York. It is easier for them to receive vital services and visit relatives; many report planning their daily schedules around the reduced-fare time. I hope the lessons learned in New York City are applied on a national level.

It should be part of the Federal Government's task to encourage private, nonprofit organizations to provide transportation suited to the special needs of the elderly. Accordingly, I am sponsoring legislation authorizing grants and loans to such organizations anxious to make transportation available for those who have special difficulties.

To a large extent, however, the quality of transportation for our elderly is dependent on the quality of mass transportation systems in general. Unless our buses and subways are intelligently planned and sufficiently funded, none of our citizens will receive adequate transportation. With this in mind, I am sponsoring a bill to grant operating subsidies from the Federal Government to local transportation authorities and I hope that this bill will be reported favorably from the House Banking and Currency Committee. I have supported efforts to remove restrictions on the size of grants the Federal Government can make to any one State and have urged Secretary of Transportation Volpe to press for the use of highway trust funds for mass transit purposes. Along with 40 of my colleagues, I urged President Nixon to free the entire \$900 million Congress made available for mass transit, a third of which has been spent.

Mr. Speaker, we must extend the freedom of mobility to the elderly and to all our citizens so they may enjoy all the rights and privileges to which they are entitled.

SECRETARIES WEEK, APRIL 23-29

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 21st annual observance of Secretaries Week and I should like to take this opportunity to offer a warm

and well-deserved tribute to the secretaries all over the Nation.

They serve with efficiency, dedication, and superb skill, contributing in great abundance to the ordered operation of business, industry, government, and the professions.

The National Secretaries Association, the largest organization of its kind in the world, is sponsoring this special week. Its theme is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business." Indeed they do.

I take special pleasure in joining with others throughout the country in offering this salute to secretaries. Their efforts have set a lofty standard which rightfully merits the recognition of everyone.

TENNESSEE FARMER WINS MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN EFFICIENCY AWARD

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. James E. "Sonny" Fox and his wife Shirley were in Washington to accept the Midsouth Soybean Efficiency Award given by the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council.

Mr. Fox has a long list of farming awards and is no doubt one of the top farmers in the Nation. I am proud to have him and his family as my constituents.

As a tribute to Mr. Fox I am inserting a press release that tells the story of how he managed the winning crop:

TENNESSEE FARMER WINS MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN EFFICIENCY AWARD—PRODUCES 37 BUSHEL PER ACRE ON DOUBLE-CROPPED LAND

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A yield of 37 bushels of soybeans per acre in Tennessee doesn't often make headline news, even though this is some 11 bushels greater than the 1971 average yield in Tennessee.

However, when this kind of yield is averaged over 276 acres of double-cropped land, it becomes impressive. And it was good enough to help James E. Fox of Obion, Tenn., win the Midsouth Soybean Efficiency Award.

Fox is one of three regional winners to receive the soybean award. Midwest efficiency winner is John Reiser, Jr., of Ashland, Ill.; Russell Stevens of Hurlock, Md., is the Southeast regional winner.

Secretary of Agriculture Earle L. Butz met in Washington today with the three soybean farmers to discuss ways to bring soybean production more in line with domestic and foreign use and to fill the soybean supply-demand gap. The three efficiency winners also met with the congressmen from their states and USDA commodity officials.

The award, sponsored by the National Soybean Crop Improvement Council, is made to leading soybean growers who recognize the profit opportunities in soybeans and whose management practices earn them good net returns.

To Fox, efficient soybean production hinges on a well planned farm cropping system.

"Farming is like any other business; you have to have a realistic, scheduled work load to operate efficiently," Fox says. To spread out his work load, he plants soybeans, corn, wheat and sets aside 25 percent of his acreage.

Springtime is a busy season for Fox, who farms 610 acres with his father and a full-time worker. Corn planting begins in mid-April, which leads into soybean planting about the 15th of May. Wheat harvesting starts the first week in June. As soon as the combine makes a pass, the wheat ground is plowed, disked and planted to soybeans. Wheat harvesting, plowing, disking and soybean planting operations often take place in the same day.

In 1971, Fox planted 290 acres of soybeans, of which 276 were double-cropped. Two-thirds of the double-cropped beans were drilled with seven-inch row spacings, and one-third were planted with a conventional planter in 38-inch rows.

Fox's double-cropped soybeans returned a net income of \$65.64 per acre. His production costs were as follows: seed, \$5.00; fertilizer, \$3.50; herbicides, \$5.00; seedbed preparation and planting, \$10.50; combining, \$8.00; trucking, \$1.50; labor, \$4.00; real estate taxes, \$1.25; and cash rent, \$10.00, for a total of \$48.75. His overall farm soybean yield averaged 36.9 bushels per acre and grossed more than \$115.00 per acre, based on an average price of \$3.10 per bushel.

The Obion County farmer lists several production practices that helped him produce efficient, high-yielding soybeans.

Double-cropping provided Fox with high returns as a result of good yields and lower-than-average production costs.

"By double-cropping, I was able to divide my land rent and taxes between the wheat and soybean crops," he says.

Fox makes efficient use of his fertility program, too. On soybeans that follow soybeans, he applies 200 pounds of 0-20-20. If soybeans follow corn, he relies on the carryover corn fertilizer. Last year's corn crop received approximately 125 pounds nitrogen, 75 pounds phosphate and 75 pounds of potash.

Seedbed preparation is critical for double-cropped beans. Fox says, "I'm able to do a better job of planting if I moldboard plow the wheat stubble." He plows about 8 to 9 inches deep and then disks once.

Fox uses two completely different planting methods to get his beans in on time. One planting operation consists of a 12-foot roller harrow combined with a wheat drill. Fox uses a drill "because of the time element". He says, "It's an efficient, labor-saving operation that allows us to get our beans in while I'm still combining wheat".

When all the wheat is harvested, Fox starts planting with a 4-row planter in 38-inch rows. Fox uses 60 pounds of seed per acre in the conventional planter and 120 pounds in the drill.

The Mid-South Efficiency winner planted three varieties in 1971—York, Pickett and Hood. "By using three different maturing varieties I'm able to spread out harvesting," Fox says.

He used three herbicides to control specific weeds in problem areas on his farm. He incorporated 1½ pints of Treflan prior to planting to control Johnsongrass. In separate fields, he broadcast 1¼ pounds of Lorox and 1½ gallons of Dyanap just before the soybean plants emerged for cocklebur control.

Fox started harvesting October 1 and finished November 15. He says, "Wet weather slowed up harvesting, and I had to hire some custom combining".

Fox described his growing season as "excellent with plenty of moisture". He says, "The only exceptions were a 10-inch overnight rain in August and the wet harvest season". He estimated that soybean moisture at harvest averaged about 13 percent.

He sold most of his soybeans, but has saved enough seed for his 1972 crop. This spring, Fox plans to increase his soybean acreage to 425 acres. He says, "Soybeans were our number one cash income crop in 1971,

so we're going to rent extra land and plant more soybeans".

Fox has been farming for 12 years. He is a member of the American Soybean Association, Tennessee Soybean Association, and the National Farmers' Organization. In addition, he is a director of the National Tractor Pullers' Association and Tennessee State Tractor Pullers' Association. He also is a member of the Obion County Conservation Club, the Glass-Mt. Moriah Community Club and the Glass Church of Christ.

In 1970, he received the "Outstanding Young Farmer" Award in Obion County. Fox and his wife, Shirley, have two children, Tim, 12; and LeEllen, 9.

CONGRESSMAN FLOWERS SUPPORTS EDUCATION

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend my colleague WALTER FLOWERS on his fine record in support of education as a Member of Congress, and I invite others to check that record:

April 23, 1969: H.R. 514, voted "yes" on bill extending programs for elementary and secondary education.

May 6, 1969: H.R. 5554, voted "yes" on special milk program for children.

July 21, 1969: H.R. 11651, voted "yes" on providing free or reduced-priced meals to needy children under National School Lunch Act.

Sept. 15, 1969: H.R. 13194, voted "yes" on increasing availability of student loans.

Oct. 6, 1969: H.R. 13304, voted "yes" on educational assistance for gifted and talented children.

H.R. 13310, voted "yes" on special programs for children with specific learning disabilities.

July 31, 1969: H.R. 13111, voted "yes" on Amendment adding over \$894 million to Office of Education appropriations for FY 1970. Also voted "yes" on final passage.

Feb. 19, 1970: H.R. 15931, voted "yes" on passage of comprise appropriations bill (after Presidential veto of H.R. 13111 was sustained).

July 16, 1970: H.R. 16916, voted "yes" on Appropriations for Office of Education for fiscal year 1971.

Aug. 13, 1970: Voted to override President's veto of H.R. 16916.

July 23, 1970: H.R. 18515, voted "yes" on Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971.

Aug. 3, 1970: H.R., voted "yes" for educational programs on environmental quality and ecology.

Aug. 12, 1970: H.R. 17570, voted "yes" on program of education and training in heart disease, cancer, strokes, etc.

April 7, 1971: H.R. 7016, voted "yes" on Office of Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972.

July 27, 1971: H.R. 10061, voted "yes" on appropriations bill for Labor-HEW for FY 1972.

Nov. 4, 1971: H.R. 7248, voted "yes" on Higher Education Act Amendments.

May 20, 1971: H.R. 8190, voted "Yes" on 2nd Supplemental Appropriations bill—including funds for education for FY 1971.

Dec. 2, 1971: H.R. 11955, voted "yes" on Supplemental Appropriations Bill for FY 1972 including education funds.

RESULTS OF HON. JACK EDWARDS' ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, crime remains the No. 1 concern of citizens in the First District, according to the results of my 1972 legislative questionnaire. Following close behind was the school busing issue.

Asked to name three issues that should be given top congressional priority, a strong 68 percent of the approximately 12,000 responding to the questionnaire again this year chose crime.

All other topics trailed far behind. They were, in this order: Drug abuse, the economy, unemployment, the Vietnam war, pollution, taxes, the Communist threat, education, civil rights, poverty programs, space programs, foreign aid, aid to cities, and housing.

In addition to these subjects, others listed amnesty, concern for prisoners of war and those missing in action and those favoring a recomputation of military pay.

On the balance of the questioning, here are the results:

QUESTIONNAIRE

Would you favor allowing \$1 of your income tax payment to be used as a donation to the political parties?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 19 |
| No | 81 |

In light of government efforts to clean up the environment, would you be willing to pay more for products if their manufacture and use could be made virtually pollution free?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 66 |
| No | 34 |

Would you favor federal programs to curb pollution even if it meant higher taxes?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 36 |
| No | 64 |

Would you favor extending the term of President to six years with a one-term limit?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 62 |
| No | 38 |

Do you feel that a national health insurance program is needed?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 43 |
| No | 57 |

Do you believe the federal government should be allowed to intervene in prolonged strikes which damage the public interest?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 88 |
| No | 12 |

Federal farm controls and supports should be:

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Phased out within 5 years..... | 61 |
| B. Continued substantially as it is... | 33 |
| C. Increased | 6 |

Do you favor drug education courses in public schools?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 88 |
| No | 12 |

Do you feel that President Nixon's wage and price controls are working?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 39 |
| No | 61 |

Do you favor increasing the minimum wage to \$2 per hour?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 42 |
| No | 58 |

Do you approve of the President's effort to end the war and assure the return of our prisoners of war?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 79 |
| No | 21 |

Do you believe the President has done all he can do in this regard?

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| | Percent |
| Yes | 65 |
| No | 35 |

Those commenting further on the President's Vietnam withdrawal generally approved of his action. Many expressed great disgust that the United States got into a "no win" affair.

Mr. Speaker, each year I find the people of the First District of Alabama eager to express their views on the important issues facing our Nation. The replies to my annual questionnaire always serve to emphasize the duty of Government to be responsive to the needs of the people and serves to reaffirm my belief in the basic wisdom of the people to know what is right.

GIANT OIL COMPANY PAYS \$7.5 MILLION IN FOREIGN TAXES—NO TAX TO U.S. GOVERNMENT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in checking further 1971 corporate reports, it appears from an examination of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio's annual report that this giant oil company, which did \$1,393,798,000 worth of business last year, paid no U.S. corporate income taxes—but did pay \$7.5 million in taxes to foreign governments.

It is true that the net income of this Cleveland, Ohio, based corporation declined between 1970 and 1971—nevertheless it made a profit of \$54.6 million and paid out \$36 million in cash dividends on common stock.

The corporate report lists the payment of \$7,508,000 in foreign taxes—an increase of \$3.3 million over 1970. The report includes several provisions for deferred U.S. taxes, but as a recent textbook on corporate financial reporting notes, "deferred taxes" is only a provision for that portion of postponed taxes which might have to be paid in the near future.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Standard Oil of Ohio will make U.S. tax payments "in the near future," since, as the corporate report further notes:

Accumulated unused tax losses of BP (British Petroleum) approximating \$50 million . . . are available to be applied against future taxable income of BP through 1974.

From my study of the 1971 financial report of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, it appears unlikely that any corporate taxes will be paid to the U.S. Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, this case is just another example of how the tax structure frees the corporate sector of support of the Federal Government and throws an ever-increasing burden on the average, small taxpayer.

ARTHUR SINGER LEAVING SBIC PROGRAM AFTER A JOB WELL DONE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Singer will be leaving his post as associate administrator for operations and investment of the U.S. Small Business Administration at the end of this week.

In that capacity, Art Singer has shepherded for more than 3 years now the Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program set up by the Congress in 1958 to provide venture capital to small business.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and one concerned with the viability of small business, I have followed the progress of the program closely over the years.

It is my observation that the SBIC approach has thrived in the past few years, and that much of the credit must go to Art Singer.

Under his leadership, the SBIC industry has attracted a greatly increased amount of private capital. He initiated a benchmark study of the program, which laid the groundwork for potential improvements in its operation.

In an imaginative move in an area where imagination is vitally needed, he got together five of the Nation's outstanding venture capitalists and conducted a seminar for new managers of minority enterprise small business investment companies—MESBIC's. He has urged that SBA be granted the authority to guarantee private lenders' loans to SBIC's—an approach which Congress adopted last December and one which promises to increase funding for SBICs and venture capital financing for small business.

Art Singer has proven himself a decisionmaker and a leader, an administrator who has brought excellent judgment to bear in a difficult sphere.

He has earned the confidence and respect of those of us in the Congress with whom he has worked, as well as venture capitalists around the country.

Now, Art will be leaving his post to return home to El Paso, Tex., and take up new responsibilities. I congratulate him for the outstanding job he has done for the Nation's small business concerns and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF QUEENS
VILLAGE COMMUNITY SPIRIT

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to one of the finest examples of community pride and spirit that I have ever witnessed in the course of my political career. Just as I had occasion to congratulate my Queens Village constituents last fall on their wonderful centennial celebration, so the village residents have outdone themselves this year by demonstrating that hard work and cooperation are, more so than ever, the distinguishing characteristics of this fine New York neighborhood.

The event to which I am referring, Mr. Speaker, is the second annual musical comedy production, to be staged and performed at Our Lady of Lourdes School auditorium this coming weekend by a highly talented and motivated group of residents from the Queens Village area.

Every Member of this legislative body is, I am sure, well aware of the divisiveness and lack of understanding which are threatening to strangle the very esprit de corps which has been a trademark of American society for so long. It is precisely for this reason that I call your attention to the praiseworthy efforts of this community-minded group of citizens who have managed to produce, after 4 months of hard work, a theatrical event even more impressive than last year's success.

Mr. Speaker, this season's show is entitled "Broadway Sends You Its Regards." All proceeds, after expenses, will go toward such worthy goals as improved educational and recreational opportunities for youth in the Queens Village community. I would ask leave to make special mention here of the production staff, cast, and crew members whose teamwork has resulted in yet another musical triumph:

"BROADWAY SENDS YOU ITS REGARDS"

Our Lady of Lourdes, Queens Village, April 28, 29 and 30, 1972. Moderator, Rev. James G. Cregan.

Directed by: Christine Greiner.

Musical Director: Lynn Gabriel.

Assistant Director: Jim McEntee.

Music: Jean Quinn, Dan Quinn and "The Generation Gap."

CAST

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Veronica Averill | Susan Larman |
| Lynn Bent | Ginny Lee |
| Bill Bieniek | Debbie Lembo |
| Bonnie Breen | Don Magnotta |
| Debbie Breen | Ann Marks |
| Beryle Brenes | Michael Martucci |
| Maureen Brodie | Mary McGovern |
| Eileen Coen | Don Meissner |
| Dennis Cutrone | Mary Mullen |
| Anne Dailey | Debbie Ostermann |
| Fran D'Emilio | Eileen Panos |
| Marge Denisco | Jane Pason |
| Marion Dessereau | Lorraine Petrucci |
| Madeline Drew | John Pittari |
| Linda Glauner | Eileen Planson |
| Terry Goetz | Linda Reantillo |
| Anne Greiner | Susan Reantillo |
| Ben Gulino | Mike Ross |
| Jeanette Hoogenboom | Sam Rubino |
| Walter Kasprzak | Chrissy Russo |

Don Schuellein
Steve Schuellein
Grace Sparacino
Joe Stenza
Juliann Stetina

Beth Thomas
Frank Tierney
Betty Titko
Deidre Wrynn
Joan Zavattaro

CREW

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Mike Bieniek | Bill McCauley |
| Jerry Coss | Marion McCauley |
| Mary Ann Curcio | Jimmy McLoone |
| Phyllis DiCiurcio | Vivian Mehringer |
| Billy Hansen | Jane Metzger |
| Deanne Hoogenboom | Jim Mullen |
| Joe Lenihan | Bob Schmidt |
| Harry Madara | Claire Strauss |
| Eileen Madden | Mike Taylor |
| Kathy Maher | Cathy Tully |
| Madeline Maher | Margaret Vasquez |

Mr. Speaker, I have my ticket for Friday night's performance of "Broadway Sends You Its Regards." I would encourage any and all of my colleagues who reside in the New York metropolitan area to join me in an evening which will prove, as well, that the vanishing species of community spirit is alive, well, and thriving in Queens Village, N.Y.

KNICKERBOCKER DRUM AND
BUGLE CORPS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, we in New York are very proud of the Knickerbocker Drum and Bugle Corps which has played to audiences throughout the United States and Canada. This 100-member corps designated as the city of New York's "teenage marching and musical ambassadors of good will" has just recently returned from its second triumphant international tour which once again has brought joy and entertainment to millions. For the interest of those Members of the House who are not familiar with this group, I want to quote from the Butler's Festival of Champions score sheet of August 9, 1971, which best describes the activities of this organization:

The drum and bugle corps is one of America's best known pageantry units. The corps has entertained in over a dozen states and in Canada and is well known throughout the Nation as New York City's Official Teenage Marching Ambassadors of Musical Goodwill.

The Knickerbockers have two performing groups including the New York Knickerbocker drum and bugle corps which is a highly rated class "A" unit open to experienced teenage drum corps and marching band veterans or the Knickerbocker Cadet drum and bugle corps which is the unit's training operation and which is open to boys and girls from the ages of ten to fifteen who have had no experience in the drum corps field.

The Knickerbockers provide all musical and marching training, all instruments and equipment, and all uniforms and travel free of charge to its member youngsters who now number over 200. An insurance fee and weekly dues are the only expenses the children have. Operational funds are raised by a variety of activities run for the youngsters by their own Parents and Booster Association and by the Knickerbocker Federal Savings and Loan Association who co-sponsor the corps.

I want to take this opportunity to once again publicly praise this outstanding group of young men and women and to especially praise their general manager, Mr. Harvey Berish, for his leadership.

RADIO FREE EUROPE

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, I indicated I would seek increased funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I said at that time that I did not believe the radios to be "anachronisms of the cold war" but viable entities which command the respect of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the fear of those who rule.

Recently, the syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak addressed themselves to this issue and I'd like to share their timely comments with my colleagues at this point.

POLES AID DRIVE AGAINST RFE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The present drive to end vital U.S. government subsidies for Radio Free Europe (RFE) is being aided by a clandestine operation of the Polish Communist Party, according to a confidential report from a reliable informant inside Poland.

This informant reports that the now deposed regime of then party boss Wladyslaw Gomulka about two years ago became dissatisfied with the lack of action on RFE, the Munich-based station which beams broadcasts to Poland and other Eastern European Communist states. Consequently, it set up a secret group to "systematically instigate opposition toward RFE" with \$3 million funneled into Poland's Washington embassy.

In charge of the operation, according to this report, is Ryszard Frelek, a member of the party secretariat. Besides stirring up opposition, it was charged with responsibility for supplying helpful information to American foes of RFE.

Serious American students of the Polish situation doubt that anything close to \$3 million was appropriated for this purpose. However, the informant's past record is good enough to make the outlines of the story credible.

Actually, anti-RFE operations in Warsaw remained strictly secret until February when rumors began pouring out. "It is assumed that they were started by former Gomulka men who were removed from this project," the informant reports.

However, he adds that there is divided opinion deep inside the Polish United Workers' Party—the country's Communist party—about RFE. In party discussions, he says, it is noted RFE not only "creates many problems for the party leadership" but also provides some benefits.

Without RFE, almost all seem to agree, Soviet instructions would be more strict and also there would be a trend to fall in line with other Soviet republics," he adds.

A footnote: The informant reveals that party secretary Jerzy Lukaszewicz recently called in the heads of Poland's newspapers and radio stations to caution them not to go overboard in praising Sen. J. W. Fulbright's drive against RFE. "The mass media in Poland should use only information from the Polish press agency without any embellishment of their own," according to the informant.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: HOW WELL IS MY COMMUNITY INFORMED

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry L. Gilbert of Reno, Nev., a Reno High School student, has earned the first place award in the contest, "Ability Counts," sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I ask that Mr. Gilbert's award-winning speech be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as further encouragement to our handicapped in the United States so that they will know that their fellowman is concerned with the capabilities, potential and accomplishments of the handicapped.

The speech follows:

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: HOW WELL IS MY COMMUNITY INFORMED

(By Harry L. Gilbert)

I have often heard it said that man fears what he does not understand. This idea is a broad one and can apply to a wide range of situations, but it seems to relate particularly well to the employment problems of the handicapped. Perhaps more than any other group in today's society, these people have had to struggle against public ignorance to dispel the instinctive fear they have encountered.

Mrs. Billy Qualey is one person who has been winning her struggle. Ever since she was stricken with polio at the age of eight, she has had to fight to overcome people's reactions to her handicap. Now, as a credit department employee at Montgomery Ward, she can speak from experience and is able to pinpoint the cause of the public's misunderstandings and fears. "People don't know enough," she says, "and this is because the information services just don't tell enough."¹ This remark sums up the situation neatly, for although a survey of local businessmen showed that most were familiar with the "Hire the Handicapped" advertisements that appear from time to time on radio and television and in print, only a few could recognize any of the details of those ads.² They knew that "It's good business to hire the handicapped," but that's about all they knew. And, of course, few of them had ever had much contact with a handicapped person. In view of this lack of knowledge, it cannot be very surprising that when many employers actually come face to face with a person who is handicapped, their reaction is one of subdued terror. They are unprepared for the strange experience, and they tend to withdraw in fear. Mrs. Qualey adds, "Everyone likes to say 'hire the handicapped,' but when it gets right down to doing something, people are leery of the whole thing."

Recently, however, this attitude has begun to change. Agencies helping the handicapped have expanded and formalized their public-relations departments and have increased their efforts to bridge the gap between employers and trained handicapped job-seekers.³ Counselors from the agencies give pro-

grams to service clubs and other organizations, since members of these groups are often potential employers. Counselors also visit new industries in town to explain their programs and to survey the type of jobs that will be available for their clientele. Later they return to the employer with a specific client's records to set up an interview. As with any employment situation, though, the interview is still the most important step, because it allows the handicapped person to prove himself in front of the employer, thus placing the final responsibility for success or failure on the applicant himself.⁴ The agencies report that the response to this program has been excellent. In the fiscal years 1969 and 1970 alone, the State Rehabilitation Division helped 933 disabled people to become productive members of our society.⁵

The methods of the rehabilitation agencies have brought impressive results, but to date their impact has been restricted because of the limited number of industries that the agencies work with. If these methods—dealing intensely with specifics rather than with generalities—were applied to the whole of society, the effects could be staggering. The way to help the community really know and understand its handicapped is to throw out the vague and ineffective advertising campaigns now in force and replace them with greatly expanded programs that would present the disabled in a new light. They need to be shown neither as an anonymous group of people who need help nor as statistics on a chart, but rather as real individuals—each with his own needs, troubles, desires, and fears—who just happen to be disabled. They need to be presented as actual people in personal interviews, in editorials, and in picture stories in publications all over the country, from the smallest local newspaper to the largest national magazine. If everyone had the chance to meet Mrs. Qualey and see her at work, moving confidently about in spite of her crutches, no one would wonder why "it's good business to hire the handicapped."

I cannot say that such a comprehensive national advertising campaign would solve all the problems of the disabled, nor even that it would lead to their being fully employed. Nothing is ever that simple. But I can say that what people know and understand they can accept; for as Emerson has written: "Knowledge is the antidote of fear."⁶

EARTH WEEK IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of the Earth-Day resolution that passed this House, I take pleasure in calling attention to a recent proclamation by the Governor of Alaska, William A. Egan. He has set aside the third week in April as "Earth Week in Alaska."

Alaska faces the same environmental crisis faced by many other States, and her citizens realize their responsibility for a healthy environment. In many ways, Alaska represents America's future. Rich in many natural resources critical to the needs of our Nation, and also abundant in wildlife, forests, lakes, and rivers, Alaska must not make the mistakes of other States. It is our intent to prove it possible to tap the many

wealths of our State such as oil, iron, copper, and zinc without the byproducts of pollution and ecological imbalance. Earth Week in Alaska symbolizes the awareness of this responsibility, to ourselves and to the world, and promises cautious development through respect for our ecology.

The proclamation is as follows:

PROCLAMATION: EARTH WEEK

Fortunately, the state of Alaska is not faced with the critical environmental problems that some states have. Alaskans, however, recognize the need to promote a broader awareness and understanding of the need for environmental improvement.

As Alaska's population increases and new industries appear and expand, our State will be exposed to many of the problems now being experienced in other areas. In order to prepare for these events, our new State Department of Environmental Conservation is overseeing environmental management for Alaska.

Alaskans are very much aware of ecological problems. We read about them every day, and are sensitive that this beautiful State of ours is kept as free from this spoilage as possible.

Every Alaskan has a right to live in a healthy environment.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim the third week in April as Earth Week in Alaska and call upon all citizens of the State to a greater awareness of sound ecological principles; an appreciation of our clean air and water; respect for control of species populations through sensibly regulated hunting and fishing, and preservation of their natural habitat; and a dedication to the solving of environmental problems through wise development and use of natural resources.

Dated this fifth day of April, 1972.

MORE PROBLEMS IN NAVY SHIPBUILDING

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am releasing to the public today a recent General Accounting Office study that reveals that missiles that missed their targets too often and huge cost overruns are plaguing the Navy's program to modernize 20 missile carrying frigates.

According to the GAO, the missiles placed on the destroyers suffer from "a high percentage of failure."

Despite the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars the Navy's latest surface-to-air missile—the Standard—simply cannot do the job. Apparently the American people have been sold another weapon system that borders on being a dud.

According to the GAO, the Navy's program to modernize these 20 guided missile frigates has also fallen prey to cost overruns totalling more than \$300 million.

Recently, the Committee on Armed Services has been conducting hearings on huge cost increases in new ship construction programs. Obviously the public is being victimized by giant Navy cost overruns in both the building and modernizing of ships. The GAO report indicates that—

Data on missile firing from frigates modernized today indicate a high percentage of

¹ Mrs. Billy Qualey, employee at Montgomery Ward, in an interview January, 1972.

² Surveys of 17 businesses, conducted at the Village Shopping Center and in downtown Reno, January, 1970.

³ Mr. William Kelly of the State of Nevada Rehabilitation and Adjustment Center, and Mr. Virgil Wedge of the Washoe County Association for Retarded Children, in interviews, January, 1972.

⁴ Mrs. Mary Morrison of the Reno Junior College of Business, interview January 1972.

⁵ Ibid., Mr. Kelly, Footnote 3.

⁶ Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Courage," *Society and Solitude* (Oxford, 1927), page 255.

failure. One missile system, the Standard, has experienced a decrease in effectiveness over the last year against air craft. The rate of successful firing has dropped considerably below that achieved in the previous year.

The total cost overruns on this program amount to \$307.8 million. In the last year alone, costs have increased by \$154.4 million. A total of 80 percent of the \$154.4 million cost overrun last year was due to increased cost at the Philadelphia Navy Yard and the need for more repairs on these ships than originally anticipated.

To be more specific, insufficient work load and declining morale have been responsible for a total of \$67 million of cost overruns last year at the Philadelphia shipyard. Another amazing facet of this whole problem is that it now costs more to convert and modernize our warships than the original price tag of the vessels. Originally the DLG-6 class guided missile frigate costs the Navy \$51 million. Today the current estimate for the modernization and conversion of each vessel has now climbed to \$61.5 million.

As many of my colleagues may know today is the second day of hearings by the House Armed Services Committee which is investigating skyrocketing shipbuilding costs. It is my hope that under the leadership of the distinguished gentlemen from Louisiana and chairman of the committee, Mr. HÉBERT, the committee will expand its current investigation to scrutinize all costly shipbuilding programs, not just the unfolding disaster at Litton Industries in Pascagoula, Miss. The committee should carefully consider the appropriation of an additional \$139.6 million in next year's budget for the continuation of the conversion program.

In addition to problems at Litton Industries and the huge cost overruns in this modernization program, there are several other shipbuilding programs that demand the attention of the House Armed Services Committee. In its meeting today, I had an opportunity to submit questions to Adm. I. C. Kidd, the Chief of Naval Materiel about claims on the DE-1052 class destroyers, questionable provisional payments on shipbuilding claims, and huge cost overruns that occur in our submarine programs.

The House Armed Services Committee has an excellent opportunity to carefully examine and study the spiraling costs and inefficiencies in the Navy's shipbuilding program. It is my hope that rather than hold just 2 days of hearings on these problems, that the committee will examine all shipbuilding programs and hopefully remove some of the excess fat that weighs down our defense establishment.

CAN MAN TURN HIS BACK ON SPACE?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwin McDowell, an editorial writer for the Wall Street Journal has written an article entitled "Can Man Turn His

CXVIII—885—Part 11

Back on Space?" which appeared in the April 21 edition of the paper for whom he writes. It is a very provocative article which raises the question of the challenge of space and the unquestionable rewards for the nations who accept it. I commend Mr. McDowell and would hope that all in this body read his remarks:

CAN MAN TURN HIS BACK ON SPACE?

(By Edwin McDowell)

In Caruaru, Brazil recently, a father withdrew his eight-year-old son from school because the teacher insisted that man had landed on the moon.

Closer to home, shortly after the first moon walk, and against a backdrop of unprecedented TV coverage and millions of printed words, many Americans continued to express skepticism. Some thought it was a gigantic hoax, others were sure the lunar surface was really the Arizona desert, still others were certain it had all been an elaborate science fiction odyssey.

In short, not everyone believes that America's space accomplishments are real. What is more unsettling, even as Apollo 16 attempts to unravel the mystery of the moon's violent birth some four billion years ago, is that among Americans who believe that man has walked on the moon, there is widespread disagreement as to the value of space exploration.

On the day of liftoff for Apollo 16, Vice President Agnew assured the launch crew that Americans aren't bored with the space program, and he added that "you probably find more people enthusiastic about the space program than you've ever seen before."

But samplings and surveys have made it clear that a great many people are simply not enthusiastic about the space program. In fact, they have serious reservations about rushing to conquer the moon when Planet Earth is still so far from conquering discrimination, pollution, hunger and poverty.

This lack of enthusiasm is reflected in the sharply diminished space budget, in the cancellation of two Apollo moon landings, and in the fact that Apollo 16 is the penultimate moon flight scheduled for this entire decade.

THE CRITICS' CASE

The critics are many and their arguments are impressive. British historian Arnold Toynbee, for example, compared our first moon landing to the building of the pyramids or Louis XIV's palace at Versailles. "Sizing up man's achievements," he commented, "one would say how amazing, how strange, that this creature is so marvelous in his technology, but in morals and social behavior he has stayed practically stationary."

Philosopher Lewis Mumford complained: "It is not the outermost reaches of space, but the innermost recesses of the human soul that now demand our most intense exploration and cultivation."

And not long before his death, Bertrand Russell, although applauding the skill and courage of the moon flights, expressed grave reservations about their wisdom. According to him, the bustle and locomotion of space travel would probably do little to promote wisdom, thought or enlightenment. He felt that "men who take to a life of conquest tend to be men who are indifferent to the higher values of civilization."

"I should wish to see a little more wisdom in the conduct of affairs on earth," Lord Russell said, "before we extend our strident and deadly disputes to other parts. . . . It is for us to grow to the stature of the cosmos, not to degrade the cosmos to the level of our futile squabbles."

Each of these arguments has merit. So, too, perhaps, have the arguments that the American space program should place greater reliance on moon rovers, or that space exploration should become more of an inter-

national venture than the exclusively American and Russian domain that it has been so far.

Indeed, probably the only argument against space exploration that is patently absurd is the contention that the space program is the special province of the Silent Majority, and therefore is unrelated to the world of the intellectuals and the poor.

In a foreword to an important recent book ("Nine Lies About America," by Arnold Beichman), Tom Wolfe writes of "the phenomenon of the intellectuals' amazing hostility to NASA's success in reaching and exploring the moon."

Social critic Wolfe is particularly interested in Norman Mailer's criticisms of the space program as "tasteless" and of the NASA facilities in Houston as "odorless." "This seems like a piece of pointless crankiness," writes Mr. Wolfe, "until one realizes that 'odorless' is a code word for 'sterile.' In fact, his long and involved book on the first moon flight, 'Of a Fire on the Moon,' was nothing more than an announcement that the whole enterprise was sterile." What Mailer and other critics, home and abroad, were really saying, according to Mr. Wolfe, is that these nonintellectual Americans may have accomplished a feat—but the feat was worthless.

But if the arguments against space exploration are impressive, the arguments in favor appear to be even more so. For our periodic thrusts aimed at solving the age-old mysteries of the cosmos are not just an expensive plaything of the Silent Majority, but a quest whose revelations probably will benefit all mankind.

The economic arguments themselves are impressive, although they can easily be overstated. (Remember the promises about how our tax dollars spent on foreign aid were going to repay us all ten-fold?) Nevertheless, the technological spin-offs from space exploration, some of them already apparent in communications, medicine and food, raise the definite prospect of directly improving mankind's material life on earth.

Furthermore, there is no assurance that the money spent on space exploration, if we were to cut or eliminate our space program, would automatically be diverted to education, housing or other social needs—at least not if the Silent Majority has the political clout and the grudging hostility to broadened social measures that we are repeatedly assured it does have.

Nevertheless, the economic arguments are distinctly secondary considerations, and not only because such promises frequently turn out to be as chimerical as the chain-letter system of piling up a fortune.

Arthur Schlesinger Jr. put it very well when, addressing himself to criticism that space exploration is wasteful, he said he could imagine similar criticism in Spain in the 1490s: "Why in hell are Ferdinand and Isabella giving all that money to that madman Columbus when they could build a good nunnery or a hostel or something?"

But even that analogy is imperfect. For Columbus discovered America by accident, whereas we know that the moon and Mars and Venus are out there in space waiting to be explored.

A more precise analogy would be if Britain or Portugal, during their glory days of exploration, knew there was a new world beyond the seas but decided it should remain undiscovered and unexplored until they solved their domestic problems. Fortunately for both countries, Elizabeth I and Prince Henry the Navigator had other ideas.

SCIENTIFIC REWARDS

This is not to suggest that the U.S. should ignore the costs of space exploration, and race frantically from one planet to another while America's own cities fester and die. Perhaps the temporary moratorium the ad-

ministration has placed on space flights is advisable, even though each new moon mission is far more productive and scientifically rewarding than each of its predecessors. But abandonment of America's space venture, which some critics have been urging, would be disastrous.

Historian and philosopher Salvador de Madariaga has properly noted, "It is from men who act on nature, and do not merely suffer to be acted upon by her, that history flows." And Arthur Clarke, the noted space writer, observed: "A nation which concentrates on the present will have no future; in statesmanship, as in everyday life, wisdom lies in the right division of resources between today's demands and tomorrow's needs."

Moon exploration is only the beginning of the long stride across the ages of man. It is only one more waystation along man's eternal journey toward the new and unknown. It is a transcendent event, one that imperfect modern man should no more turn his back on than men of antiquity should have turned their backs on other villages or other lands.

It is an awesome, Promethean challenge, one that only a frightened, confused nation—a nation of people who have lost their way—would reject as an unworthy goal.

WHY ARE THE SOVIETS UNDERWRITING U.S. FOREIGN AID LOSSES?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, not only are the U.S. taxpayers being milked to fund the Export-Import Bank, IMF, World Bank, and other international cartels with funds to induce American investments in developing foreign countries, but under the Overseas Private Investment Corp., the U.S. taxpayers are also being used to guarantee payment for the losses suffered by American industry if their foreign operations are seized or nationalized by the government in power.

American losses could not have been more consistent if planned. OPIC has had to ask Congress for an additional \$85 million appropriation to cover mounting claims, such as the \$89.6 million claim filed by ITT for the loss of the telephone company it developed only to have it confiscated by Marxist President Allende of Chile.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, OPIC is broke—exactly how broke was not evident until today's paper carried a story indicating that:

The Black Sea and Baltic Insurance Co., a subsidiary of Ingosstrakh, the USSR's state insurance agency, has underwritten a portion of a \$26 million boost from \$2.2 billion—in the amount of expropriation insurance written to protect United States investment in developing nations.

The Soviets play only with a stacked deck. If they do not hold all the aces, they do not play. The American people can but conjecture what advantage would be gained by the Communists if, for example, they carried the insurance for the loss by ITT in Chile. Not only would the Soviets, or their allies, gain control over the industry developed, but they would also have a powerful lever to use against the parent company in bargaining to "settle the claim" or it could just be that

the Soviets recall what happened following nationalization of the U.S. copper mines in Chile—the Red Chinese got the copper.

I insert related news clippings following my remarks.

The news articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1972]
SOVIET UNIT AIDS UNITED STATES ON SURETY EFFORT

The Overseas Private Investment Corp. announced yesterday that an arm of the Soviet Union government has participated in United States efforts to insure U.S. private investment overseas.

OPIC said that the Black Sea and Baltic Insurance Co., a subsidiary of Ingosstrakh, the USSR's state insurance agency, has underwritten a portion of a \$26 million boost from \$2.2 billion—in the amount of expropriation insurance written to protect U.S. investment in developing nations.

OPIC is a government corporation providing political risk insurance, investment loan guarantees and other assistance to U.S. private investors overseas.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1972]

ITT PREDICTS WINDFALL IN CHILE FIASCO

The International Telephone and Telegraph Corp. has reassured its stockholders that ITT will collect \$89.6 million from the U.S. government as an insurance claim for the telephone company taken from ITT by the Allende government of Chile.

But the U.S. insurance agency, the Overseas Private Investment Corp., said that no decision has been made on ITT's claim and cannot be made for at least another six months.

In its annual report, issued two weeks ago, ITT said the corporation would lose \$70 million because of the Chilean property expropriated by the government there. But it assumes that \$89,658,000 will be paid by OPIC, a government-backed agency which insures overseas investments against political risks such as revolution, insurrections and expropriations where the foreign government does not pay fair compensation for the U.S. property.

ITT noted that earnings from Chiltelco were down sharply in 1971, mainly because the government of Salvador Allende had raised wages but refused to permit rate increases. The corporation predicted, therefore, that the "reinvested insurance proceeds of the Chilean divestment will more than replace the 1971 earnings."

The \$89.6 million figure was listed under "current assets" as "receivable from OPIC." A spokesman at corporate headquarters in New York said this represents the company's estimate of "the minimum we could expect to recover" from the Chilean episode.

But the statements in the annual report are not meant to suggest that ITT has abandoned any effort to negotiate a settlement with the Chilean government, the ITT spokesman said. Chilean sources have claimed that ITT is not negotiating in good faith because it figured the government agency would pay its claim if there was no agreement, an accusation which ITT has denied.

Marshall T. Mays, general counsel for OPIC, declined to discuss the ITT claim, except to say, "There has not been any formal determination and there couldn't be until the year is up" from the date of the Chilean action. That means that officially OPIC could not grant ITT's claim before October of this year, according to the agency.

OPIC, Mays says, has not given any assurances to ITT about the status of its claim.

The ITT claim adds another element to the giant conglomerate's current problems with government, but it also complicates the

status of OPIC, which depends on both company-paid premiums and congressional appropriations for its reserves.

This year, faced with mounting claims, OPIC has asked Congress for an additional \$85 million appropriation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1972]
UNITED STATES AND CHILE CLASH OVER DEBT PAYMENT

(By Lewis H. Diuguid)

SANTIAGO.—The effort by Chile to renegotiate heavy foreign debts has brought it into direct conflict with the United States, a confrontation that both have professed a desire to avoid.

At immediate issue is the U.S. insistence, in negotiations in Paris, that Chile accept a "standby loan" from the International Monetary Fund as a precondition to stretching out debt repayment.

The United States has taken just the opposite stance in debt negotiations next door in Argentina.

Standby loans are politically controversial in debtor countries, since they involve an active IMF role in internal management of the economy in order to assure debt repayment.

President Salvador Allende, along with the Communists and Socialists who dominate his ruling coalition, has been among the most vociferous critics of the IMF, calling it a tool of imperialists.

But Allende called in the IMF to help prepare his case for presentation to the United States and European governments at the "Paris Club" negotiations. The 77-nation IMF seeks to facilitate trade by contributing, through timely loans, to the monetary stability of its members.

In past renegotiations, standby loans from the IMF were standard procedure, and so were subsequent denunciations from the debtor countries that policies imposed by the fund had compromised their sovereignty and stymied their development.

The United States, Britain and other creditor countries argued at the Paris talks now recessed, that a standby loan was required for Chile, even though the IMF itself did not recommend it. Chile was adamantly opposed.

The IMF has often sought means short of a standby loan to serve the needs of debt-ridden developing nations. It is clear that this policy is being put to a major test in Chile and in neighboring Argentina.

DIFFERING POLITICS

While the two debt cases are similar in economic terms, the politics of the governments are different. And so are U.S. policies toward the two nations.

The policies are believed to be formulated not in the State Department, but in the Treasury Department.

The United States has insisted on the need for the restrictive standby loan for leftist Chile, but in the case of the military dictatorship in Argentina, Washington has taken unusual steps to help it obtain IMF-blessed credits without the standby loan.

Both Chilean government and U.S. embassy officials agree that the difference in policy derives from the fact that Chile has nationalized massive holdings of U.S. copper companies without compensation.

When the Paris talks got underway last month, U.S. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John R. Petty argued that the issue of compensation for the Anaconda and Kennecott copper holdings should be an integral part of the debt negotiations. The other creditor nations sought to avoid discussion of the copper situation.

About half of Chile's \$3 billion foreign debt is to the United States. Chile is asking that \$1 billion falling due in 1972-74 be rescheduled for payment over 10 years beginning in 1976. About 40 per cent of that money is owed to the United States.

Chile hopes to cooperate quietly with the IMF, while taking a strong public stand to it. Thus, Foreign Minister Clodomira Almeyda and Ambassador to the United States Orlando Letelier denied this week that a standby loan would be considered by Chile.

If the United States sticks by its position and Chile does also, it is considered probable that the talks will collapse; Chile will settle with the creditor nations accepting its terms, and payment on debts to the United States will be suspended indefinitely—or repudiated outright.

TRADE PROBLEMS

This, in turn, would foreclose public and private U.S. lines of credit to Chile and trade between the two nations would founder.

Letelier said he felt that if the United States rejected the Chilean proposal while other creditors accepted it, this would reflect a political rather than an economic decision.

Chile's reserves of foreign currency were more than \$300 million when Allende was elected in late 1970. They are now barely sufficient to import necessities, let alone pay debts.

The principal cause of the crisis was the fall in the price of copper, the only substantial export, and a rise in volume and price of the principal import, foodstuffs.

With the announcement last November that the debt must be renegotiated, Allende suspended most payments. This resulted in suspension of short-term credits by U.S. lenders.

However, some European lenders have continued credits to Chile. The Soviet Union, through its bank branches in Western Europe, has extended \$50 million in untied lending of convertible currency.

Argentine banks offered more than \$20 million for meat imports, despite the nearly desperate Argentine foreign exchange crisis. This apparently was accomplished by backup lending through the Inter-American Development Bank, using largely U.S.-provided funds.

Argentina is seeking to obtain new loans totaling \$1 billion abroad, instead of asking its creditors to accept renegotiated terms.

U.S. private lenders have made clear that before such loans could be floated, Argentina must obtain a credit from IMF. This loan would require a letter of intent on the part of Argentina, but the commitments would not be binding, nor would the terms be so demanding as those of the standby term. Most of all, it would be politically palatable.

The Nixon administration supported Argentina in this presentation to IMF, and came up with a complementary package of Export-Import Bank loans.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 15, 1971]

CHILE TO SELL RED CHINA 65,000 TONS OF COPPER

Chile's state-owned copper agency, Codelco, said a contract had been signed in Peking last week providing for the sale of 65,000 tons of Chilean copper to mainland China during the next four years, the Associated Press reported from Santiago.

Prices weren't disclosed but most international sales of copper follow the London metal market where copper sold yesterday for 47½ cents a pound. On that basis, the sale would have a current value of nearly \$61.6 million.

While the sale is a major one, it doesn't as yet constitute a major Chinese inroad into the Chilean copper market. Figures on Chile's total copper production aren't currently available, but the two largest of its mines—Chuquibambilla and El Teniente—have in recent years produced more than 300,000 tons annually.

Codelco said the Peking sale involves 38,000 tons of blister copper, 18,000 tons of electrolytic copper and 9,000 tons of large-bore copper wire.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 21, 1971]

UNITED STATES-CHILEAN RELATIONS HINGE ON COPPER-FIRM COMPENSATIONS (By James Nelson Goodsell)

A long era of American involvement in Chile is about to end.

With passage of a constitutional amendment by the Chilean Congress July 11, the way was clear for the Marxist-oriented government of Salvador Allende Gossens fully to nationalize the country's vast copper industry, which had been largely in United States hands.

There was never any doubt that the Chilean Congress would approve the plan. Meeting in joint session, the legislators passed the measure unanimously, indicating just how popular the nationalization concept is.

The importance of the measure to Chile can be seen in the fact that copper is Chile's most important resource, and that the South American country earns 80 percent or more of its foreign exchange from the sale of copper.

POOR MANAGEMENT CHARGED

The big question remaining is just how much compensation will be given the foreign copper companies, including Kennecott, Anaconda, and Cerro. In a wide-ranging speech July 11 in Rancagua, Dr. Allende denounced the foreign firms, accusing them of "avarice for profits" and "poor management" in running the copper mines.

This seemed to some commentators a firm hint that a confrontation between the Chilean Government and the foreign firms, perhaps eventually involving the United States Government, is in the offing.

"We will pay if it is fair," Dr. Allende told a gathering of miners. "We will not pay if it is not fair. We are going to stop money from leaving Chile and going to the great international copper empires. We are going to stop Chile from being a beggar nation."

Speaking in Rancagua, a city south of the capital of Santiago that sits at the base of the mountain holding El Teniente, the world's largest underground copper mine, the Chilean President said his accusations against the American firms are based on recent surveys by French and Soviet mining experts.

The studies, he said, show that the companies did not use efficient management techniques in operating the mines. He singled out Kennecott and Anaconda for making "fabulous sums" in Chile while allowing their mines to deteriorate. Kennecott operates Teniente, while Anaconda operates Chuquibambilla, the world's largest open-pit copper mine. The Chilean President accused Anaconda of making quick profits in recent years at Chuquibambilla and allowing equipment to "become obsolete."

The two mining firms have denied the accusations.

The compensation factor could well become a major factor in determining future United States policy toward Chile. The companies are covered by millions of dollars in expropriation insurance by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, an agency of the United States Government. The exact amount is not clear.

Should the Allende government refuse to pay compensation or offer a figure the companies consider too low, they could claim insurance payments from the United States Government.

DEALS WORKED OUT

Complicating the picture of compensations is the Chileanization of the copper program hammered out by the former government of Eduardo Frei Montalva. Under this program, the government worked out individual deals with the separate firms, to buy into the firms at rates of 25 or 33 or 51 percent ownership. This brought additional investment into Chile in the past four years. Dr. Allende is

already on record as saying he will honor those contracts, but they are only a portion of the total copper-investment picture in Chile.

The rest, involving 50 years or more of mining activity in Chile, is the large question mark. Some idea of Dr. Allende's approach, perhaps implied in his speech, should be clear by the end of the month. He has promised a full report to his nation by that time.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1972]

UNITED STATES, SOVIETS SIGN ACCORD EXPANDING CULTURAL EXCHANGE

(By Murray Seeger)

Moscow.—The United States and the Soviet Union agreed today to extend and expand their 14-year-old agreement for cultural, scientific and educational exchanges.

The new accord provides for an increased number of scholars, technical experts and performing artists to be exchanged between the two nations during the 1972-73 period. The greatest expansion will be in scientific and technical areas, reflecting the current high interest here in improving the efficiency of the nation's economy.

U.S. Ambassador Jacob Beam and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Alexei Smirnov signed the new accord, which has been the subject of negotiations here since March 17.

[U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, who is in Moscow to discuss grain sales to the Soviet Union, was received by Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev today, Tass news agency reported. The two men conferred in "an informal and businesslike atmosphere," Tass added.]

The new agreement also stipulates that each government can send one official traveling exhibit abroad similar to the Soviet arts show now appearing in Los Angeles and the American technology exhibit, which is currently in Moscow.

American negotiators said the cultural talks have been "businesslike" and not marked by the kind of political wrangling that has interrupted previous negotiations. They attributed part of the positive negotiation atmosphere to a Soviet concern not to mar the approaching summit talks between Soviet leaders and President Nixon next month.

After the signing ceremony, Smirnov, said the cultural agreements had "invariably proved to be beneficial for both sides" and have a "positive influence on the general status of relations between the states."

[In Washington, Secretary of State William P. Rogers said the accord would make "a useful contribution" toward increasing "contact and cooperation between our two peoples."]

U.S. officials noted the agreement is voluntary and simply sets out a plan for exchanges. Frequently, one side or the other has failed to deliver on half of an exchange automatically cancelling the other half.

In the scientific and technical areas, the agreement calls for 21 exchanges including five which were not carried out in the 1970-71 agreement. But the program also proposes for the first time an unlimited number of additional exchanges in 18 specific fields that could be negotiated individually in the next two years.

U.S. officials said they were unable to get written assurances from Soviet officials to reduce imbalances that have marred the cultural agreements. American artists in Russia often find they have been booked into small auditoriums and in remote cities while Russian artists are booked by commercial agents in the U.S. into the best and biggest halls for longer tours.

The biggest imbalance is in the tourist traffic which is also covered by the agreement. In 1971, an estimated 58,000 American tourists visited the Soviet Union while

only 200 Russian tourists visited the United States.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1972]

U.S. ROLE IN THIRD WORLD DEFENSE

(By Lewis H. Diuguid)

SANTIAGO.—Under Secretary of State John N. Irwin II defended the U.S. role in the development of the Third World today.

Irwin's speech seemed in response to yesterday's opening address to the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) by its host, Chilean President Salvador Allende, who severely criticized American performance.

However, a member of the 20-man U.S. delegation headed by Irwin said that his remarks had not been altered as a result of Allende's speech.

"The United States has supported and contributed substantially to the process of development," Irwin said. It has joined with others in establishing the concept that the wealthier countries have a responsibility to help the poorer nations accelerate their economic and social progress."

Allende had said that the industrial countries, and implicitly the United States in particular, dominated the world economic order and manipulated it to improve their own well-being at the expense of the less-developed nations, which make up 96 of UNCTAD's 141 member nations.

M'NAMARA'S STATISTICS

World Bank President Robert S. McNamara also addressed the plenary session today, amply sustaining with statistics Allende's contention that the gap between rich nations and poor—and between rich and poor within many nations—is widening.

McNamara stressed that while developed countries had agreed at previous international meetings that their official development assistance should reach 0.7 percent of their gross national products by 1975, the figure for the United States actually has fallen from 0.5 percent in the early 1960's to 0.3 percent this year. It is expected to drop to 0.24 percent by 1975.

So large a role does the United States play in aid that the overall figure for the 16 industrial nations is expected to be half of the target in 1975—even though several European nations are increasing their aid substantially.

While McNamara noted that the gross national products of developing nations had increased in recent years, he rattled off figures to show that this means no progress for the majority poor in many countries.

INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Citing Brazil McNamara said its GNP had grown 2.5 per cent per capita annually over the last decade, while the share of the poorest 40 per cent of the people had declined from 10 to 8 per cent in the same period. The richest 5 per cent of the people increased their share of the wealth from 29 to 38 per cent.

Mexico, India and other countries show similar patterns, he said. Among measures he advocated to reverse the trend were fast, vigorous tax and land reforms.

"If developing countries themselves do not adopt the policies to deal with this problem, there is little that, international institutions and other external sources of aid can do to help the poorest 40 per cent of their peoples," he said.

Irwin, like McNamara and Allende, stressed that "Increased attention must be given to particular human needs and social goals" at this third UNCTAD. He said U.S. bilateral aid will be focused on "education, nutrition, increased agricultural production and, for countries who wish it, help in family planning."

President Nixon has promised that the United States will provide preferential tariff

treatment for goods of the Third World, a step already taken by Japan and European countries.

"As all of you know only too well, the United States has not yet been able to put its own plan into effect. We very much regret our inability to do so," he said. Internal economic problems persist, creating an inauspicious atmosphere, he added. "We will recommend action by Congress as soon as the chances for success improve."

Other speakers today included former Japanese Foreign Minister Kiichi Aichi, French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and West German Finance Minister Karl Schiller.

REDUCTION OF MANPOWER IN U.S. COAST GUARD

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard has begun reducing its current manpower by 5 percent under orders of President Nixon. This cutback means the deactivation of 1,700 personnel and a vast amount of equipment. Yet, for many years Alaska has requested more Coast Guard vessels and men to more adequately patrol our vast coastlines and protect our fisheries.

I have received from the Alaska State Legislature a copy of a resolution passed by them relating to this reduction of manpower in the U.S. Coast Guard. The Alaska State Legislature vigorously protests the reduction of Coast Guard manpower and requests the President to direct the reassignment of some of the men and ships to be deactivated to Alaskan jurisdiction. I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the Record for my colleagues' attention a copy of this important resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 87

Relating to the reduction of manpower in the U.S. Coast Guard

Whereas, beginning this month, the United States Coast Guard will begin reducing its current manpower by five per cent under orders of President Nixon; and

Whereas this cutback in the Coast Guard's manpower means the deactivation of 1,700 officers and men along with ten cutters, three aircraft, two LORAN stations, and one ocean vessel station; and

Whereas continuously for many years Alaska has requested more Coast Guard vessels and men to more adequately patrol our vast coastlines, protect our fisheries from the blatant intrusion of foreign vessels, and perform more never-ending search and rescue operations; and

Whereas Alaskans have been told that additional craft and manpower requested could not be released from other duty stations and transferred to Alaska; and

Whereas Alaska is desperately in need of more fisheries surveillance and search and rescue operations, the present complement of Coast Guard equipment currently in Alaska being totally inadequate to ensure the sanctity of our waters and resources and protection of lives and property;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that it protests vigorously the reduction of Coast Guard manpower and the deactivation of enforcement ships when Alaska is in urgent need of additional Coast Guard patrol capabilities in Alaska; and be it

Further resolved that the President is urged to reassess his ordered cutback in the current manpower of the United States Coast Guard and to direct the immediate reassignment of some of the men and ships to be deactivated to the jurisdiction of the Seventeenth Coast Guard District.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary, Department of Transportation; Admiral Chester R. Bender, Commandant, United States Coast Guard; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED—A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today, I place in the Record the final of the four installments of a documentary history of the Manpower Development and Training Act. This installment, contains excerpts from the committee reports, and floor debate of the 1968, 1969, and 1972 amendments to MDTA, and brings the development of the act itself up to date. There have been, of course, very significant manpower legislative developments which do not appear in this history, since they do not constitute a part of MDTA. I refer, to the efforts made in the 91st Congress to enact a Comprehensive Manpower and Employment Act, which was vetoed by the President in December 1970, and the more successful effort last year to enact and obtain presidential approval for, the Emergency Employment Act. Equally vital to the national manpower system, but also outside the scope of this history are the amendments and improvements to the Vocational Education Act which have been enacted over the past decade.

The fourth installment follows:

[90th Cong., 2d sess., House of Representatives, Rept. No. 1595]

AMENDING THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

June 27, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following report together with additional, minority, and individual views [to accompany H.R. 15045].

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 15045) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 104(a) of the Act (labor mobility demonstration projects) is amended

by striking out "1968" in the first sentence of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(2) Section 105 of the Act (trainee placement assistance demonstration projects) is amended by striking out "1968" in the first sentence of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(3) Section 251 of the Act (PART D—CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS) is amended by striking out "1969", and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(4) Section 304(d) of the Act is amended by striking out "1968" and "1969", and inserting respectively in lieu thereof "1969" and "1970";

(5) Section 310(a) and 310(b) of the Act are amended by striking out "1969" wherever it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 202(f) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(j)".

(b) The first sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(j)".

SEC. 3. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting after section 308 the following new section:

"TRAINING AND RELATED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 309. The Secretary of Labor shall provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, training and related technical assistance for specialized or other personnel which are needed in connection with the programs established under this Act or which otherwise pertain to the purposes of this Act. Upon request the Secretary may make special assignments of personnel to public or private agencies, institutions, or employers to carry out the purposes of this section; but no such special assignments shall be for a period of more than two years. Two per centum of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year for this Act shall be reserved to carry out the purposes of this section during such fiscal year."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by redesignating the existing provisions as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In making arrangements for institutional training financed in whole or in part with funds appropriated to carry out title I, and title II, parts A, B, C, and D, of this Act, including but not limited to basic education, employability and communications skills, prevocational training, vocational and technical programs, and supplementary or related instruction for on-the-job training whether conducted at the job site or elsewhere, priority shall be given to the use of skill centers established under the authority of this section."

(b) Section 301 of the Act is amended by redesignating the existing provisions as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In order to make maximum utilization of previous investments of Federal funds made under this Act and to avoid unnecessary waste and duplication, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under the authority of this section and through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), allocate sufficient funds and numbers of institutional trainees to insure a level of skill center operation in each State equal to that which existed on June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, whichever is the greater. In no event shall the overall allotments for institutional training be less than 65 per centum of the funds appropriated by the Congress to carry out title II of this Act. No new skill centers shall be established in an area already served by a skill center as defined by the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare,

nor shall an existing center be discontinued or curtailed as long as this Act is in force unless it has previously been established by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that, (1) an existing center is no longer able to either provide or arrange for needed training, (2) training of a similar nature previously provided has been ineffective, or (3) there is no longer a need for training based on labor market analysis or other pertinent data."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "and the Virgin Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by inserting after "purposes of the Act" the following: ", and except that the State agency for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be paid up to 100 per centum of such costs".

(c) Section 308 of such Act is amended by striking out "and Guam" and inserting in lieu thereof "Guam, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

Amend the title so as to read:

A bill to extend expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

H.R. 15045 was introduced on February 1, 1968, in the form of a simple change in the expiration dates in the Manpower Development and Training Act (42 U.S.C. 2571-2620). This act first placed on the statute books in 1962 has been amended three times since, in 1963, 1965, and 1966. The tendency of each of these amendments has been to make the act and its administration more flexible and more responsive to shifting needs.

The overall intention of your committee in 1968 is the same as it has been in each of these other occasions in which MDTA has been amended. The words of your committee's report in 1966 (H. Rept. 2017, 89th Cong., second sess.) are still appropriate:

"At the time the act was passed, many thoughtful Americans looked upon the advent of automation and the other aspects of the new technology as bringing with them inevitable and far-reaching economic dislocation. The debate over automation and its effects was not couched in terms of whether or not the effects would be traumatic, but on how quickly we could recover from them."

"In 1966, there is still no question but that automation will continue to proceed apace, and that the techniques and structure of American industry will change even more in years to come than it has changed in years recently past."

"If the MDTA program is to remain a useful tool for coping with the changes that we can expect in the near future, if we are to use this device, with others, to alleviate and even escape the economic penalties which technological change customarily exacts, this act must continue to be altered as experience and changing problems dictate. An act which 4 years ago was primarily aimed at the problems of those who had experienced or were facing technological unemployment, is not necessarily, and not without alteration, useful to meet the problems of the disadvantaged and the hardcore unemployed or to deal with critical skill shortages. The 1966 amendments are not simply a weapon in the war against poverty—though they are a weapon in that war. They are not simply a safeguard against the effects of automation—though they are such a safeguard. They are not simply a remedy for industry's problem of growing skill shortages—though they are such a remedy. Rather, these amendments, like the original act and its subsequent amendments, are an attempt to build the foundations upon which a national manpower policy can, as

someday it will, be built, so that the Nation's most valuable natural resource—the brains and muscles and ingenuity of its people—can be most effectively utilized in the context of a free economy."

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Select Subcommittee on Labor, chaired by Representative Holland, held 2 days of hearings on H.R. 15045. Testimony was taken from the Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; from Mr. Leo Beebe, executive vice president of the National Alliance of Businessmen; from Mr. Kenneth Young of the AFL-CIO; and from Mr. Jack Michle, director of the East Bay Skills Center in Oakland, Calif. On June 13 the subcommittee voted to report H.R. 15045, with amendments, to the full committee, and on June 20 the full committee, after making further amendments, ordered the bill reported to the House.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Basically, H.R. 15045 extends the expiration dates contained in the present Act. The authority to conduct the basic training programs under this Act, which would now expire on June 30, 1969, is extended to June 30, 1972. Certain experimental and development programs are extended for shorter periods of time. Title II-D authorizing training for inmates of correctional institutions, which now expires on June 30, 1969, is extended for one year. The provisions of section 104 (labor mobility demonstration projects) and section 105 (trainee placement assistance demonstration projects), which expire June 30, 1968, are extended for two years. The net effect of these amendments are, in short, to extend the pilot programs until 1970, and the basic program until 1972.

Section 2 of the bill is a purely technical amendment, correcting an obvious typographical error contained in the 1966 amendments.

Section 3 calls for a 2-percent set-aside of funds appropriated in each fiscal year under the Act, for the purpose of providing training and related technical assistance toward the preparation of the specialized personnel who are needed to make MDTA a more effective program. Counselors, job development specialists, and program administrators are illustrative of the personnel this amendment is meant to help prepare, though this is not an exhaustive list. As manpower policy becomes broader in its application, and as manpower institutions, on State and local as well as the Federal level, become more significant tools of economic policy, the need for trained people with broad manpower expertise to man such institutions becomes crucial. In providing for this training, your committee does not intend that it shall be limited to the personnel needs of the Departments of Labor and HEW and the State agencies directly involved in administering this Act. Other public agencies, at the Federal and at the State and local levels (where the needs are especially acute), as well as private and nonprofit agencies, will have growing need for such manpower specialists. The authority contained in section 3 of this bill ought to be utilized to help train people for the entire spectrum of need. Although this amendment was not contained in the original bill, the Secretary of Labor advised the committee during the hearings that he had no objection to this amendment. Indeed, he suggested that he would welcome it.

Section 4 seeks to make it possible for skill centers to be used in a more flexible and satisfactory manner to carry out institutional training and related aspects of the program. The skill center has proven to be an excellent device in providing both basic education and skills training, without running afoul of the inflexibilities sometimes found in trying to mesh MDTA institutional training with the school year and other problems of the standard vocational education system. Testimony before the subcommittee indi-

cated that among the unexpected dividends of the skill centers is that they sometimes provide an institution with which trainees—particularly disadvantaged trainees—can identify in the same way that the educationally advantaged can identify with the schools which are their gateways into the world of work. In some skill centers, representatives from other agencies—employment counselors, educational rehabilitation personnel, welfare and probation officers, and the like—find office space and an opportunity to bring their specific services to the trainees. The skill center in such a situation can become a nucleus for a broad-gage manpower center, serving a vital purpose of even wider proportions than those which MDTA by itself seeks to encompass.

The effectiveness of skill centers in the narrow terms of training and placement are also very impressive. In terms of placement rates and effectiveness in reaching the hard-core unemployed, all the data testifies to the value of the skill center, whether looked at purely as a training institution or from a broader frame of reference.

But the skill centers, too, have run afoul of certain inflexibilities in the act, or, to be more precise, in its administration. The major problem has been the perhaps exaggerated attention the Department has paid to the requirements of the act that there be a "reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the person is to be trained" (sec. 202(f)). This provision was originally, and is still, intended by your committee to insure that MDTA does not fall into the trap of providing "busywork" training for obsolescent skills or for jobs for which there is no real demand. Your committee felt enough of this had been done in the name of job training in the past, and that to do more of it would be to perpetrate a fraud alike on the trainee and on the taxpayer.

To avoid this trap the Congress provided, and the Department of Labor has correctly insisted, that a determination be made that there is a "reasonable" expectation of employment for a trainee using the skills he acquires through MDTA. But the key word is "reasonable." The testimony we received from persons knowledgeable in the program tends to indicate that job surveys have become a stumbling block in the effective use of the skill centers. Excessive delay in making such surveys, inflexibility in making determinations, have contributed to periods of idleness in the use of skill center personnel. The frequently very highly qualified and capable instructors available to the skill centers ought to be utilized to the fullest, as should the sometimes superb equipment and physical plant which are found in these centers.

The committee is convinced that more administrative flexibility is needed in order to utilize the full potential of the MDTA skill centers. For example, arbitrary time limits established under the project method for initiating training programs make it impossible to enroll trainees after the program has begun. Thus, the "pipeline technique" cannot be employed and enrollments in skill centers have shown that oftentimes teachers and equipment are not used to full capacity. Much needed resources and personnel stand idle while the need for training, especially for the disadvantaged, continues.

In administering the program, your committee would urge that the Secretaries of Labor and HEW both should "give priority" as section 4 of the bill directs, to the use of skill centers. In making this statement of legislative intent, your committee does not mean to suggest that other training facilities should be neglected while trainees are waiting in line to get into crowded skill centers. Nor do we mean to suggest any diminution in the efforts of the two Departments to utilize the training facilities of the private sector. But the tests of "reasonable expectation of employment" and similar criteria should not be so managed as to result in letting dust gather

on modern machine tools in skill centers, and losing the services of highly trained instructors while an overscrupulous effort to document the availability of jobs eats up all the leadtime during which those jobs remain available.

Section 4(b) of the bill directs that the two Departments in exercising their authority under section 231 should so direct the planning under CAMPS (cooperative area manpower planning system) that sufficient funds and sufficient training "slots" are allocated to skill centers so that such centers may be operated at a level equal to that achieved on June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, whichever, in a given State, is higher. It further directs, as a warning against either overconcentrating or underconcentrating resources on the skill centers, that no new centers be established or existing ones be discontinued or curtailed until the two Secretaries establish, in effect, that an existing center can no longer do the job, or has not been doing the job, or that the job doesn't need to be done any more. Any one of these conditions is sufficient, under this amendment, to authorize the discontinuance of an existing center. If, in the course of making such a determination, it becomes apparent that a new center under different auspices or with a different structure is needed, then such a new center can be established.

Finally, to insure sufficient funds for the skill centers and for other institutional training projects of particular merit, section 4(b) of the bill specifically allocates 65 percent of the funds appropriated for title II activities to institutional training. It is the intention of your committee that the bulk of any increase in institutional allotments which this amendment may eventually create should be utilized, wherever possible, and without excessively rigid rules, to achieve the basic thrust of this new subsection, which is to build upon the existing base provided by the skill centers without denying access to institutional training programs to those persons who do not live in areas served by skill centers.

The final amendment approved by your committee is in section 5 of the bill, which extends the MDTA program to American Samoa and the trust territories. The matching provisions of section 301 of the act are waived in their case. The Secretary of Labor is given authority to establish the amount of training allowances in both of these newly added areas as he now has with respect to Guam and the Virgin Islands, because of the inapplicability of the training allowance formula, attached as it is in the several States to unemployment compensation levels.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

TITLE I—MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION

LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 104. (a) During the period ending June 30, [1968] 1970, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to in-

voluntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 105. During the period ending June 30, [1968] 1970, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than \$300,000 may be used for purposes of this section.

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SELECTION OF TRAINEES

SEC. 202. (a) * * *

(f) Before selecting a person for training, other than the training under subsection [(1)] (f), the Secretary shall determine that there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the person is to be trained. If such employment is not available in the area in which the person resides, the Secretary shall obtain reasonable assurance of such person's willingness to accept employment outside his area of residence.

TRAINING ALLOWANCES

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed persons selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of the Act. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed \$10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided*, That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by \$5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further*, That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including pay-

ments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess. With respect to Guam [and the Virgin Islands], the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the Secretary shall by regulation determine the amount of the training allowance to be paid any eligible person training under this Act.

With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.

For persons undergoing on-the-job training, the amount of any payment which would otherwise be made by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to that payment as the number of compensated hours per week under the training program bears to forty hours.

The training allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked (other than in employment under such an on-the-job training program) in excess of twenty hours per week.

PART B—DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 231. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of this title enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State education agencies will undertake to provide training needed to equip persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals, except that with respect to education to be provided pursuant to referrals under subsection (b) or [(1)] (j) of section 202, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the education to be provided under such subsection through other appropriate education agencies. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public educational agencies or institutions or through arrangements with private educational or training institutions where such private institutions can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or where such institutions can, at comparable cost, (1) provide substantially equivalent training, or (2) make possible an expanded use of the individual referral method, or (3) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages. The State agency shall be paid not more than 90 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that payments in excess of 90 per centum are necessary because such payments with respect to private institutions or programs carried out in conjunction with programs or projects under section 102(6) are required to give full effect to the purposes of the Act, and except that the State agency for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be paid up to 100 per centum of such costs: *Provided*, That for

the period ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. Such agreements shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provision (1) for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, (2) for immediate certification to the Secretary of Labor by the responsible training agency with respect to each person referred for training who does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training absent good cause, and (3) for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall give preference to training and education provided through State vocational education agencies and other State education agencies. However, in any case in which he determines that it would permit persons to begin their training or education within a shorter period of time, or permit the needed training or education to be provided more economically, or more effectively, he may provide the needed training or education by agreement or contract made directly with public or private training or educational facilities or through such other arrangements as he deems necessary to give full effect to this Act.

(b) In making arrangements for institutional training financed in whole or in part with funds appropriated to carry out title I, and title II, parts A, B, C, and D of this Act, including but not limited to basic education, employability and communications skills, prevocational training, vocational and technical programs, and supplementary or related instruction for on-the-job training whether conducted at the job site or elsewhere, priority shall be given to the use of skill centers established under the authority of this section.

PART D—CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 251. Without regard to any other provision of this title or section 301 of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall, during the period ending June 30, [1969] 1970, develop and carry out experimental and demonstration programs of training and education for persons in correctional institutions who are in need thereof to obtain employment upon release. Arrangements for such education and training shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after consultation with the appropriate area manpower development and training advisory committee. Programs under this part shall be conducted through agreements with officials of Federal, State, and local correctional institutions. To the fullest extent practicable, the Secretary of Labor shall utilize the available services of other Federal departments and agencies. Programs under this part may include vocational education; special job development and placement activities; prevocational, basic, and secondary education, and counseling, where appropriate; supportive and followup services and such other assistance as is deemed necessary.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

APPORTIONMENT OF BENEFITS

SEC. 301. (a) For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under parts A and B of title II of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall apportion 80 per

centum of the funds available for such purposes in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards shall consider only the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed in such State, and (5) the average weekly unemployment compensation benefits paid by the State. The remaining 20 per centum may be expended by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as they find necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of title II. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized to make reapportionments from time to time where the total amounts apportioned under this section have not been fully obligated in a particular State, or where the State or appropriate agencies in the State have not entered into the necessary any other State is in need of additional agreements, and the Secretaries find that funds to carry out the programs authorized by this Act: *Provided*, That no funds apportioned with respect to a State in any fiscal year shall be reapportioned before the expiration of the sixth month of such fiscal year and only upon 30 days' prior notice to such State of the proposed reapportionment, except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year.

(b) In order to make maximum utilization of previous investments of Federal funds made under this Act and to avoid unnecessary waste and duplication, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall under the authority of this section and through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS), allocate sufficient funds and numbers of institutional trainees to insure a level of skill center operation in each State equal to that which existed on June 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, whichever is the greater. In no event shall the overall allotments for institutional training be less than 65 per centum of the funds appropriated by the Congress to carry out title II of this Act. No new skill centers shall be established in an area already served by a skill center as defined by the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, nor shall an existing center be discontinued or curtailed as long as this Act is in force unless it has previously been established by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that (1) an existing center is no longer able to either provide or arrange for needed training, (2) training of a similar nature previously provided has been ineffective, or (3) there is no longer a need for training based on labor market analysis or other pertinent data.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 304. (a) For the purposes of carrying out title I, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$46,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out parts A and B of title II, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$385,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out part C of title II, there are hereby authorized to

be appropriated not in excess of \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

(d) For the purpose of carrying out part D of title II, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, [1968] 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, [1969] 1970, such amounts as may be necessary.

(e) For the purpose of carrying out title III, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

DEFINITION

SEC. 308. For the purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and [Guam] Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Training and Related Technical Assistance

Sec. 309. The Secretary of Labor shall provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, training and related technical assistance for specialized or other personnel which are needed in connection with the programs established under this Act or which otherwise pertain to the purposes of this Act. Upon request the Secretary may make special assignments of personnel to public or private agencies, institutions, or employers to carry out the purposes of this section; but no such special assignments shall be for a period of more than two years. Two per centum of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year for this Act shall be reserved to carry out the purposes of this section during such fiscal year.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 310. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, [1969] 1972.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, [1969] 1972.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. HOLLAND, MR. GIBBONS, MR. HATHAWAY, AND MR. MEEDS

We support H.R. 15045. We support it, indeed, with enthusiasm and with deep feeling that the Manpower Development and Training Act has, in the 6 years of its operation, more than fulfilled the hopes of its original authors, among whom some of us are numbered. This program, which has achieved an ever-growing amount of bipartisan support among the Members of the Congress, and stanch backing in all segments of the economy, has served the Nation well and faithfully. Nearly half a million Americans have successfully completed institutional and on-the-job training courses under MDTA, and this does not take into account the thousands of others who have "failed to complete" such courses, not because they couldn't handle the training but because even incomplete training courses enabled them to find better jobs.

Since its original enactment in 1962, the Congress has seen fit on several occasions to amend the basic act. In every case, these amendments have been designed to make the program more flexible, to enable the Secretaries of Labor and HEW to more rapidly and meaningfully meet their responsibilities, to allow for more expeditious action to meet current manpower problems as well as to plan for long-range trends. This movement toward more flexibility, this trend away from rigidity in fund allocation and away from limiting the choice of tools avail-

able to those given these grave responsibilities, has not been accidental. We have deliberately, and as a matter of considered policy, sought to do just that. In making MDTA more flexible, the Congress has sought to achieve precisely what it sought to achieve in the 1967 amendments to title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which is also characterized in its approach to manpower problems by the concept that what is needed is the development of a substantial arsenal of weapons, to be utilized as needed, in an integrated program, by those who have the operating responsibility to see that our national manpower resources are most advantageously developed.

Most of the provisions of this bill carry out that long-standing congressional policy. Section 4(b), which we believe to have been introduced and adopted with the best of intentions, turns that policy around, in our judgment, exactly 180 degrees. Section 4(b) of this bill will have the effect, we fear, of reducing the options available to manpower administrators in precisely the wrong way. We cannot disagree with the purpose of this amendment. We do disagree with its timing, its scope and its method of achieving the purpose.

Section 4(b)'s purpose, clearly, is to maximize the use of skill centers as a mode of offering institutional training. With this objective we wholly agree. We concur in every thing the committee report says about skill centers, and would, if necessary, add further praise of their achievements and their promise. On this point, there is no substantial disagreement. But in seeking to implement this policy the amendment freezes the number of skill centers—and we have no real knowledge at this point of what number of skill centers we are fixing, or which skill centers will be preserved, and which found not to be eligible, how many trainees we are affecting, or how much it will cost. The term "skill center" is variously defined. Merely calling a hastily thrown together congeries of courses a "skill center" doesn't necessarily make it one, even in the minds of the sponsors of this amendment, and certainly not in the eyes of those charged with the administration of this legislation.

The real damage done by this amendment, is in the sentence which appears casually in the midst of the subsection 4(b) and which is not tied, logically, to the skill center concept, arbitrarily fixing the institutional allocation at 65 percent of all funds appropriated under title II of the act. The precise level of the figure is one flaw, but its greatest flaw is that it is a rigid floor and may well become an equally rigid ceiling.

In order to fund an unknown number of skill centers, this bill allocates a very large sum of money, taking much of that money away from other institutional programs and eventually taking it away, too, from availability for the JOBS program, through which the resources and talents of the private sector are being harnessed to the manpower training and development problem.

One further, perhaps symbolic, perhaps real, flaw is to be found in the language of the amendment. In directing the two Secretaries to "allocate sufficient funds and numbers of institutional trainees to insure a level of skill center operation in each State equal to that which existed on June 30, 1967 or June 30, 1968, whichever is greater," the amendment turns MDTA into a program for the maintenance of institutions rather than a program for the training of people and the development of manpower resources. In enacting this language, we are explicitly committing ourselves to the maintenance of skill centers, *without adequate regard to the needs which may exist in a given community at a given time*. The trainees must be shuffled about to accommodate the needs of the centers, rather than the other way around. Further, we are directing the preservation of existing skill centers and impeding the cre-

ation of new ones, again without adequate regard for the needs of the unemployed or underemployed for whose benefit this act is supposed to operate. Section 4(b) of the bill before us turns MDTA into a program of guaranteed employment for the faculty and administrators of skill centers, at the cost of the very people the entire program is supposed to benefit.

We do not oppose 4(b) because it refers to skill centers. We would oppose it if it did the same thing for any one of the devices that have been created or utilized under MDTA. We would oppose it if it applied to standard vocational schools, to on-the-job training, to coupled projects, or to whatever. Its flaw is that it takes a very good part of the program and seeks to enshrine its operation at the cost of all the other good parts of the program. It is an unwieldy provision which may result, not in the misuse of appropriated funds, but—even worse—in their nonuse.

We hope that the House can be prevailed upon to amend or drop this section to H.R. 15045. If the House does so, we think it should be made clear at the time that we do so without in any way departing from the intention stated in the committee report and in subsection (a) that skill centers should be used in the maximum amount feasible consistent with the broad objectives of MDTA. Skill centers, their remarkable physical plants and their excellent staffs ought to be used to the fullest possible extent—remembering first, however, that the purpose of this act is to meet the needs of those who require training in order to find meaningful permanent employment in the real world.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 15045

We are not opposed to the bill reported by the committee. In fact, we strongly support all of its provisions, most of which would extend the life of significant portions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), several of which are shortly about to expire. Our criticism is directed not at what the bill contains but at what it fails to include.

Not only do all of us support the continued existence of the MDTA, but some of us take a great deal of pride not merely in having cooperated at its birth in 1962, but in having made significant contributions both to its original enactment and its subsequent development and improvement as well.

What we fear, and it is this at which our critique is aimed, is the serious impairment, even the possible elimination, of many of the training programs, both on the job and institutional, which have been established and successfully operated under MDTA. For that reason we believe that the committee bill ought to be amended to include provisions designed to prevent this impairment and possible elimination of training programs which have proved their value.

The damage to these programs has already begun and becomes progressively more serious. This development is the result of the adoption by the administration of new manpower approaches establishing programs which are relentlessly eliminating an increasing number of the successful types of manpower project, particularly in the OJT field, which had theretofore been set up under MDTA and many of which still exist although now threatened with extinction. These new approaches are best described in the administration's announcement of March 19, 1968, setting forth its manpower goals and funding for the fiscal year 1969.

The overall estimate is for total program funds under title II of MDTA of almost \$354 million. Of this total, over \$22 million will be reserved for training individuals in redevelopment areas under part C of title II and will not be apportioned among the States.

Pursuant to section 301 of the act, 80 percent of the remaining \$331 million, amounting to \$265 million, will be appor-

tioned among the States, and 20 percent, amounting to \$66 million, will be retained in an unapportioned account to be administered by the Secretaries of Labor and HEW. The \$265 million to be apportioned among the States will be allocated as follows: \$160 million to institutional training, \$84 million to on-the-job training (OJT), and \$21 million to part-time and other-than-skill training.

However, during the fiscal year 1968 the administration initiated two new manpower programs, the concentrated employment program (CEP) and the job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS) programs, both of which were to be and are being funded out of appropriations for title II of MDTA and the Economic Opportunity Act, and under the authority of these two statutes, without resorting to new legislation. These two programs are directed toward helping effectively what may accurately be called the innermost hard core of the "hard-core unemployed."

The March 19, 1968, announcement estimates that of the total needed to finance these two new programs, \$99 million will come from MDTA title II appropriations, the larger part of which, approximately two-thirds, will be taken from funds to be apportioned among the States. Thus of the \$84 million to be apportioned to the States for OJT purposes, \$45.1 million will go into JOBS programs and \$16.2 million into CEP activities, leaving only \$22.7 million for the States to use for their ongoing and traditional OJT projects, a reduction of 73 percent.

It is painfully obvious that these ongoing and traditional types of OJT projects will be reduced to a mere shadow of their former status and that whatever autonomy that several States have hitherto enjoyed in promoting, developing, funding, monitoring, and otherwise serving training programs under title II of MDTA will virtually disappear or be seriously diminished.

However, we wish, with all the emphasis at our command, to make it perfectly plain that we do not oppose either the goals, the purposes, or the structure of both the CEP and JOBS programs. To the contrary, we wholeheartedly approve them. We think they are so important, and may prove to be so valuable in finding the beginning of a solution for the problem of the innermost hard core of the "hard-core unemployed," that they deserve a separate and specific legislative authority of their own.

At the very least, they should have separate, specific, and adequate funding of their own rather than being implemented by cannibalizing much of the finances essential to the continued survival of other manpower programs which are, at present, and have been, since the inception of MDTA, effectively performing a somewhat different but equally desirable, even indispensable function. It is our view that none of the ongoing MDTA projects, established outside the CEP and JOBS programs, ought to be terminated unless it can be shown that such project is not complying with any applicable requirement of the Manpower Act, or is not being carried out effectively in a manner reasonably designed to effectuate the policies of that act, or that the need for such a project no longer exists, nor should such a project be curtailed except to an extent equivalent to the decrease in the magnitude of the need it was designed to meet.

We therefore shall offer on the floor, amendments, rejected in the committee, which are designed to assure the continued existence, at their previous levels, of these ongoing and traditional manpower programs. Simultaneously we pledge our support for any appropriate effort to secure for the CEP and JOBS programs the separate and additional funds needed to permit these two new programs to achieve the goals set for them by the administration. We firmly believe that the approach we have taken, will have

the additional beneficial result of restoring to the States that autonomy under title II of the MDTA which Congress intended them to have, and of which they are being deprived by the manner in which the CEP and JOBS programs are being, and will continue to be, administered unless our amendments are adopted.

We are convinced that the cannibalizing approach and funding of CEP and JOBS as administered by the Secretary of Labor are contrary to the intent of Congress and go beyond the authority given him under title II of the MDTA. In this connection, and in support of this contention, it is extremely relevant to quote from the report of the Committee on Appropriations, recently committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES.—The bill includes \$400 million, a reduction of \$13,096,000 from the request, and an increase of \$14,503,000 over the amount appropriated for 1968.

The committee desires that the Department review its current policy of increasing the emphasis on the on-the-job training over institutional training. Evaluations made of the manpower development and training program have concluded that institutional training is a more effective way of reaching the disadvantaged. *The committee questions the arbitrary division of funds made by the Secretary of Labor in allotting money to the States. A review of the legislative history of the Manpower Development and Training Act leaves considerable doubt that the Secretary has the authority to carve the State apportionment up between institutional and on-the-job training. The committee feels that it would be more desirable, and more in keeping with the legislative history, if the States were given more of a voice in determining the division of available funds between the two.* (Emphasis added.)

Although we express no opinion on the comparative merits of OJT versus institutional training, we are in complete agreement with the Committee on Appropriations that the Secretary of Labor is depriving the States of the autonomy given them in title II, and that in doing so he is acting beyond the scope of the authority given him by that same title.

From its inception, the Manpower Development and Training Act has contained provisions which make clear the congressional intent that the States were expected to be active partners in the Federal manpower program. Section 301 of the act contains an allocation formula which provides a method of distributing financial resources available under MDTA to the States. Section 206 of the act encourages and authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with the States and to utilize the services of appropriate State agencies in carrying out his responsibilities.

In accordance with these sections, the States have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Labor to participate in the MDTA institutional training programs and some States in addition have put into effect arrangements involving the OJT institutional training programs. The MDTA institutional training programs are administered by the State employment security agencies with the State departments of education participating in the development and operation of institutional facilities.

During Federal fiscal year 1968, the Secretary had entered into OJT institutional program agreements with over 12 States and the combined activity of these States constituted more than half of the total Federal effort in this program area. It has been in this area that there have been serious program problems. The States have experienced de-

lays in funding projects that have been accepted by employers and that have met the standards prescribed by the U.S. Department of Labor. The damage done by delay in funding is twofold; it has caused disenchantment of employers, and more importantly, it has meant a delay in reaching these individuals that the legislation sought to serve. As the fiscal year 1968 comes to a close, it is unlikely that all training projects developed within the funds that were apportioned and approved by Federal regional officials as meeting Federal standards and requirements will in fact be funded and that some of those which have been, will be able to survive. The uncertainties that prevailed in fiscal year 1968 are being projected into fiscal year 1969, as we have pointed out in describing the administration's manpower blueprint of March 19, 1968.

Equally important, however, as the announced change in apportionment, the U.S. Department of Labor has proposed for the OJT area a vital change in the arrangements between the States and the U.S. Department of Labor. The agreements between the States and the U.S. Department for MDTA programs provided that the States would assume the responsibility of promoting, developing, funding, monitoring, and other services associated with implementing the training programs, and the U.S. Department of Labor made funds available to the States for personnel to handle these important functions. The Department of Labor now proposes that in the OJT area the more important functions of promoting, developing, and funding be assumed by Federal personnel and that State agencies retain only the lesser responsibilities of monitoring and servicing projects. A proportion of the experienced State personnel, whose training has been financed by Federal funds, would be released from employment and, presumably new Federal employees would be secured to assume the duties now handled by State employees.

In order to assure the participation of State agencies in the MDTA programs that Congress intended, we propose that sections 301 and 206 of the Manpower Act be amended. The action of Federal officials during the past 2 years makes it obvious that amendments to both sections are needed in order to insure the orderly operation of the Federal Manpower Program within States having agreements with the Secretary of Labor, in line with the legislative intent of these two sections.

We suggest that section 301 be amended to insure that appropriated funds allocated to the States remain fully available to the States as long as the States have a backlog of unfunded Federal manpower programs that meet Federal criteria and standards. The amendment would narrow the Secretary's discretionary authority to some extent. At the same time, it would guarantee that appropriated, allocated manpower training funds made available to the States under Federal-States agreements were actually available when the States completed their part of the working agreement and were ready to utilize the funds. This proposed amendment to section 301 would have considerable force in giving the State agencies some assurance that the Federal Government would live up to its commitment.

Our proposed amendment to section 206 would require the Secretary to enter into agreement with States and State agencies requesting the right to become active working partners in the Federal manpower program. At present, under section 206, the making of agreements is completely discretionary with the Secretary, and he can, in fact, decide to ignore the request of a State to become a partner in the Federal manpower program. There is considerable concern that during fiscal year 1969, the Secretary will reduce the number of States with

which the Department will negotiate such working partnership agreements.

The proposed amendment to section 206 would assure continued participation of the States in the Federal manpower program and would remove the possibility of changing operating methods between the Federal and State governments on short notice. Presumably, without such an amendment, changes planned for those States having an OJT agreement could be extended, without congressional approval, to existing agreements with the State employment security agencies that would involve the training programs in all 50 States. Such a development would mean that all MDTA training programs would become Federal operations and the provision for allocating funds to the States as now provided in the legislation would mean very little. The Federal officials could distribute the funds within the States without State participation to suit the objectives of Federal Government officials.

We sincerely hope that the House will approve the amendments we have proposed and that it will give serious consideration to providing additional adequate but separate funding for the CEP and JOBS programs.

WILLIAM H. AYRES.
ALBERT H. QUIE.
ALPHONZO BELL.
JOHN N. ERLÉNBERG.
JOHN DELLENBACK.
MARVIN L. ESCH.
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. SCHERLE

I am not opposed to the professed purposes and objectives of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended nor to the provisions in the bill reported by the committee extending the life of several of the important provisions of the act.

Nevertheless, I voted against reporting the bill because I am convinced, on the basis of considerable evidence which has come to my attention, that these professed purposes and objectives are not being fulfilled. This failure is the direct consequence of the gross maladministration of the act by those executive departments and agencies of the Government which have the responsibility for carrying out the intent of Congress as expressed in the statute.

For many months I have been increasingly appalled by the shocking ineptitude, carelessness, waste, and inefficiency which characterize the operations of many of the programs established under the Manpower Development and Training Act programs which are financed almost entirely from Federal funds. In other words, they are paid for with huge sums of money taken out of the pockets of the hard-working and long-suffering American taxpayer. Despite these enormous expenditures of public funds, the degeneration in the activities and administration of our national manpower and policy programs has sunk to a level of waste, inefficiency, and self-seeking opportunism which is matched only by the similar conditions which have long prevailed in the implementation of the so-called war on poverty by the Office of Economic Opportunity, its retainers and satellites.

Earlier this year, I received evidence of a situation which had arisen in a federally financed manpower project in my own State of Iowa which was so disgraceful that I was forced to conclude that only a thorough public airing offered any hope of eliminating these cancerous growths on the body politic, or, at any rate, halting their further proliferation. It seems to me that if the American people, particularly that overburdened segment that shoulders virtually all of the Federal tax load, were given the essential facts about the operation of our manpower programs, without sentimentality and in their stark and naked reality, they would, as with a single voice, demand their complete reform,

or, if that were not possible, their total abolition.

With that consideration in mind, I requested the chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor, in a letter sent to him early last March, to have the committee, through its professional staff, make an official investigation of the situation in my home State, because of the serious questions concerning the improper disposition of Federal funds which were involved in the Iowa situation.

Thus in the face of this silent and impenetrable barrier to an effective examination of the functioning of our national manpower policy, I am left with no choice but to point out to the American public by means of these views, the incredible mess which has been made of many of the programs and projects established pursuant to that policy. The situation in Iowa to which I have referred is neither unique nor even exceptional—it is quite representative of a number of similar situations which exist in other parts of the Nation.

To be precise, I have unchallengeable information that \$4,518 in MDTA funds were "funneled into the Iowa Department of Public Safety for an on-the-job training program that existed only on paper." This was the finding of the Iowa State auditor who investigated the matter. The investigation found that the department of public safety employees who were to be trained not only were fully employed but were far from "unemployable." One, for example, was a veteran of 19 years in the agency and several were supervisors. All were surprised to learn that they were recorded as having undergone 8 weeks of on-the-job training.

But let me be more specific. The MDTA program is supposedly designed primarily to assist private enterprises and government agencies in financing the recruiting and training of the economically and socially disadvantaged unemployed, often referred to as the hard-core unemployed. Here are some of the individual responses of public safety employees when they were told that they had been reported as having completed 8 weeks of "on-the-job" training:

Everett Nelson, a department investigator, said, "It's news to me."

"I don't even know what you're talking about," was the comment of Yvonne Victoria, a records section supervisor.

"There must be some mix-up," said Chief Radio Dispatcher Ralph Johnson.

"To the best of my knowledge, there was no such thing. Nobody's been looking over my shoulder. I usually sit with my back to the wall." This was the observation of Leonard Murray, a supervisor in the department's bureau of criminal investigation.

Interesting in the case of Harold Schurtz, who joined the department after a 27-year employment career with the Mason City (Iowa) Fire Department, a career from which he retired as chief of fire prevention. One of the OJT contract lists Mr. Schurtz among 10 persons who are described as "hard-to-place unemployed." Said Mr. Schurtz: "It's an insult. Ridiculous—I can't remember being unemployed since I was a kid in school."

Here we have a number of individuals, all employed, who are totally unaware that they are receiving or supposed to be receiving on-the-job training. I have been advised that failure to inform an employee that he is being trained constitutes a violation of a Federal Government regulation which reads as follows:

"The subcontractor shall furnish each trainee upon commencement of training with a copy of his training outline and time-schedule for his training occupation."

Twenty-three Iowa Public Safety Department employees are named in several claims for reimbursement as having undergone on-the-job training under MDTA on a 40-

hour-per-week basis from December 5, 1967, to January 27, 1968. The manpower council thereupon paid the public safety department a total of \$4,518 allegedly to offset the department's cost in training these employees. The claims were signed by Roger K. Scholes, former public safety department personnel officer. Payment authorizations were signed by John M. Ropes, director of the Iowa Manpower Development Council.

Mr. Ropes and Russell V. Kelso, Iowa State Director of the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, in the U.S. Department of Labor, signed OJT contract pursuant to the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Mrs. Patricia Powers, a subordinate of Mr. Ropes, arranged the contracts with Mr. Scholes. Mrs. Powers is paid an annual salary of \$9,900 as an OJT director with the manpower council.

In talking with public safety department employees and officials, it was learned that some department workers did attend a 2-day management dynamics seminar at the University of Iowa at Iowa City, but expenses for such attendance, totaling \$1,099, were paid for out of OJT funds quite apart from the \$4,518 paid to the public safety department as reimbursement for on-the-job training of department employees. A few said they also attended weekly or monthly lectures given by a university faculty member in Des Moines. It is not known if such attendance constituted part of the OJT program for public safety department employees, nor what the cost involved, if any, might have been.

Finally, and as a sort of appropriate climax consistent with the operation of this nonexistent training program, was the use of \$153.12 of the training funds to pay the expenses for a going-away party for former Public Safety Director Gene Needles, whose term expired at the end of last April after the Iowa Senate had voted against his reappointment.

This is the unbelievable picture, bordering on the hilarious were it not so tragic for the taxpayer, revealed by just a single MDTA project in my home State. I might add that our State auditor has also found that about \$300,000 of MDTA funds have been granted to 261 private firms and to 28 State and local agencies for manpower training programs. We are still awaiting a report on their nature and the results they have achieved.

I have dwelt at considerable length on the foregoing situation both because, occurring as it did in Iowa, it strikes close to home, and it is a startling illustration of conditions which are widespread in the implementation and administration of many of our manpower programs. I do not wish to burden this report with descriptions of similar conditions which prevail in MDTA projects in other States and cities. But the unbridgeable gap between promise and achievement exists everywhere including the newest wrinkles promulgated by the administration in the manpower field.

Last year, with the greatest fanfare, the administration launched a "crash" program to train 100,000 "hard-core" jobless unemployables by July 1, 1968—which is less than a few days away. To be operated by the U.S. Department of Labor under the authority of the existing manpower and antipoverty laws, the program was centered in 22 high density unemployment areas, chiefly ghettos and slums, with \$102 million of MDTA and antipoverty funds to be spent to achieve the stated objective. This new program is known as the concentrated employment program (CEP).

Thus far, there have been few official statistics on what has actually been accomplished. In a May 1968 press release, the Manpower Administrator, Assistant Secretary of Labor Stanley Ruttenberg, claimed that 59,400 hard-core unemployed had been en-

rolled under CEP, and that 22,500 of them had been placed in jobs. Of the enrollees, 83 percent were Negro, 8 percent Mexican-American, and 3 percent Puerto Rican. But even on the basis of these unsubstantiated figures, the CEP operation is far from having succeeded in achieving its declared goal of training 100,000 hard-core unemployed by July 1, 1968, despite the implied claim of success on the part of Mr. Ruttenberg. To the contrary, there have been reliable local reports that CEP is floundering, that relatively few have been trained, and even fewer placed in jobs.

Among these reports are the following: Birmingham, Ala.: Contracted for \$3 million to place 1,400 individuals in jobs. As of December 7, 1967, almost halfway to the target date of July 1, 1968, six persons have been placed in jobs and only a few hundred were in training.

Phoenix, Ariz.: This is a \$3.5 million program to provide training for 2,500 individuals. In January 1968, with less than 6 months to go to the target date, "265 had been helped, of which 38 are in jobs with private industry." There are indications, however, that although there hasn't been very much done toward helping the "hard-core unemployed," 143 new employees have been taken on to operate the program with salaries totaling over \$830,000, all coming out of the \$3.5 million grant.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: Under a \$4 million contract 1,925 persons were to be trained and placed in jobs. As of November 2, 1967, almost 3 months after the program got underway, only 74 individuals had been directly placed in jobs.

New Orleans, La.: The CEP program with a \$4.5 million budget and a goal of 5,000 placements, began on July 21, 1967. As of January 6, 1968, almost 6 months later, \$714,076 had been spent with 817 persons placed in jobs at a cost of \$874 each, and 316 "meaningful placements" registered at a cost per individual of \$2,260. In an interview, a leading CEP official conceded that "the effort has not worked very well yet * * * and the 5,000 goal may be too big a bite for 1 year."

St. Louis, Mo.: The CEP contract was for \$5 million to place 4,000 in jobs in the period of 1 year. As of January 10, 1968, only 600 had been placed. Among the reasons given for this sad performance by persons who were in a position to know but who preferred to remain unidentified were "too many fingers in the pie both nationally and locally * * * and bureaucratic jealousies between the Labor Department and OEO."

Los Angeles, Calif.: A contract for \$8.6 million was signed by the Labor Department last year for a CEP program to place 2,000 in jobs in a year's time. By December 26, 1967, less than 50 had been so employed. County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn stated that among other drawbacks, \$2 million of the \$8.6 million went for administrative overhead, much of it going for 80 additional personnel.

It is these conditions in the administration and operation of our manpower programs which, as I have said, induced me to vote against favorably reporting the committee bill. I believe that an effective manpower program is attainable, but only if the conditions I have described are rigorously corrected, and sound administration stringently adhered to. In the face of the failure or refusal to act by the executive branch, only the Congress can insist that the necessary cleanup operation be performed. I feel that the consideration of the committee bill provides an excellent opportunity for Congress to take the necessary measures to rescue the manpower program from a failure just as resounding and as scandalous as that which has been the fate of much of the antipoverty program as it was administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

WILLIAM J. SCHERLE.

[House, Sept. 4, 1968]

AMENDING THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15045) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 15045, with Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15045 is a bill to extend the Manpower Development and Training Act. This is the primary purpose of the amendments. We have other amendments, but the primary purpose is to extend the pilot programs until 1970 and the basic programs under this bill until 1972. All the main titles of the bill have always carried an open-ended authorization. We are presently spending about \$395 million a year. For fiscal year 1969 we have in the House-passed appropriation bill (H.R. 18037) by the Committee on Appropriations the figure of \$400 million which has also been agreed to by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This authorization bill is very necessary.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15045 extends provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Its passage at this time is of critical importance to maintain program continuity and assure continued progress toward full employment.

The MDTA is the keystone of our current efforts to develop and utilize to the fullest extent possible the most valuable resource this Nation has—the ability and talents of each of its citizens. It was initially enacted in recognition of the fact that the productive potential of many individuals in this country was being tragically wasted, partly because we lacked a basic manpower policy and training programs for unemployed or underemployed workers to give them the skills they needed to obtain suitable jobs.

It is now well established that the MDTA is an effective instrument for achieving the purposes Congress originally intended:

Since passage of the act in 1962 more than 1.2 million training opportunities have been authorized. Of these, nearly 740,000 have been for institutional training, over 455,000 for on-the-job training, and 60,000 for part-time and other training.

As of June 1, 1968, over 725,000 persons had been enrolled in institutional training and 435,000 had completed their training. Approximately 285,000 persons had been enrolled in on-the-job training—OJB—and 155,000 had completed their training.

Seventy-six percent of those completing institutional training and 89 percent of those completing OJB were employed when last contacted. Of these placements, 78 percent of the trainees from institutional programs and 93 percent of the trainees from OJB were employed in training-related jobs.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, the bill we are considering extends the authority to conduct these basic training programs to June 30, 1972, and makes minor amendments, which I have asked the able gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) to explain later in

detail. Uncertainty about the continued flow of funds has already led to a phasing down of manpower programs since at the present time there is no formal assurance that all training under title II will not have to be completed by December 30, 1969.

H.R. 15045 also extends the expiration dates of three pilot programs—training for inmates of correctional institutions, the labor mobility program, and the placement assistance program. The last two have already suffered a termination of their program authorization. All three have provided valuable lessons, but more information is needed before it can be determined whether they should be expanded or made a permanent part of the national manpower effort.

To prevent a greater and more serious break in the continuity of MDTA programs it is essential that we pass H.R. 15045 without delay and without additional amendments that might create unwarranted roadblocks in conference. The next Congress will undoubtedly want to consider in depth the total array of Federal manpower programs and develop from the current proliferation a cohesive national policy and comprehensive legislation. But our task this year is to insure that no backward steps are taken, and this can be done by immediate passage of H.R. 15045.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. PERKINS. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, during the recess we lost one of the distinguished Members of this body, ELMER HOLLAND of Pennsylvania. I wish to take this time and opportunity on this first day back from the recess and during the consideration of this bill to give credit where in my opinion credit is not often given.

Mr. Chairman, ELMER HOLLAND was the real father of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I remember that in January of 1961 when I was appointed to serve on his subcommittee, the first subject ELMER HOLLAND scheduled was work upon some kind of program in order to provide training to people to enable them to obtain jobs that were available.

Mr. Chairman, at that time I do not believe many people thought of this approach and of this act. He was the real father of this act. He pushed for its adoption and worked out the problems until he finally got it through both bodies of this Congress. It carries some amendments that some of us proposed, but basically it is his idea and a great deal of credit should be given to ELMER HOLLAND for his creative thinking and his hard work in originating and pushing through this legislation to final adoption.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to agree with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa with reference to the efforts which were made toward securing passage of this legislation by ELMER HOLLAND. In fact, the gentleman from Iowa beat me to the punch, for I intended to devote a portion of my remarks to the role ELMER HOLLAND has played as chairman of the Manpower and Automation hearings in 1961 and 1962, as sponsor of the original act in 1962 and as chairman of the subcommittee which was continuing responsibility for legislative oversight. I recall distinctly the last legislative conference that the late great and distinguished former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Rayburn attended in the fall of 1961.

ELMER HOLLAND was present, and the Speaker asked several questions there. One question which was most important concerned the priority of floor action between the Manpower Development Training Act and the Youth Conservation Corps bill. The then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, ELMER HOLLAND and I agreed that the Manpower Development Training Act should

take precedence over the Youth Opportunities Act at this time.

ELMER HOLLAND was diligent. He labored day and night, and his whole heart was in this program. He certainly commands the respect of this entire Congress and the Nation for his constructive work in the manpower field and in presenting this legislation before the Congress.

Upon the death of Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, another great member of that subcommittee succeeded Congressman HOLLAND as the chairman, Congressman JOHN BRADEMANS, of Indiana. I know that under the leadership of Congressman BRADEMANS this legislation, the Manpower Development and Training Act, will continue to be expanded and directed to meet the needs of the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no objection to these amendments. I understand we are going to complete only the general debate today.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 9 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES).

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of our committee, has explained very adequately the purposes of the bill. I believe we all realize that if they are going to protect the pockets of the public in this country, people are going to have to learn to earn, and this is a vehicle for that purpose, so that people can learn to earn.

Mr. Chairman, we have many people, in fact they run into the hundreds of thousands in this country, who are physically and mentally able to perform the functions of a daily job, but who are not trained to do the jobs that are in short supply.

This program to date has worked very well. I know that if our late colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLLAND, could be with us today he would feel very proud of his efforts in having spearheaded this program from its very beginning.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the members of the Committee, we are just going to finish general debate today, and the bill will be read for amendment tomorrow. There will be several amendments offered which in my judgment will strengthen the bill, and I do want the Committee to know that there will be some amendments before the Committee tomorrow.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MDTA

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, few acts in recent years have achieved the support from professionals and laymen alike which the Manpower Development and Training Act has now attracted. Conceived by the Congress, and supported since its inception on a bipartisan basis, MDTA has provided educational and job opportunities for those whom the formal school system failed to reach. The flexibility of MDTA has allowed its administrators to harness the energies of the public and private sectors to solve complex manpower problems which neither could solve alone. Its ability to change as the needs of the country change has resulted in a transition from meeting the challenges of national skill shortages and automation to the current emphasis upon the employment of the disadvantaged. Its innovations, whose impact has been felt far beyond the confines of MDTA programs themselves, include the skill centers, cooperative school work programs, the New Careers emphasis, and more sophisticated approaches to on-the-job training.

By concentrating upon the needs of the individual, the program has demonstrated that the application of imagination, time and

patience by employer, teacher, and trainee can both result in the employment of so-called unemployables and the upgrading of workers whose talents are underutilized and too frequently unrecognized. I sometimes am concerned that the full social significance of this achievement is lost as we apply the cost benefit, cost utility, and other measures necessary to assure that our programs are operating efficiently and effectively. The difference between moving from unemployment to employment or from an unskilled to a semi-skilled or skilled occupation cannot be assessed simply by subtracting pretraining from posttraining earnings.

At the same time the hearings of the Education and Labor Committee have brought to light problems in program implementation which the majority report and amendments I shall propose today are intended to correct. The skill center, an institution designed expressly to meet the needs of the hard-core unemployed, must be encouraged to develop further the valuable educational approaches and services in which they have pioneered.

It also seems clear from the testimony that States and localities now regard the manpower problems of the disadvantaged in many cases as a matter of high priority—in coming years they must be given a greater voice both in the design and implementation of MDTA programs.

The increasing number of programs dealing with the disadvantaged, and the recognition of the substantial human resources required to place these people successfully, suggest that we must raise considerably the level of expertise in our manpower programs.

Only by fully utilizing the available resources within the public and private sectors and within the Labor Department, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies shall we even begin to meet the full scope of the unemployment problem in our urban and rural poverty areas.

TRAINING AND RELATED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENT

Manpower programs designed to reach the unemployed and underemployed in urban and rural poverty areas have demonstrated that not only more money but also better trained manpower personnel are needed, if such efforts are to succeed. It is not enough for the manpower specialist to sympathize with the plight of the poor in general; he must know how to diagnose the particular needs of the individuals he is assisting and what specific steps can be taken to meet those needs. In recent months business groups, Government agencies, nonprofit groups, and academicians have expressed concern over the insufficient number of qualified counselors, job development specialists, and program administrators available.

Section 3 of the Education and Labor Committee amendments to MDTA adds a new section 309, which provides for the reservation of 2 percent of the sums appropriated in any year for the entire act to be used by the Secretary of Labor to provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, training and related technical assistance for specialized or other personnel needed in the administration of programs under the act. The new section further allows assignments of personnel to public or private agencies, institutions, and employers for this purpose, for not longer than 2 years.

Acceleration of manpower programs in disadvantaged areas has increased the demand for employment experts both inside and outside the Labor Department. Secretary Wirtz has said on several occasions that he would rather have a few good administrative and program staff than more millions of dollars. In hearings before the Select Subcommittee on Labor, Secretary Wirtz was asked if he would have any objection to the setting aside of 2 percent of the funds appropriated under MDTA for the training of persons to

administer programs authorized by the act. He replied that such an emphasis would be entirely appropriate and all to the good. Manpower Administrator Rutenberg also indicated that he would have no objection to such an amendment.

Several manpower task forces and consultants have also expressed support for additional training of manpower personnel. The Employment Service task force report stressed that the growing demands upon the Employment Service for comprehensive manpower services call for a more complex set of skills than previously required and that the problem of improving the quality of personnel working in the manpower system has therefore now become more acute. The proposed amendment to MDTA to increase the amount and scope of training and related assistance would implement the task force's recommendations for more employee self-development through inservice and outservice training and for a well-defined training program including the State and local as well as regional and national levels.

Greenleigh Associates earlier this year published a report entitled "Opening the Doors: Job Training Programs," in which they included numerous recommendations for improved staff training. Emphasizing that existing procedures for manpower staff training are wholly inadequate, they recommended establishment of a comprehensive manpower personnel program which would make inservice training available to administrators at the local, county, State, regional, and Federal levels. Such training would be designed to increase staff capability for program implementation, stimulate interchange of information about manpower problems and program techniques, and, last but not least, promote coordination among programs, agencies, and levels of government. This inservice training would include establishment of a National Manpower Institute and expanded utilization of colleges and universities for training State, county, and municipal government officials, as well as regular face-to-face briefings for operating personnel on the findings of research and experimental and demonstration projects and their implications for policy, program, and operations.

After extensive hearings in 1963 and 1964 the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concluded that any long-range solution to the critical shortage of employment counselors would require an increase in the supply of professionally trained personnel. They suggested that one way to cope with this problem would be Federal financial support for more professional training for present employment service personnel and for attracting potentially qualified entrants to the employment counseling field. This year I am pleased to see that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is supporting the 2-percent set-aside amendment which we have initiated.

Manpower experts have pointed out several other benefits which might be derived from a more effective training program. Prof. Irwin Berg of Louisiana State University, writing in the Employment Service Review, has underscored the current lack of a precise role for the employment counselor and the subsequent need for counselors to acquire greater skill and a better understanding of their function in the Employment Service. Such additional training is particularly important in the light of the greater emphasis upon counseling in the new concentrated employment program. Melvin Finn, of the Bureau of Employment Security, has suggested that a program intended essentially for personnel in State agencies under the age of 35 who had demonstrated executive potential might act as an incentive for highly competent young people to remain in the Employment Service and would serve as a vehicle to prepare them for positions with

greater responsibility. He found that the State agencies' response to the limited program of this kind which the Labor Department sponsored was far greater than anticipated.

The findings of a number of studies dealing with the manpower needs of Federal, State, and local government also are virtually unanimous in stressing that expanded government training programs are long overdue. In "Governmental Manpower for Tomorrow's Cities" the Municipal Manpower Commission reported that not only does demand continue to outstrip supply for many groups and, especially for those which require specific training for local governmental careers, but the gap is growing fast. Prof. David Stanley of the Brookings Institution suggested that New York City should issue an executive order establishing training and development of professional, technical, and managerial personnel as official city policy, found an Institute of urban and metropolitan affairs, and actively encourage organizations to conduct training on the problems confronted by particular agencies. The Committee for Economic Development has found that in most segments of the Federal Government, surprisingly little attention has been given to developing managerial manpower.

Recent evolution in the goals of MDTA and growth in the manpower responsibilities of the Federal Government necessitates not only implementation of these proposed training improvements but also adoption of a more comprehensive view of what training and related technical assistance entails. I would hope that the Labor Department will regard this amendment as an opportunity to move in two broad fronts. First, improvement in the quality of existing counselors, job development specialists, and program administrators; and second, attraction of newcomers into the manpower field.

As manpower policy becomes broader in its application, State and local governments and voluntary nonprofit and corporate agencies are experiencing a steadily increasing need for individuals with manpower expertise to man and staff their programs. In providing training the Committee on Education and Labor has emphasized in its report that it does not intend that training shall be limited to the personnel needs of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the State agencies directly involved in administering this act. This amendment is intended to help train people for the entire spectrum of need.

The expanded training program will hopefully include both expansion of promising current training efforts and exploration of additional training possibilities. I would hope that the Labor Department could now expedite its current efforts to join with OEO in establishing regional manpower technical assistance and training centers and expand its program to assist JOBS contractors in training middle management and firstline supervisors in receiving, accepting, and retaining individuals from the hardcore unemployed. At the same time a number of other training possibilities might also be examined. Internship programs at the State and local level which involve the full gamut of manpower programs and closer liaison with the junior colleges might provide new recruiting and training possibilities. Special 1- or 2-year scholarship programs might be instituted which would allow indigenous leaders of CAPs or other neighborhood programs to receive academic training in manpower-related subjects.

At a more advanced level a national manpower institute could be created and the groundwork laid for a series of regional institutes. Rotation of personnel among Federal, State, local, and private agencies could be increased to the point where a cadre of personnel would be created with an areawide

perspective on manpower problems. Special programs might be developed to upgrade the skills of these Employment Service personnel who have volunteered to work in urban and rural slum areas.

In coming years current manpower programs will expand to a size which will necessitate some type of decentralization. The quality of manpower personnel at the State and local level will then become a critical factor in the success or failure of the programs.

THE NEED FOR SKILL CENTERS

I hope that the skill centers will now be able to utilize more comprehensively their basic education and other resources in exploratory and prevocational simulated work experience to help the disadvantaged determine where their real interests and aptitudes lie and make preliminary preparations to pursue them. I can think of nothing more devastating to the disadvantaged trainee than for him to be hired, almost unseen, through a job program only to find that he has no aptitude for the job or that he lacks the basic education to operate in it, let alone compete for better jobs.

I am concerned by evidence presented to the Select Subcommittee on Labor which indicates how frequently subcontractors funded with OEO versatile funds delegated to the Department of Labor have established skill centers in the same communities as MDTA skill centers. In some cases such duplication of facilities may be necessary to reach different target populations within the ghetto, but it appears that in some cases identical training is being provided while vacant slots exist in MDTA skill centers. In Detroit, where I know that the MDTA skill center has done an outstanding job, the subcontractor for the Department of Labor is not only duplicating the physical plant, but is also asking to borrow the idle equipment from the MDTA skill center.

Such duplication of skill centers also entails considerable additional cost to the Government. At this moment there is about \$20,000 worth of MDTA drafting equipment idle in the JFK Center in Philadelphia. The JFK Center was created with MDTA funds, and has placed 100 percent of its drafting students in employment at a cost per student instruction hour—including allowances—of \$2.78; this also included the initial purchase of the new equipment. The private contractor program recently announced by the Department of Labor will cost the Government \$6 per student instruction hour. With the MDTA equipment—now idle—already amortized, the skill center could have conducted the training for half the cost. Flexibility in manpower training programs must be maintained and CAP agencies should not be forced to work with intransigent, unsympathetic public institutions. At the same time the MDTA skill centers should not be bypassed without regard for their record of training.

This failure to develop the skill centers is particularly unfortunate, because the record of training is so good. The use of an open-ended curriculum approach to occupational preparation has proved an effective way of stimulating disadvantaged students who the public schools could not reach. New educational techniques combined with supportive services designed to help solve a whole gamut of human problems has enabled these trainees to gain the basic and vocational education without which they cannot become fully productive workers.

In view of the success of the skill centers, which are such a large part of the institutional MDT program, I am concerned about the extent to which institutional MDT activity has been curtailed both in fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969. During fiscal year 1967 about 177,000 persons were enrolled in programs for which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible, including 80,000 trainees in skill center opera-

tions. The most liberal estimate suggests that the total institutional training has dwindled to fewer than 60,000 individuals enrolled in all such programs. This serious reduction in the level of institutional training since 1966 is a result of the transfer of MDT resources to on-the-job training programs. I do not mean to suggest that all institutional training should be indiscriminately supported. It is sometimes said that 116 skill centers are in existence, but not all of them are providing the necessary combination of training and services to meet the needs of the disadvantaged. As the annual report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Education and Training," points out, there are approximately 70 skill centers which meet MDT criteria. But the effective skill centers must be fully funded and their further development must be actively encouraged. To overcome the numerous and serious needs of the Nation's poor, a concerted effort must be made to increase the disadvantaged person's command of the fundamental process of communication—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—as well as alleviate his deficiencies in math. If the disadvantaged person is to become a vigorous and active participant in our society, and not merely a semiemployed, unskilled appendage to the worker force, we must bring to bear both the functions of the educational process, and employment opportunities and the paycheck. In our current healthy reaction against the "credentials trap," we must not fall into the equally dangerous assumption that all the urban and rural poor need is a job. Only the combination of training and employment will meet the scope of the problem. It is as unconscionable to place a man in a job for which he is not prepared as it is to train a man for a job which does not exist.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

But before I speak of it, I will follow the eloquent comments of the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], and our colleague from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], in saying a few more words about the sponsor of this bill, our late and beloved colleague, the Honorable ELMER HOLLAND of Pennsylvania. It is tragic, and at the same time, fitting that this bill should come before the House on the same day on which the House is officially advised of the death of our friend from Pennsylvania. As has already been said, if ever a Member of this House were the "father of a program" Elmer Holland was the father of MDTA. And I say this without in the slightest detracting from the contributions made to the act from the very beginning by other Members present here, including Members from the other side of the aisle. In particular, Mr. Chairman, I salute our talented and hard-working colleague from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], who has made most significant contributions to the enactment of this milestone legislation.

Mr. Chairman, ELMER HOLLAND was among the first of the Members of this House to recognize not only the perils of the automation revolution, but its promise as well, and to consider the means to combat its hazards. He knew of the dangers because his district, like mine, was among those hard hit some years ago by the changing patterns of industrial organizations and the changing methods of production.

I might say that when in late 1963 the Studebaker plant was shut down and went out of automobile production in my home city of South Bend, Ind., the manpower development and training programs made possible by the legislation we are here considering today, played a crucial role in the comeback of the entire South Bend community.

Mr. Chairman, when in 1961 President Kennedy took office and the Committee on

Education and Labor entered upon a major reorganization of its own structure, ELMER HOLLAND was appointed as chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation. He had already worked with some of his colleagues and with the incoming administration on the first draft of what was to become the Manpower Development and Training Act. Before the 87th Congress adjourned in 1962, MDTA was on the statute books, and the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare were engaged in what has become one of their most important tasks—the development of manpower resources and the training and retraining of people for new jobs to meet the needs of our ever-growing, ever-changing technology and industry.

Four times in the 6 years since ELMER HOLLAND and the members of his subcommittee, refusing to rest on their laurels, refusing to consider a good job well done as long as there was room for improvement, have amended MDTA—sometimes to make very minor, even technical changes, sometimes to give the act and the program new emphasis, new focal points, new directions. Early this year, with the act approaching the terminal dates of its existing legislative authority, ELMER HOLLAND introduced a bill to extend that authority. Once again, with his full support, his subcommittee took the simple extension and made further changes—for the most part minor changes.

It would have been good if ELMER HOLLAND could have lived to see the fruition of his efforts today. It would have been good, I am sure, because I am convinced that this House will tomorrow give the kind of rousing bipartisan stamp of approval to the work done by ELMER HOLLAND and his colleagues that has come to be a trademark of this legislation.

Born in the midst of partisan controversy, MDTA has satisfied its early critics and gratified its early sponsors and has become an almost universally accepted part of the Nation's basic policy in dealing with the growing problem of matching work that must be done with the people that are available to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today in the new role of chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, which ELMER HOLLAND so long and so ably led. I am deeply grateful that with me are other members of that subcommittee—members who have worked long hours and long years with ELMER HOLLAND in the development of this legislation. The subcommittee will present to this House today a bill on the details of which there are some differences of opinion—this is not a bill we are asking the House to rubber stamp. But I do think I speak for all my colleagues on the subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans—when I say that there is little difference among us as to the basic value of MDTA, as to the need for extending it beyond its present expiration dates, and as to the debt we all owe—that millions of Americans who have better jobs and more salable skills because of MDTA owe—to our late colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, ELMER J. HOLLAND.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further requests for time?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one word of a personal nature before we get into the detailed consideration of this legislation. H.R. 15045 was introduced in this House by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLLAND. The Manpower Development and Training Act, which it seeks to extend and amend, can claim, as all major programs can

claim, many original authors. But certainly preeminent among them was the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The consideration of this bill today would have been, in a sense, the climax of ELMER HOLLAND's career. He had decided, last winter, not to run for reelection, and a month ago, he had tendered his resignation as chairman of the subcommittee which has responsibility for this legislation. In being here with us today, he would have been able to see his major legislative accomplishment—the act which was, of all the bills he had cosponsored and led the fight for, his particular pride and joy—extended for another 3 years, amended in minor particulars, but reassured of a further period of growth and experimentation.

Death saw it differently. His voice will not be heard in support of this bill today, but his spirit and his determination that the age of automation would not be an age of massive economic dislocation—that progress need not be painful—that technology could be the servant, and not the master of men—will be very much alive as we turn to the consideration of H.R. 15046.

I will not ask that this bill be passed "as a memorial to ELMER HOLLAND." He would have been the first to respond to that kind of plea with a short, and probably not very elegant, word or two. No, Mr. Chairman, the passage of H.R. 15045 must rest on the merits of H.R. 15045. The fact that we are considering this bill, the fact that the House which he loved is turning on this, our first legislative day subsequent to his death—that alone is all the memorial that ELMER HOLLAND could have asked, or that we have the power to give him.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be derelict in my responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if I failed to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is one of the top experts on manpower legislation in this country. I believe the whole Chamber feels the same way. No individual has given more time to the study of the manpower field in his efforts to strengthen and coordinate the manpower programs than the gentleman from Michigan. His contributions, to my way of thinking, have been monumental. He deserves the praise of this Chamber and this country for his great contribution in this area.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for his very kind words.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15045 is a bill to extend the life of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and to make further minor amendments to that act. I believe the House will be able to work its will on this legislation in a relatively short time, as we have been able to do in previous sessions when we have amended the act in other ways. This is one piece of legislation which has, almost since its inception, enjoyed the broadest conceivable kind and of bipartisan support in this House, as indeed, it has enjoyed in the Nation as a whole.

MDTA began, Mr. Chairman, as primarily a response to the problems posed to the economy by the technological revolution of our times. Automation, the development of new industrial processes, the abandonment of old techniques, brought with it the promise of increased productivity and a higher standard of living. But they also brought the threat of unemployment, of massive dislocation of workers from jobs at which they had spent a lifetime, from skills which would soon be no longer salable. I will not say that MDTA alone dispelled the threats which our technological revolution posed. I will not even say that that threat has been entirely avoid-

ed, or even that the major impact of the new technology has yet been felt. But it is safe to say that there are hundreds of thousands of American wage earners today who owe their jobs, their productivity, and their peace of mind to the retraining programs developed under this act.

In recent years the focus of the act has shifted moderately, to enable the institutions we have developed under MDTA to be brought to bear on the problem of hard-core unemployment. MDTA programs are by no means wholly unconcerned with the original intent of the act, nor, indeed, should they be in the foreseeable future, but, as is only proper, a major share of attention and a major share of MDTA resources are being utilized to develop new training opportunities and job opportunities for those who have historically found it the hardest to share in the high levels of employment which the economy as a whole has enjoyed in recent years.

H.R. 15045, as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], originally provided for a simple extension of the various expiring provisions of the act for various periods of time. A few programs such as a relocation assistance demonstration project, and a placement assistance demonstration project, authority for which expired on June 30 last, are extended for 2 years until June 30, 1970. An experimental and demonstration program involving skill training for inmates for correctional institutions, authority for which expires on June 30, 1969, was also extended until June 30, 1970.

The basic authority under the act which expires on June 30, 1969, was extended until June 30, 1972. To these provisions, no objection of which I am aware has been voiced in the hearings or in the correspondence members of the committee have received, and they remain in H.R. 15045 as section 1 of the reported bill. This section is the heart of the bill, really, and the urgency of the bill rests on them. If the States are to continue planning for their programs, if State employment security agencies are to continue forward planning to discover areas in which training is needed, this extension of the basic authority is essential.

In addition to extending the life of the MDTA program, the bill makes some minor amendments. In Section 2 are purely technical amendments correcting an inadvertent typographical error that crept into the 1966 amendments in the rush of final passage at the end of the 89th Congress. These errors have caused no problems, but in the cause of legislative neatness, they should be amended.

Section 3 provides for a setaside of 2 percent of the funds appropriated in each fiscal year under this act to enable the Secretary of Labor to provide training and related technical assistance for specialized and other personnel needed to administer the act and programs under it and related to it.

As manpower policy becomes more complex, there is developing a very great need, not only at the Federal, but also at the State and local level, for trained personnel to administer the program and to carry out activities related to it. There is full agreement in the committee as to the necessity of this training. Indeed, the amendment itself was offered by the minority members, and accepted unanimously. The Labor Department advises me it has no objections whatever to this amendment.

Section 5, if I may be allowed to skip the order of sections momentarily, is a simple amendment to extend the areas in which MDTA programs may be carried out to include American Samoa and the trust territory; and to allow programs in the trust territory to be wholly federally financed. This amendment, offered in the committee by the gentleman from Hawaii, is also non-controversial.

Section 4 of the reported bill is the closest we have come this year to reporting a con-

troversial amendment, and here the controversy rests not on the intent, but on the mechanism of the section. Here, too, I believe there is strong bipartisan support for a corrective amendment which will be offered when the bill is opened for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Section 4 seeks to correct an administrative problem that has arisen under the act with respect to the skill centers—institutions that are among the most valuable contributions of MDTA to the spectrum of manpower tools. These centers, which at their best—if a Member from Michigan may be allowed pardonable pride—like the Patrick McNamara Skill Center in Detroit, combine the best environment, the best equipment, and the best instructors with other supportive services, and, in their own fashion, provide many MDTA trainees with the kind of institutional point of reference which in many cases the ordinary schools and vocational institutions fail to offer. The skill centers have an excellent record in course completion, and placement, and are universally thought of as one of the real strengths of the institutional aspect of MDTA training.

Subsection 4(a) directs that, in providing institutional training, the Secretary of Labor should make maximum use and give priority to the use of skill centers. With this provision, there are no objections on this side of the aisle. This direction to the Secretary is to "give priority" to the use of such centers. It does not provide any ban on the use of other techniques where necessary, and sets no percentage or other criteria as to allocation of funds. That priority should be given to skills centers is a proposition with which no member of this committee is prepared to take issue. But the question of degree, the question of using a given skill center in a given situation, is a decision as to which the subsection still vests discretion in the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is certainly the intent of the committee that this discretion ought to be utilized in conformity with the clear intent of this section. Priority should be given to skill centers. But this principle need not paralyze the Secretaries in the use of other types of institutions and training situations.

Subsection 4(b) also seeks to meet the problems faced by skill centers, notably those problems which the centers run into because of the language in the original act requiring a "reasonable expectation of employment" before persons can be referred to training. The requirement has been met through employment opportunity surveys conducted by the State public employment services, and has sometimes resulted in the nonuse of skill center facilities and personnel while a survey was awaiting completion. According to testimony taken in the hearings, this administrative requirement has also resulted in the skill centers being asked to operate on the basis of individual budgets for each separate course—sometimes involving as many as 40 or more separate budgets annually. When, out of these 40 or more separate budgets, you are seeking to operate an institution with continuing costs, not always easily attributable to a given course, and to maintain a high-caliber staff on a year-round basis, things can get pretty sticky.

It is the committee's intention to make it crystal clear that skill centers can be funded on an annual basis. We will, I believe, revert to this point at a later stage in the discussion of the bill, but the committee's action, it should be understood, was directed primarily toward this objective.

Subsection 4(b) provides for the allocation to existing skill centers of funds and training "slots" sufficient to insure a level of skill center operation equal to that which existed on July 30, 1967, or June 30, 1968, whichever is greater; for a guarantee that

no less than 65 percent of all title II funds will be allocated to institutional training; and for the meeting of certain criteria before existing skill centers can be closed down, or new ones created. As I have suggested earlier, we will discuss these sections of the legislation more thoroughly under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Chairman, I have emphasized the bipartisan nature of this legislation, and on previous occasions, I have had the pleasant duty of pointing out to this House that MDTA and its amendments have been the product of continued bipartisan work on that duty again today. There may be disagreement on the contents of this bill before we complete its consideration, but as it was reported to the House, the bill expresses, in all of its provisions, a broad, constructive consensus which transcends party, region, and the differences between liberals and conservatives. The 1968 MDTA extension and amendments bill reflects an area of agreement which is particularly refreshing in a time of great controversy.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the present time we are in a situation where the rate of unemployment is relatively low and there is a clear and steady demand for more manpower. At the same time, there are concentrations of high unemployment in given areas. Those who are not employed under such circumstances present a serious problem to the Nation in its effort to increase the Nation's manpower supply and develop the human resources of the poor so that they may achieve—and the country may benefit from—their fullest possible economic and individual potential.

I have no doubt that we require new policies and approaches to locating and bringing the unemployed into the work force and increasing their potential as a valuable manpower resource. Studies have already shown us that skill and prevocational training and related services are sorely needed by the majority of those not now in the work force. Most of these people are not only poorly educated in terms of formal schooling but also lack any sort of special skill training either on or off the job. This is true in spite of the extensive and precedent-shattering efforts made by this administration to expand the quantity and improve the quality of such training and to make it more readily available to those who need it most.

Under these circumstances it is vital that we not take any more time than is absolutely necessary before we extend existing authority to continue the significant training programs which have their source in title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The priorities of this program have been altered and modified over the past 6 years in order to achieve a sounder balance between attempting to meet the severe needs of the most desperately disadvantaged and providing the additional supportive or other services required by those who are more nearly job-ready. As the program has demonstrated its ability to respond quickly and flexibility to our increasing understanding of the nature of the problem of unemployment, and underemployment, it has won our respect and deserves our continued support. We can continue to consider further modification of the nature of the MDTA program after we take this important first step of preserving the essential continuity of its existence. It is in this spirit that your committee recommended enactment of H.R. 15045.

As an example of the success of this worthy program in my own State of Michigan and as a demonstration of its relevance to the more sophisticated needs of today's rapidly changing world of modern industry, let me just briefly cite the heartening experience of

Ling-Temco-Vought's missile and space division in Michigan. The machine operator training program has provided 33 employees to the division, with only one graduate of the program failing to be placed with the company. These men were hard-core unemployed, people who often could not find work as common laborers, and who were apparently trapped in the vicious cycle with which we have all, by necessity, become increasingly familiar: that is, lack of skills coupled with lack of motivation combining to keep the kind of job wanted just beyond the reach of the individual; because he lacks skills he is not employed and he becomes discouraged, does not seek training, and ceases to look for work.

In this program, however, most of these problems were overcome by sympathetic and intelligent planning to meet the individual needs of people who had often surrendered hope to despair. It would be misleading to say that each of these persons has become a skilled employee; some were unable to adjust to the requirements of the job, to accept detailed directions and to understand concepts of productivity and self-motivation. These few were reluctantly let go.

But the overwhelming impression, as you examine these and other training efforts under MDTA, is of productivity, performance, and progress. The program is working well and we must extend and support it, while preserving our right, indeed our duty, to improve it wherever and whenever a compelling case is made that such action is necessary.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 19045, to extend the expiring provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In the span of a few years, the Manpower Development and Training Act has blazed creative new trails in the critically important area of training thousands of disheartened and desperate jobless persons for satisfying and productive employment. That in itself is enough to justify immediate passage of the bill before us.

Beyond past accomplishments, MDTA funds support new programs that promise much for the future. Prominent among these is job opportunities in the business sector—JOBS—which seek to hire, train, and retain the hard-core unemployed. It does so by combining on-the-job training with other services, such as remedial education, medical services, and individual counseling on personal problems and proper work habits. JOBS involves an unprecedented partnership between Government and business under which private companies bear the normal training costs and the Government pays for the extra supportive services which have proved to be a necessary ingredient in any program designed to bring the most severely disadvantaged in our society into the competitive world of work. There are already favorable indications that the partnership will be unusually productive. One hundred thousand people are expected to be on the job and in training by the end of this year, or 6 months ahead of schedule.

JOBS and other innovative programs for manpower development, in itself a relatively new area of public policy, require talented, trained, and dedicated people to carry them out. In this connection I am particularly pleased to see that the committee bill provides for a 2-percent set-aside of funds appropriated each year under the act for the purpose of providing training and technical assistance for the personnel who are needed in the planning, administration, and execution of complex manpower programs.

I do not think that the importance of the provision can be underestimated. For exam-

ple, many of the people running JOBS programs—from top management to the immediate supervisor of individual trainees—have had little or no experience in coping with the special problems of the hard-core unemployed. Technical assistance which will help them sensitively carry out their mission can very well make the marginal difference between the success or failure of a soundly conceived program.

Federal and State staff, as well as private citizens involved in manpower programs, will be able to benefit greatly from training funded by this provision. As manpower programs have expanded, it has become increasingly obvious that there is a crying need for an expanded pool of trained and expert people to implement them at all levels of government. Moreover, as innovative programs are launched and as new and better training techniques are discovered, it becomes more and more apparent that professional staff need in-service training to keep up-to-date with the latest developments. Traditionally, for example, staff members have specialized in one function such as counseling. Today's concept of an effective manpower program, is one that is comprehensive in scope, uniting many formerly separate services. In order to administer such a program, staff members must have some measure of expertise in several different areas. The 2-percent setaside of funds for training and technical assistance will help insure that they have the opportunity to broaden their knowledge and capability to meet the challenges inherent in this critically important field.

H.R. 15045 provides for a continuing program of training for unemployed and underemployed workers, and also provides the wherewithal for developing and upgrading the staff to carry out this program.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, the great need for an effective national manpower policy has often been remarked upon in this Chamber—and this House has done much to build toward that goal; a goal, I must say, toward which we all aspire. Now, as has so frequently been the case in recent years, we are faced with opportunity to demonstrate, once again, whether we have achieved an adequate understanding of the elements of that policy.

We have before us today, H.R. 15045, to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act. It is absolutely essential that this basic building block of our manpower program be preserved, so that it may continue to serve as an essential component of the national effort to utilize what your committee has referred to in the past as "the Nation's most valuable natural resource—the brains and muscles and ingenuity of its people."

In these circumstances I am confident that we can demonstrate our receptivity to the lessons of the recent past and our sensitivity to the needs of our fellow Americans by taking appropriate action right here and now—action which will show that we understand that the price of flexibility and responsiveness to the changing demands made upon the manpower program is not going to be paid by hasty and ill-advised dismantling of or tinkering with soundly constructed machinery.

I believe it is fair to say that the MDTA is one mechanism for social and economic progress which works now, has worked in the past, and will continue to perform up to expectations in the future.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the House Republican policy committee supports the extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962—MDTA. Properly amended and administered, this act can play an important role in the fight

against unemployment and underemployment.

The Republican Members of Congress long have been interested in establishing a sound program that would solve this Nation's manpower problems by utilizing the ingenuity and vast resources of private enterprise to upgrade and develop the skills of our labor force. The Republican effort in this area began in 1961 with a study by the House Republican policy committee. Leading authorities in the fields of education and on-the-job training were asked to participate and their comments and recommendations were included in the report, "Operation Employment." This study became the basis for the Republican-proposed Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which was adopted in great part and enacted into law by the 87th Congress.

From its inception, the Manpower Development and Training Act has contained provisions that attempted to make clear the congressional intent that the States are to be partners in the Federal manpower program. Section 301 contains an allocation formula which provides a method of distributing funds to the States. Section 206 encourages and authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with the States and to utilize the services of the State agencies.

Unfortunately, this intent and these provisions have been downgraded and disregarded by the Johnson-Humphrey administration. As a result, the States have experienced delays in funding projects that have met the prescribed standards and have been accepted by employers. Completely in disregard of congressional intent, the Department of Labor has proposed that the promotion, development, and funding of on-the-job—OJT—projects be assumed by Federal personnel. The State agencies would retain only the lesser responsibilities of monitoring and servicing.

Furthermore, despite the proven value of on-the-job training, the Johnson-Humphrey administration is using MDTA funds to finance new programs under title I-B of the Economic Opportunity Act. The result has been the elimination of sound manpower projects in the on-the-job—OJT—training field.

In order to have an effective training program, States must be permitted to participate on an active partnership basis. Efforts to involve private enterprise must be increased. All funds appropriated for MDTA should be utilized for MDTA programs. Similarly, funds allocated to the States should be released to finance approved projects. Also, the Secretary of Labor should be required to enter into appropriate agreements with States and State agencies interested in becoming active working partners in the Federal manpower program.

Republican amendments rejected in committee that are designed to assure these results will be offered again during the floor consideration of this legislation. We urge their adoption.

The Manpower Development and Training Act can be the basis for a successful program in a field that has been marked by frustration and futility. Properly amended and administered, it can utilize the training resources of both private enterprise and institutions to provide meaningful training for jobs that are waiting to be filled.

Jobs and hope must be substituted for unfilled promises and despair. Under a Republican President, the Manpower Development and Training Act can become key legislation in the fight against unemployment and poverty.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15045. The Manpower Development and Training Act has been one of the great success stories of the 1960's. We have spent a lot of money on MDTA since it was first enacted in 1962—over a billion dollars. But the investment has been a sound one.

As of March 1968, over 1.2 million training "slots" had been authorized—725,000 in institutional training, 435,000 in on-the-job training, and 60,000 in other types of MDTA activity.

Of those who have completed institutional training, 76 percent were employed when last contacted, and of the on-the-job trainees, 90 percent were still employed when last contacted. This is, I suggest, a very enviable record indeed. The hopelessness that sometimes overwhelms us all when we think of the tremendous problem of combating hard-core unemployment, if this Nation is to remain stable and if equality of opportunity is to be more than a pious slogan—this hopelessness, Mr. Chairman, finds a healthy antidote in the statistics about MDTA and its effectiveness as a weapon against hard-core unemployment, against technological unemployment, against skill shortages—against many of the economic problems which prevent us from finding a job for every willing worker, and a worker for every job that needs to be done.

I join with my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, and with my other colleagues and friends who have already taken this opportunity to pay tribute to the sponsor of this bill, and the father of MDTA—our late colleague, ELMER HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania. But I agree, too, with the idea that has been expressed here that we can pay no better tribute to ELMER HOLLAND than by turning to the work we have carried this far under his leadership, and further improving the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I will support H.R. 15045 because I believe it is a wise and prudent investment in an area in which the returns can be enormous. I will support it, too, because I also believe that the damage that could result if we failed to make that investment, if we turn back after having come so far and done so much, would be incalculable, but certainly enormous.

MDTA serves the needs of the hard-core unemployed. But it does more than that. It serves the needs of industry, it serves the needs of small employers whose requirements for skilled workers are utterly beyond their own ability to meet, and, above all, it serves the broad public interest.

Mrs. MNK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the outstanding success of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, I am extremely proud to add my support to H.R. 15045, a bill which will extend the authority of this program through 1972. Of all the legislation adopted since 1961, I believe the MDTA reaches closest to the goal of training unemployed and underemployed men and women to become more useful and productive members of our society.

I cannot speak too highly for the success of this effort. Men and women who have been employed and who have accepted responsibilities in the belief that their employment would continue, have been suddenly displaced by changes in technology and for new and different demands for goods. Under the MDTA they have had an opportunity to use their basic skills to learn new occupations and to be returned to the ranks of the employed. Similarly, persons who have for one reason or another entered the labor market without perfected skills have benefited from the training offered by this program to learn a trade and thereby have gained an opportunity for employment.

In short, the MDTA has offered the best hope for employment and economic self-sufficiency. It is truly an effective program.

I am pleased that H.R. 15045 will extend its authorization for training to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. My visit to the trust territory last January substantiated the oft-told need for greater emphasis in job training to enable the people of these islands to compete for

employment opportunities which are now offered to Americans who are brought in at considerable cost to the Federal budget. This job training will undoubtedly make available better jobs for Micronesians and help them to provide their families with something more than a subsistence income.

The authorization in H.R. 15045 to extend the training programs to public and private institutions should result in making training opportunities available to the physically handicapped as well as to men who are held in custodial institutions and who should be trained in preparation for their eventual return to society.

I join with the committee in urging greater and more flexible use of skill centers. It has been proven that the men who are trained in these skill centers are not only more quickly absorbed into the labor force, but adapt more readily to the training program itself than if placed in a strictly education-oriented institution.

I also support the provision in the bill which allows for a 2 percent set-aside of funds appropriated in each fiscal year under the act, for the purpose of providing training and related technical assistance toward the preparation of the specialized personnel who are needed to make MDTA a more effective program. Counselors, job development specialists, and program administrators are many of the persons who could be trained under this provision.

These changes to the basic law are needed improvements and therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

GENERAL LEAVE EXTENDED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute committee amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[House, Sept. 5, 1968]

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: Beginning on page 4, line 19, strike everything through the end of page 5, line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Section 202 of the Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Nothing in this section shall prevent the funding of training in approved skill centers, on an annual basis."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am proposing this amendment as a substitute for subsection 4(b) of the bill before us. This proposed substitute serves the same purpose as does subsection 4(b), and avoids some of the flaws which able and distinguished members of the committee see in the language of that section.

Section 4 of the bill seeks to overcome by legislation one major administrative prob-

lem which was discussed before the subcommittee, and which, I believe, the members of the full Committee on Education and Labor approach unanimity in seeking to correct.

During the several years that MDTA has been in operation, it has made a great many contributions to the array of institutional weapons we can utilize in our efforts to combat manpower problems. One of the major contributions has been the development of the skill center—an institution which provides a broad variety of skill training, specifically directed toward the needs of MDTA trainees, as distinguished from the more traditional clientele of the vocational education system. Skill centers, such as those in Detroit, Philadelphia, New York City, Atlanta, and in some 60 other areas, have been able to combine the talents and personnel of that vocational education system with the talent and abilities of other sectors in a "mix" which has produced excellent results with specific reference to the people MDTA is trying hardest to assist.

In the course of the hearings on this legislation—and, indeed, even before the hearings—it had become obvious that one major problem was affecting the efficient working and full utilization of these skill centers. In order to be utilized most efficiently, they must maintain a permanent operation, with the most economic use of space, of equipment and, above all, of staff. The ideal way to provide such use is to allow for annual funding, on a continuing, institutionwide basis, of such centers. But as the present law is interpreted, because of the requirement for a "reasonable expectation of employment" before a trainee can be referred to training, it is necessary for the Labor Department, through the State employment security agency, to conduct a survey before any course can be established in a skill center. These surveys take time, and there is, inevitably, a lag between the proposal that a course be set up and the certification of such a course as meeting an expected employment need. This means in theory, and very often in practice, an experienced and competent instructor's talents will be utilized for a period of 10 to 12 weeks, and that, before he is sure what will happen after that, a further survey must be conducted, and further delay incurred in setting up a new course.

In addition, the operation of a skill center on the basis of certifying each course separately, involves substantial extra bookkeeping, with a skill center, as one witness told the subcommittee, being required to operate on 40 or 50 separate and distinct budgets in the course of a given fiscal year.

Section 4 of the reported bill was an amendment, offered by me in the full committee, to give priority to skill centers, and to provide for mechanisms which, we all felt at the time, would insure such priority in a meaningful way.

After further consultation with members of the executive branch and with representatives of the vocational education profession, I am persuaded that it would be simpler and more effective to strike the second half of section 4; namely, section 4(b), the mechanisms by which I had hoped to insure priority for the skill centers, and to replace it with a simple provision that allowed directly for annualization of funding for skill centers. The substitute amendment which I have offered, is intended to allow such annualization, and to permit the operation of these valuable centers without removing the basic MDTA requirement that training be offered only where a reasonable expectation of employment exists. Such an expectation is essential. It would make no sense to run skill centers, however effective they might be, to train buggy whip makers and sarsaparilla bottlers. But it makes no sense, either, to allow job opening surveys to hold up training when there is a known demand for a given skill. I offer this amendment, not truly as a substi-

tute for, but as a clarification and improvement of the original section 4(b).

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the other members of the committee share the gentleman's intention to make easier and more efficient the use of skill centers. I supported the gentleman's original amendment in the full committee, and if the substitute does the job the gentleman suggests I am of a mind to support it on this floor.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question about that.

Does the gentleman intend that the requirement, now found in other subsections of section 202 of the act, that trainees only be referred where a "reasonable expectation of employment" exists, should be suspended or modified where skill center training is involved?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. No, indeed. The reasonable expectation requirement is essential to MDTA, and, as I said before is left in full force by my substitute amendment. The thrust of this substitute amendment is to remove the procedural barrier which that language has posed to efforts to provide for annual funding. The Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare are, I understand, trying to eliminate the problems posed by the overly rigid application of the "reasonable expectation" language. This amendment, which preserves that basic requirement should enable them to surmount the technical obstacles which, they feel this language has so far offered to the annual funding of skill centers, and will unmistakably indicate that the intent of the Congress is clearly that skill center funding is to be on an annual basis.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say with that assurance I wish to commend the gentleman for having offered this substitute amendment. I think the substitute is better than the original. I supported the original, and I shall certainly support the substitute. The gentleman has made a constructive contribution to the operation of this program. I take pride again in the fact that this program is one in which Members on both sides, the majority and the minority, have had an opportunity to make such constructive contributions and are making them in this bill today.

I congratulate the gentleman for his having offered the amendment.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his support of the amendment and his kind words.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since section 4(b) covers three paragraphs on pages 4 and 5, did I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment would strike the language beginning on line 19 of page 4, through line 16 on page 5?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Yes; the amendment would strike the language beginning on page 4, line 19, through to the end of line 16 on page 5, and would insert a new subsection (b).

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On

page 6, immediately following line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 6. (a) Section 206(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 206. (a) To the fullest extent consistent with the effective administration of this Act and in order to achieve maximum coordination with all manpower training programs authorized by this and other Acts, the Secretary of Labor shall, in his discretion, enter into agreements to carry out the purposes of this part with each State so requesting, or with the appropriate agency of each State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor shall, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this Act, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall make payments to such State or appropriate agency for expenses incurred for such purposes. Agreements with States or appropriate State agencies shall assign to them the promotion, development, funding, monitoring and other services associated with implementation of training programs under this title, and responsibility for utilization of funds apportioned to the States in accordance with section 301 of this Act. In States where such agreements are entered into between the Secretary and the State or its appropriate State agency, the Secretary shall not enter into additional agreements which duplicate in any way the functions of the State or its appropriate agency authorized by agreements under this section."

"(b) Section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking the period at the end of the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That funds apportioned to the States and made available to appropriate State Agencies in fiscal year 1969 through agreements entered into under section 206 of this Act shall remain fully available to the appropriate State agency until either the funds have been completely encumbered or the State agency backlog of programs that meet Federal criteria have been exhausted; Provided, however, That the provisions of the preceding proviso shall not be effective until there shall have been appropriated for fiscal year 1969 under the authorizations for this Act not less than \$48,000,000 to carry out the program known as Job Opportunities in the business sector and not less than \$31,800,000 to carry out the concentrated employment program."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this House has engaged in debate with reference to the problems in the manpower bill earlier this year, particularly in connection with the appropriation bill, to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I offered amendments to try to correct some deficiencies that had developed in the manpower training legislation largely because of the transfer of funds from the on-the-job training program to the two new programs started in the Labor Department, known as job opportunities in the business sector and concentrated employment programs. Both of these programs were started under the general authority granted in the MDTA and the Economic Opportunity Act, without specific authorization or hearings by the committee of the Congress.

We are facing this year a total budget request of \$354 million for the manpower program, under title II of the MDTA. Of that amount, the budget plans to take \$99 million of title II funds to fund the JOBS program and the CEP program.

The amendments I have offered I have worked out with the majority. They are different from the amendments offered in the committee, and they are different from the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota and me earlier this year on the floor of the House.

In effect they say to the Secretary of La-

bor, first, it was the intent of Congress, and still is, that these manpower programs to the maximum extent possible be administered through responsible existing State agencies, and where possible agreements must be entered into with such State agencies if they are responsible and prepared to administer the programs effectively in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

This language is very clear in my amendment. The discretion remains with the Secretary of Labor to determine whether the State is equipped to administer the program effectively, but it would carry out further the mandate of Congress that we wish in those States that have effective State labor departments to have these programs coordinated at the State level and that we have maximum involvement of the State agencies in administering the programs.

The discretion left to the Secretary in my amendment offered here today would permit the Secretary to turn down agreements with States where they were unwilling or unable to administer these programs effectively, where it would not be consistent with the objectives of the program to have a particular State administering the program.

The second part of my amendment goes to the heart of the question of the JOBS and CEP programs being funded out of regular manpower funds. Rather than request additional money for the new programs, to involve private enterprise in the solution of the hard-core employment problem, the Secretary of Labor sought funds and obtained them from the poverty program and from the manpower program and from other sources. This, in effect, depicted the regular on-the-job training program in many States, including New York, which found itself held up on programs that had been approved in substance and on their merits, but funds could not be obtained for them.

My amendment would prevent the transfer of funds that have been allocated to the States if the Congress has appropriated not less than \$48 million for the JOBS program and not less than \$31.8 million for the CEP, the concentrated employment program. Those are the amounts for these two programs that have been allocated for JOBS and CEP, respectively, from the title II, MDTA budget request.

I believe these amendments are fair compromises of the various views expressed on both sides. I believe we share on both sides of the aisle a deep concern over the problems which have developed because of the pinching in the budget and in the appropriations.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do I correctly understand the amendment now offered by the gentleman leaves this in the discretion of the Secretary?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. I would clarify by saying it leaves to the discretion of the Secretary the question of whether he enters into agreements with the States, whether the States are capable and willing to administer programs.

The second part does not leave it to the discretion of the Secretary. This is the one that says after the JOBS program and the CEP program have been funded at the level they request—and that means cash available and appropriated—then they cannot withdraw money allocated to the States which the States are planning on using for their own programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODELL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I

have had an opportunity to work with the gentleman from New York on this program since its inception several years ago. I feel he is undoubtedly one of the most knowledgeable citizens in our country on this program, and certainly one who has contributed greatly to its success.

I have discussed with the gentleman, particularly these amendments. I would think that, under the amendments, as the gentleman has presented them, the proper emphasis would be contained in this legislation. Certainly the gentleman from New York has stated very cogently why he feels the State employment agency ought to be the operating agency in all cases where the State employment agency can do the job and wants to do it and is willing to do it. I would agree with him completely there.

Both of us recognize there may be some circumstances, such as these nationwide contracts with, for instance, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners or the AFL-CIO Appalachian Council or the Labor International Union of Machine Tool Builders, where they cover a number of States and operate in a particular way, and other cases where a particular private agency might be the only one with the particular experience and association to do a very particular kind of job, where we want to be able to say to the Secretary in these cases, "Certainly, go ahead with your private arrangements."

I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from New York that for the ordinary, typical, traditional type of MDTA contract, the kind which has worked so well and the kind we want to promote, if the State employment service is willing and able and desirous of doing the job they ought to be given the opportunity to do that job.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his generous comments, and particularly appreciate our agreement as a matter of legislative history here on what our objective is and the way we want the programs administered under the circumstances when it is feasible to accomplish the objectives of the act through the State agencies.

I believe the gentleman will agree that where a State is responsible and where it has an organization of employees who are experienced in administering these types of programs they can do a great deal to coordinate the many training programs we have.

Unfortunately, today in New York we have a minimum of 14 and probably a maximum of 30 or 35 different training programs, many of them emanating from different legislative sources than the Manpower Development and Training Act. I believe the States can help us in beginning to coordinate those programs because many of them are also administered at the Senate level.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York.

With few exceptions, programs administered by the States under the Manpower Development and Training Act have been extremely effective in meeting the needs of those whose training is not adequate for our increasingly technological society.

Operation of MDTA has since its inception been almost free of the kind of criticism frequently leveled against some of our other legislative efforts.

Possibly it is MDTA's very popularity—and consequently its relative assurance of continued funding support—that is responsible for its present role as a source of funds for new programs initiated by the executive branch.

Let me make very clear, Mr. Chairman, my complete agreement with the minority report statement of wholehearted approval of the innovative concepts in CEP and JOBS programs.

But regardless of the worth of these new endeavors, State-run MDTA programs of proven merit should not be subject to severe cutbacks for the others' benefit.

By the same token, I would not favor gutting a successful and on-going education program so that funds might be placed in another.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that successful programs operating under MDTA—programs which have demonstrated their effectiveness—programs meeting community needs—should not die for lack of funds so that those funds may be channeled elsewhere under nonexistent legislative authority.

Back-door pilferage is not consistent with responsible legislating.

Traditional manpower programs should be assured of continued existence until such time as Congress decides that they are no longer necessary or useful.

Their fate should not depend solely on whether a new approach might be equally or more effective.

I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendments before us today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I merely want to say, speaking for myself, that the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York, as they were read to the Committee, certainly do nothing to detract from the effectiveness of the program, and I believe, by putting emphasis on our desire to work through State employment services, they enhance the effectiveness of the legislation.

With respect to the second portion of the amendments—that is, the use of the MDTA allocated funds for the JOBS and CEP programs—I can certainly understand the gentleman's concern.

I understand him to say that in New York, for instance, very, very little is left for the regular MDTA-OJT programs after the CEP and NAB programs have been funded from the State's allocations. At the same time the gentleman from New York recognizes he does not want to hurt those programs, either. As I understand his amendment, it only goes into effect after the requisite funds for the CEP and JOBS programs have been appropriated.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. The gentleman will recall that on the appropriation bill, as I earlier stated, we debated this point back and forth at some length. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUINN] and I tried to clarify that we were not attempting to attack the concept of involving business in the CEP and JOBS programs, but we felt that we should protect the sanctity of the regular MDTA on-the-job program. The merit of adopting this amendment is that people will know exactly where they stand. If the appropriation process produces the money that has been requested for the JOBS and CEP programs, the State will get full funding for OJT. If not, then JOBS and CEP get their money and the rest will be allocated thereafter to the States. Even if Congress does not give all of the money necessary, as I think it should, we will avoid the situation we have had where the States thought that they would get a great deal more money and went through the process of approving applications and then found that the money was not available.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I think that the amendment in its present form is certainly acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK
Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 6, line 5, after "Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands", insert the following new section:

"Sec. 6. Section 106 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended to read as follows:

"LABOR MARKET INFORMATION AND JOB MATCHING PROGRAM

"SEC. 106. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall develop a comprehensive system of labor market information on a national, State, local, or other appropriate basis, including but not limited to information regarding—

"(1) the nature and extent of impediments to the maximum development of individual employment potential including the number and characteristics of all persons requiring manpower services;

"(2) job opportunities and skill requirements;

"(3) labor supply in various skills;

"(4) occupational outlook and employment trends in various occupations; and

"(5) in cooperation and after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, economic and business development and location trends.

Information collected under this subsection shall be developed and made available in a timely fashion in order to meet in a comprehensive manner the needs of public and private users, including the need for such information in recruitment, counseling, education, training, placement, job development, and other appropriate activities under this Act and under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, The Social Security Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal statutes.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall develop and publish on a regular basis information on available job opportunities throughout the United States on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis for use in public and private job placement and related activities and in connection with job matching programs conducted pursuant to this subsection. The Secretary is directed to develop and establish a program for matching the qualifications of unemployed, underemployed, and low-income persons with employer requirements and job opportunities on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis. Such programs shall be designed to provide a quick and direct means of communication among local recruitment, job training and placement agencies and organizations, and between such agencies and organizations on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis, with a view to the referral and placement of such persons in jobs. In the development of such a program the Secretary shall make maximum possible use of electronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information.

"(c) A report on the activities and achievements under this section shall be included in the report required under section 107.

"(d) Not less than 2 per centum of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would fill a most serious gap in our efforts to train unemployed and underemployed persons and place them in jobs of

permanence and substance. Simply stated, it would gather data on job availability and labor supply in particular skills and geographic areas and match them by a variety of programs, utilizing the techniques of electronic data processing.

Mr. Chairman, this provision would be a significant part of the MDTA's effort to train and employ people at a job level which is comparable to their ability. It is already a part of the MDTA bill reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics there are now some 3 million unemployed Americans. However, the important figure is the underemployed and the Bureau of Labor Statistics data is limited to some 2.3 million who are "employed part time for economic reasons."

Mr. Chairman, clearly there are four or five times that number. It is conservatively estimated that there are between 10 and 11 million people who fall into this category, who are working in jobs below their level of skill and ability. This information gap only serves to highlight the fact that our training programs are often unrelated to the location, ability, and potential of those to be assisted.

In addition, it is becoming increasingly difficult for us to formulate meaningful programs and to encourage private enterprise participation without accurate knowledge about the persons available to be trained and employed. A nationwide job opportunity statistics program which will provide periodic and timely information on the site, extent, and type of job vacancies, combined with a program of research and analysis by the Department of Labor, would further the objectives of MDTA.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is this the identical language that is contained in the Senate bill?

Mr. REID of New York. It is the identical language.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, insofar as I am concerned and I do not know the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] on this particular amendment, I cannot see any objection to the amendment which would make it unacceptable to the committee.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the chairman for his comments.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would this amendment involve any additional costs? Would it expand the program to the extent whereby it would call for any additional costs?

Mr. REID of New York. In response to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, the amendment specifically provides that not less than 2 percent of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out titles I, II, and III of the act shall be available for this purpose. There would not be added funds. I would say that of the funds appropriated 2 percent could be utilized for collecting and disseminating data. The basic purpose would be to obtain data on skills needed and persons available to fill them. At the moment we do not have adequate information in this area.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. REID of New York. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. While I have not had the opportunity to read the amendment, I did hear it read and I must say to the gentleman I am surprised that the Secretary of Labor is not presently doing the things that are proposed to be done under the terms of your amendment.

It is hard for me to believe that if this sort of information is necessary that we have to call upon the Secretary to act.

Mr. REID of New York. I can well understand the point raised by the gentleman. I have long felt that the Department should do this, but the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, and Under Secretary Reynolds, whom I talked to this morning, would like to have this authority and feel that it would be very helpful to any intelligent planning for private enterprise participation in future programs to have inventories of skills and needs and capabilities. However, the fact is that the Department has not been doing it, and I believe they should.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to add, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, that the Department under the provisions of title I of this act has been acquiring certain information with respect to the categories listed in subsection 1 of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, but they do not have this in a systematic inventory form. They have on several occasions requested appropriations from the Congress for the purpose of establishing this sort of system that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] envisions in this amendment. Those appropriations have not in the past been forthcoming, and I do not know if they will be now or not. I believe that would still remain the problem because, as the gentleman from Iowa clearly perceives, to do this on a thorough and large-scale basis would require considerable involvement of funds.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York authorizes the use of 2 percent of the sums appropriated under this act for this purpose.

I would want to inquire from the gentleman, if I could, does the gentleman envision—and I notice that the gentleman says here in his amendment, not less than 2 percent of the sums appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section. Does the gentleman envision that no matter what the needs of the rest of the manpower program are, that they must use at least 2 percent of the funds appropriated under the MDTA authorization to do this job regardless of whether this shorts them in some other areas?

When I got to reading the amendment, I became worried about this.

Mr. REID of New York. That is not my understanding. I believe it would be discretionary, but I would hope, and I believe it is the view of the gentleman from Michigan as well, that the Department would be given the authority, and that the Congress in its wisdom would provide such funds as might in the future be necessary. But I believe if we have these various programs without establishing systems for the collection and dissemination of data—or without funding such systems adequately—that we would not be maximizing the skills we have in this country, and we will not necessarily be training people for existing or future jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(On request of Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, and by unanimous consent, Mr. REID of New York was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when I talked to the gentleman before he offered the amendment I expressed my agreement with the amendment, but since then I have become concerned about the last subsection, subsection (b). I wonder if the gentleman from New York would object to an

amendment which would simply strike subsection (b) of his amendment so that it would simply say that this is one of the purposes for which funds appropriated under this act could be used?

This would leave the Secretary some discretion as to the level of funding for this operation.

Mr. REID of New York. I would have no objection to that. But I would hope the gentleman would join with me in expressing the hope that there would be an understanding that certain funds would be utilized.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would certainly be happy to do this, but I do not want to put them in any situation where they have to do this at the expense of their primary duties.

Mr. REID of New York. I understand that. I believe we ought to express the hope that they would find a way to do this.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this amendment primarily clarifies the authority of the Secretary in this area. Is that correct?

Mr. REID of New York. That is correct. That is because it is not systemized and it is not disseminated, so that the private employers as well as the public employers are not presently in a position to know what skills are needed or what training programs should be developed to match future job openings.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I rise in support of this amendment. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this amendment forward.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very good amendment and I rise in support of the amendment and the bill now under consideration by the House, to extend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and in particular to express my support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid.] This amendment would set up a labor market information and job matching program within the Department of Labor.

One of the many ways of combating poverty is to help the poor become productive members of society. Job training is one positive way; but obviously, training, by itself, is not always enough. We must also match people with jobs. I have long been aware that to do this, we must know what jobs need to be filled, to what extent, and where. The availability of such job vacancy information will certainly be a factor in bringing America's unemployed and underemployed into the ranks of fully productive citizens. I hope the amendment and this legislation are approved by the House.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Would the gentleman's amendment also include the design of a computer system of linking available jobs with individuals who are in the job market?

I would like to call to the attention of our colleague the testimony that the Secretary gave about such a computer system that is

already in existence throughout all of Japan where there is a computer bank which links individuals who are looking for jobs with jobs demanding those skills.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman, the answer would be in the affirmative.

The language in the amendment specifically states:

"In the development of such a program, the Secretary shall make maximum possible use of electronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information."

I would interpret that to mean a job computer banking system that would be broadly used and would be hooked up with various offices and which could provide very promptly the information to be disseminated throughout the country.

Mr. SCHEUER. And it would link the job-seekers with the available jobs.

Mr. REID of New York. Yes; and it is the linkage which, as the gentleman knows, is lacking in this important work.

Mr. SCHEUER. I congratulate the gentleman on the very thorough work he has done and I wish to say I am very much in favor of this amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA OF MICHIGAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan to the amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 3 of the amendment, strike out all of lines 21 through 24."

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this simply strikes out the provision about the 2 percent.

It leaves this one of the functions for which funds are authorized under this act but sets aside no particular share of funds earmarked for this purpose.

This is the amendment that I discussed with the gentleman from New York, and we are in agreement that an effort should be made to institute and effectively operate such a system, but we do not want to set aside any particular sum. We want that to depend upon the other needs of the whole program and upon the amounts appropriated.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, that is a correct statement.

It is certainly our hope that nonetheless the work described in this amendment will go forward.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be agreed to and likewise that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 6, immediately after line 5, insert the following:

"LIMITATION ON SECRETARY'S REAPPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS"

"Sec. 6. The proviso to section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by—

"(1) striking out the words 'sixth month' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'ninth month';

"(2) striking out the words '30 days' and inserting in lieu thereof the words '15 days'; and

"(3) striking out the phrase 'except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year.'"

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment that is in the bill in the other body offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Mr. PROUTY.

The proviso to section 301 in the present law provides that MDTA funds apportioned to a particular State for a fiscal year may not be reapportioned by the Secretary of Labor until after the sixth month of such fiscal year. It further provides that funds may be reapportioned during the third quarter of the fiscal year after 30 days' notice has been given a State and during the fourth quarter without any prior notice to the State.

My amendment prohibits the Secretary of Labor from reapportioning a State's MDTA funds until after the 9th month of the fiscal year. It also requires that a State be given 15 days' prior notice if its funds are to be reapportioned.

Unfortunately there is often a freeze on approval of State programs during the early months of a fiscal year, while legislative deliberations are still taking place. This amendment will allow the States more time to develop programs and the Department of Labor more time to consider State applications, once the freeze is removed.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin if this amendment, as I understand it, in no wise takes away from the Secretary the authority to reapportion funds but merely changes the time from the sixth month to the ninth month before the Secretary can reapportion them and reduces the required period of notice from 30 to 15 days?

Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Kentucky is absolutely correct.

Mr. PERKINS. With that understanding there is no objection to the amendment that I know of on this side.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the Economic Opportunity Act was extended last year an amendment was included whereby the General Accounting Office was directed to study the efficiency of program administration by the Office of Economic Opportunity and local public and private agencies and to determine the extent to which OEO activities achieved the objectives as set forth in the legislation. The legislation called for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the entire program as well as recommendations for additional legislation that GAO might deem advisable, with a final reporting deadline of December 1, 1968. The Office of Economic Opportunity presently allocates over \$18 million for research, evaluation, and audit work. Yet, in spite of this great outlay of money, it was the thinking of the Congress that

GAO, being the congressional instrument for the legislative oversight in checking the efficiency of governmental operations, should conduct an objective evaluation. This evaluation was considered advantageous in view of the substantial opposition to many of the programs operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity and their effectiveness in operating them.

Although the manpower of development and training programs have not been as expensive as the programs operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, there has been a considerable amount of money expended. There has not been, however, the degree of opposition to MDTA and other vocational and manpower programs as there have been to the Office of Economic Opportunity's. In fact, throughout the history of MDTA there has been strong bipartisan support, from the inception of the bill through its extensions and here again today as agreement has been reached on all amendments that have been offered.

We have found in the past that there have been internal studies and evaluations of programs by the governmental agencies operating them, but this has not been done in MDTA. I have some reservations regarding agencies conducting their own studies and providing objective evaluations comparable to those in which GAO is involved. The GAO has indicated that it does not wish to be obligated to a statutory requirement for another compulsory study as they were with the Office of Economic Opportunity. I would like to see now that MDTA has operated for approximately 6 years, that the effectiveness and efficiency of this program be studied and that the GAO be involved in it. I would go even further to say that in the future the Congress itself ought to address itself to oversight matters in its own authorizing committees. We have not, however, reached that point.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan—and I would gladly yield to him—if he agrees with me in these observations and what comments he might have on this matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get on the record that I agree completely with the gentleman from Minnesota. We have been underway in this program now for about 5 or 6 years. We know a number of programs have worked out very well. Others have not worked so well. But I feel as the gentleman from Minnesota feels, that there is a much greater need for definitive data in the evaluation of the several approaches that have been utilized in these MDTA programs that would offer some guidance to us as legislators in terms of the shaping of future legislation and in reshaping this legislation as needed.

I am optimistic that some steps have been taken in this regard that will be helpful. I like to think the Department has become more aware of the need for this sort of thing. I am also apprised of the fact that GAO has been getting involved somewhat in the Department's own evaluation of the program. I certainly hope they will continue, because I think their experience could be very useful here.

I am with the gentleman from Minnesota on this. I think the next thing we ought to undertake to do with MDTA is really to build into it some evaluation, and particularly I think we ought to exercise our own responsibilities in terms of getting some evaluation we think we can rely on and use to guide us in our future consideration of these programs. I think the gentleman is making a valuable contribution.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I hope next year and in the years thereafter we will consider evaluation not only in MDTA but in other vocational and educational programs. In a number of programs I have already indicated my desire for better

coordination by recommending a new Department of Education and Manpower, in order that our decisions may be made wisely in future Congresses. I think we need better studies by the Department and also by the GAO itself—which at present is the only independent agency responsible to the Congress.

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

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. QUIE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to state that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and in agreement with the colloquy that took place between him and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

I certainly feel that in many areas the programs have not been properly evaluated. For instance, in the Office of Economic Opportunity we authorized an evaluation and study, and I have some information that some money has not been, in my judgment, wisely expended through contracts, on evaluating certain programs. But, be that as it may, there would be no way as I see it, to evaluate the MDTA programs by the General Accounting Office unless the Secretary of Labor participated.

The suggestion of the gentleman from Minnesota deserves consideration in the future, and I know that we will work toward that end to improve not only the MDTA and vocational education but also the quality of these programs.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, during the adjournment that took place during August, one of the most respected Members of this body took the journey into the great beyond. I rise not to give a eulogy about him on this occasion, because eulogies will be given at a later date. I refer to our dear and valued friend, our late colleague from Pennsylvania, Elmer Holland. I was in Boston when I heard of his death. We knew he had been ill for some time, but his death apparently occurred with some unexpected suddenness. My purpose in making these few remarks on this occasion is to call attention to the fact that probably no Member of this body has contributed more toward the passage of manpower development and training legislation than did our dear friend, Elmer Holland. Other members of the committee also participated, and I commend them for their part.

I can remember when Elmer Holland was chairman some years ago—not so many years ago, but several years ago—of an ad hoc subcommittee to make a certain investigation and inquiry of the subcommittee emanated the first Manpower Development and Training Act. It was in the early 1960's.

The passage of this bill is a tribute to the memory of Elmer Holland. We all miss him. He performed his duties under great physical difficulties, even to the day we adjourned 5 weeks ago, being on the floor of the House and participating in the deliberations of this body. He always conducted himself not only in a gentlemanly manner but as a dedicated legislator.

My purpose in rising on this occasion is to let the RECORD contain the fact that Elmer Holland played a very important part, a leading part, in this legislation. In fact, he introduced the original bill, as I remember, in connection with the passage of the important legislation we are considering today.

I know all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will pause for a second or two on this occasion to pay tribute to our late friend and our late colleague, Elmer Holland.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I want to associate myself with the Speaker's comments.

I worked with Elmer Holland on that original legislation which he introduced first in 1961. We held long hearings. He was diligent and very much committed to the purpose of this act. It was a somewhat revolutionary or unusual approach in 1961. He was very constructive and cooperative in developing a bipartisan approach to the manpower program. It was because of his approach we were able, in 1962, to pass this legislation with a very major bipartisan imprint on it.

Certainly Elmer Holland deserves a great deal of credit for that.

More than that, it was always a privilege for me and I believe for his other colleagues who worked with him on the Committee on Education and Labor to be associated with him, working in the best interests not only of the laboring man and labor legislation but also our Nation.

I am proud to join the Speaker at this time.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of my friend. I know his remarks will be very consoling to Mrs. Holland.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse H.R. 15045, a bill to extend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. I wish also to add my voice to the chorus of tribute to the late Elmer Holland, whose patient and skillful efforts in earlier Congresses were primarily responsible for the enactment of the MDTA legislation, and, more generally, for the development of a coherent and balanced national manpower policy.

H.R. 15045 extends programs which, in my judgment, must be characterized as success stories. Since its inception, the MDTA has created 1.2 million opportunities to train and educate the human victims of automation and of an ever more sophisticated technology. These opportunities have not been of the busy-work variety. They have rather been chances to train for the skilled jobs which our economy has created, jobs which provide their holders with a productive and satisfying occupation.

I will leave to other Members the explanation of the specific provisions of H.R. 15045. I wish to discuss one aspect of the MDTA, the very successful skills centers. My home city of Trenton was fortunate to receive quite recently almost \$600,000 in MDTA funds for the Trenton Skills Center. This project is designed to provide education and training to unemployed workers in several occupational skills, including automobile repair, welding, key punch operation, electrical appliance service, and others. As this brief description indicates, the Trenton Skills Center is concentrating on preparing men and women for occupations where qualified workers are sorely needed. This undoubtedly accounts for the extremely commendable 89-percent placement rate of trainees who graduate from the Skills Center. In my opinion, the Trenton Skills Center has already contributed a great deal to the economy and the people of Trenton. I fervently hope that the skills centers programs can be continued and expanded.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure others have similar success stories from their States which would testify to the merit of the MDTA programs. The human and economic value of these programs is obvious. I would make one final comment, which may not be obvious. This Congress has properly undertaken a firm commitment to stop the crime which threatens all of our constituents. But I think we should constantly keep in mind that although effective aid to our law enforcement agencies is an essential part of that commitment, it is not the whole answer. As the report of the President's Commission on Law

Enforcement and Administration of Justice concluded:

"The criminal justice system . . . was not designed to eliminate the conditions in which most crime breeds. It needs help. Warring on . . . unemployment is warring on crime."

H.R. 15045, like all measures intended to improve the opportunities of our citizens for a productive and dignified life, will be of long-range help in stopping the violence which we all detest.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend enactment of this legislation.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to lend my support to the bill to extend the Manpower and Development Training Act of 1962.

The history of this program has been marked with significant progress, and as a former member of the Texas Employment Commission, I have some familiarity with the problems faced in this field. In the early days of this program, I am proud that I pushed the MDTA training program in Texas.

Manpower projects have traditionally been aimed to make employable those who, sadly enough, have not been able to get the kind of job they need to support themselves and families. It is a practical program: It talks dollars and cents to the little man who needs a job; it pays for itself in the form of increased tax revenues; and the bill before us now carries forward the requirement that there be a reasonably sound expectation that the type of training given will equip the person to get a decent job.

In my own district over the past year, we have seen concrete examples of the good flowing from manpower projects.

In February, a program was started in Austin to provide training to 20 hotel and restaurant cooks. Austin also was awarded a program to train 307 auto mechanics and auto parts countermen.

Another similar on-the-job-training project in Austin provides experience in auto repair for 196 people.

These programs have been good. The have proven themselves for a number of years, and I am hopeful that we may continue this effort.

I realize that there have been problems in planning the financing available to the Manpower Administration over the past year and a half. I hope this bill will, in some measure, clear the air so that the jobs to be made available in the future will bring an even greater success story.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 15045) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 1271, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 315, nays 0, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

YEAS—315

Abblitt, Abernethy, Adams, Addabbo, Albert, Anderson, Ill., Anderson, Tenn., Annunzio, Ashbrook, Aspinall, Ayres, Bates.

Battin, Belcher, Bell, Bennett, Bevil, Blesster, Bingham, Blackburn, Blanton, Boggs, Bow, Brademas, Brasco.

Bray, Brinkley, Brock, Brooks, Broomfield, Brotzman, Brown, Mich., Broyhill, N.C., Broyhill, Va., Buchanan, Burke, Fla., Burke, Mass.

Burleson, Burton, Calif., Burton, Utah, Bush, Button, Byrne, Pa., Byrnes, Wis., Cahill, Carter, Casey, Cederberg, Chamberlain.

Clark, Clausen, Don H., Cleveland, Cohen, Collier, Collins, Conable, Conte, Corbett, Cramer, Culver, Curtis, Daniels.

Davis, Ga., Davis, Wis., de la Garza, Delenback, Dent, Devine, Dingell, Dole, Donohue, Dorn, Dowdy, Dulski, Duncan.

Dwyer, Edwards, Ala., Edwards, Calif., Edwards, La., Ellberg, Erlenborn, Esch, Eschleman, Everett, Farbstein, Fawcett, Feighan.

Findley, Fino, Fisher, Flood, Foley, Ford, Gerald R., Ford, William D., Fountain, Fraser, Frelinghuysen, Fulton, Ga., Fuqua, Gallianakis, Garmatz.

Gathings, Gettys, Glaimo, Gibbons, Gilbert, Gonzalez, Goodell, Gooding, Green, Oreg., Griffin, Griffiths, Gross, Grover, Gude, Hagan, Haley, Hall, Halpern, Hamilton, Hammerschmidt.

Hanley, Hanna, Hansen, Idaho, Hardy, Harrison, Harsha, Harvey, Hathaway, Hawkins, Hechler, W. Va., Heckler, Mass., Helstoski.

Henderson, Hicks, Horton, Hosmer, Hull, Hungate, Hunt, Hutchinson, Irwin, Jarman, Joelson, Johnson, Calif.

Jonas, Jones, Ala., Jones, N.C., Karsten, Karth, Kastenmeier, Kazen, Kee Keith, Kelly, King, N.Y., Kirwan, Kluczyński, Kornegay, Kupferman.

Kuykendall, Kyros, Laird, Langen, Latta, Leggett, Lennon, Lipscomb, Lloyd, Long, Md., Lukens, McCarthy, McClure, McCulloch, McDonald, Mich.

McEwen, McFall, Macdonald, Mass., MacGregor, Madden, Mahon, Marsh, Mathias, Calif., Mayne, Meeds, Meskill, Michel, Miller, Ohio, Mills.

Minish, Minshall, Mize, Montgomery, Moorhead, Morgan, Mosher, Moss, Murphy, Ill., Murphy, N.Y., Myers, Natcher, Nedzi, Nelsen, Nichols.

O'Hara, Mich., O'Konski, Olsen, O'Neal, Ga., Ottinger, Passman, Patman, Patten, Pelly, Pepper, Perkins, Pettis.

Pickle, Pike, Podell, Poff, Pollock, Price, Ill., Price, Tex., Pryor, Pucinski, Purcell, Quile, Quillen, Rallsback, Randall, Reid, Ill.

Reid, N.Y., Reinecke, Reuss, Rhodes, Ariz., Rhodes, Pa., Riegle, Rivers, Roberts, Robison, Rodino, Rogers, Colo., Rogers, Fla., Rooney, N.Y., Rooney, Pa., Rosenthal.

Rosterkowski, Roth, Roush, Roybal, Rumsfeld, Ryan, St. Onge, Sandman, Saylor, Schadeberg, Scheurer, Schneebell, Schwengel, Scott, Selden.

Shipley, Shriver, Slack, Smith, Calif., Smith, Iowa, Smith, Okla., Springer, Staggers, Stanton, Steed, Steiger, Ariz., Steiger, Wis., Stratton, Taft, Talcott, Taylor, Tenzer.

Thompson, Ga., Thompson, N.J., Thomson, Wis., Tlierman, Tuck, Tunney, Udall, Ullman, Utt, Van Deerlin, Vander Jagt, Vanik, Vigorito, Waggonner, Waldie, Wampler, Watkins, Watson.

Watts, Whalen, Whalley, White, Whitener, Whitten, Widnall, Williams, Willis, Wilson, Bob, Wilson, Charles H., Winn, Wolff, Wright, Wyatt, Wylie, Wyman, Zablocki, Zion, Zwach.

NAYS—O

Adair, Andrews, Ala., Andrews, N. Dak., Arends, Ashley, Ashmore, Baring, Barrett, Berry, Betts, Blatnik, Boland, Bolling.

Bolton, Brown, Calif., Brown, Ohio, Cabell, Carey, Celler, Clancy, Clawson, Del., Colmer, Conyers, Corman, Cowger.

Cunningham, Daddario, Dawson, Delaney, Denney, Derwinski, Dickinson, Diggs, Dow, Downing, Eckhardt, Edmondson, Evans, Colo., Evins, Tenn., Fallon, Flynt, Friedel, Fulton, Tenn., Gallagher, Gardner, Gray, Green, Pa., Gubser, Gurney, Halleck, Hansen, Wash., Hays.

Hébert, Herlong, Holifield, Howard, Ichord, Jacobs, Johnson, Pa., Jones, Mo., King, Calif., Kleppe, Kyl, Landrum.

Long, La., McClory, McCloskey, McDade, McMillan, Machen, Mailliard, Martin, Mathias, Md., Matsunaga, May, Miller, Calif., Mink.

Monagan, Moore, Morris, N. Mex., Morse, Mass., Morton, Nix, O'Hara, Ill., O'Neill, Mass., Philbin, Pirnie, Poage, Rarick, Rees, Reifel.

Resnick, Ronan, Roudelush, Ruppe, St Germain, Satterfield, Scherle, Schweiker, Sikes, Sisk, Skubitz, Smith, N.Y.

Snyder, Stafford, Stephens, Stubblefield, Stuckey, Sullivan, Teague, Calif., Teague, Tex., Walker, Wiggins, Wylder, Yates, Young. So the bill was passed.

[90th Cong., 2d sess., House of Representatives, Rept. No. 1846]

SEASONALITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

August 2, 1968.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Perkins, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following report [to accompany H.R. 15990].

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 15990), to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: (see text below.)

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 15990 is a bill calling upon the Secretary of Labor, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, and after consultation with architects, engineers, and management and labor in the construction industry, to conduct a study of seasonal unemployment in that industry, and to make such recommendations, affecting both the private and the public sector's construction activities, as will ease the serious problem which seasonality presents.

HEARINGS

H.R. 15990 was referred to the Select Subcommittee on Labor, chaired by the Honorable Elmer J. Holland. Public hearings were held in Washington on July 15, 16, and 17, during which witnesses representing the Labor Department, the General Services Administration, and both labor and management in the construction industry testified. Support for a study of the seasonality problem was expressed by both labor and management witnesses, notably by Mr. C. J. Haggerty, president of the building trades department of the AFL-CIO, and by Mr. William E. Naumann, testifying for the associated General Contractors. No testimony in opposition to the study concept was offered to the committee.

BACKGROUND

Seasonality in the construction industry is the major cause of an unemployment rate nearly twice that of other industries in the

United States. It is, in addition, a significant factor in the unemployment rate for the economy as a whole. This committee recommends passage of H.R. 15990 as the first step in a broad-scale attack on this burdensome, wasteful, and clearly unnecessary phenomenon.

It is clear from the testimony presented during the 3 days of committee hearings that seasonality extracts a heavy toll from the construction worker. The laborer, on the whole, works only slightly more than one-third of a normal work year. While more skilled workers, such as the bricklayers and operating engineers, enjoy longer periods of employment, they still fall far short of exercising their highly skilled trades for a full work year. Government witnesses indicated that 1,600 hours could be considered a normal, average, full-time year in construction. The committee wishes to point out that if this average could be extended only 200 hours, it would be equivalent to an addition of 333,000 highly skilled workmen in the construction work force.

Although the construction worker bears the major burden of the cost of seasonal unemployment, he does not bear it alone. The contractor is forced to maintain an expensive permanent establishment during long idle periods each year. The buyer not only foregoes income from his new property for a period equivalent to the seasonal shutdown, but also must absorb an unnecessary portion of the ever-rising cost of construction.

Government (ultimately the taxpayer) pays twice for seasonality. First, as the buyer of construction; second, by the additional cost levied on the unemployment compensation system at the State level and the tax losses which arise from the limitations imposed by seasonality on the income of construction workers and contractors. In this connection, one witness estimated that Federal income tax losses arising from such limitations on laborers alone (about one-fourth of the total construction work force) amounted to \$25 million annually. He further pointed out that through the operation of the graduated tax system "a 7-percent increase in work hours would yield a 32-percent increase in Federal tax payments." It is the committee's opinion that any action taken by the Federal Government would be amply repaid in dollar terms.

The economics of year-round construction cannot be better summarized than by quoting from the testimony of Mr. C. F. Bone, a former president of the Canadian Constructors Association and chairman of Canada's All-Weather Construction Council, who appeared before the Select Subcommittee on Labor:

"The important factor to remember is that wintertime construction costs should be compared to those that will be experienced in the next summer, rather than the previous summer. Building cost indices have risen consistently each year over the past 35 years. The index in January is usually about 3 percent lower than in the following summer. This in itself indicates that it would be economical to spend quite large sums of money on wintertime construction, rather than postpone the work until spring."

Mr. Bone and other witnesses, speaking both for labor and management, were unanimous in pointing out that the cost of wintertime construction only added about 1 percent to the total cost of the contract. Thus, in considering a program to deseasonalize the construction industry we are talking about a 1-percent increase in cost on on-going projects compared to the possibility of a 3-percent increase in total cost levied by delaying the job to the next summer.

Aside from the obvious economic benefits of year-round construction, the technological feasibility of year-round work has been amply demonstrated.

The techniques of enclosure and heating can be used on building sites and small structures to carry on work during bad weather. We were surprised, however, to learn how much could be done in this regard. Again quoting from Mr. Bone:

"Enclosures are designed to fit the job and range in size from a small lean-to around a house, to huge structures such as the one used this past winter at a power project on the Nelson River in northern Manitoba. This shelter enclosed an area 580 feet by 120 feet to height of 140 feet. Within this enclosure, 750 men worked in their shirt sleeves constructing a generating station, while temperatures outside dropped to -40° F. or lower."

Apart from the Canadian experience, it was brought to the committee's attention that virtually all of the nations of Western Europe, as well as the Soviet Union, have active programs of all-weather construction. In spite of that, and in spite of the much-vaunted technological ability of the United States, this country has barely given a passing thought to meeting the problem.

The committee feels that the major obstacles to year-round construction are three. First, a lack of knowledge on the part of the industry of the techniques and cost factors that make all-weather construction both feasible and attractive. Second, a reluctance to change deeply embedded patterns of seasonality. Third, a division of responsibility for whatever additional costs must be absorbed.

In the case of the masonry industry, there has been a serious attempt on the part of participants in the industry to make a concerted attack on the problem of seasonal unemployment. The committee was impressed with the obvious enthusiasm of the joint Labor-Management All-Weather Committee for the Masonry Industry. We point out, however, that this is essentially a specialty group which cannot be expected to solve the problems of seasonality for the whole industry.

The committee feels that the Federal Government has a large stake in solving this vexing problem. In the first place, Government is a major purchaser in the construction field. Secondly, large fluctuations in unemployment rates present serious manpower policy problems and should be corrected if at all possible. Thirdly, the burden of seasonality on the unemployment compensation system should be eliminated. The Federal Government is in an excellent position to have an impact on the problem.

The executive branch apparently agrees. The testimony of Under Secretary of Labor, James J. Reynolds, indicated to your committee that steps were already underway in the executive branch to attack the problem of seasonality. We applaud these efforts and want to emphasize that nothing in this bill should serve to delay any of the steps currently being contemplated.

Nor should the fact that a study is underway serve in any manner to justify delay in adopting positive policies within the scope of Federal contracting authority. It has been proposed, for example, that the Federal Government require that all building construction on Federal projects or federally assisted projects, shall be contracted for in such a way as to assure the continual progression of work in accordance with the approved construction schedule, notwithstanding weather conditions. All requests for bids might, for example, require contractors to negotiate for continued performance with any subcontractor and to assign the responsibility for going forward with the project. It might further be required that provision be made in the general contract, and all subcontracts springing from it, for appropriate site protection together with allowances to cover such additional costs as may be necessary. The committee knows of

no barriers to contracting requirements of this kind, and this bill raises no such barriers.

Your committee recommends the passage of H.R. 15990 as a necessary spur to effective and obviously needed action.

[House, Oct. 7, 1968]

AMENDING MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT RELATING TO SEASONAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15990) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is further amended, by adding, at the end thereof, a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV

"SEASONAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

"SEC. 401. (a) The Congress finds that seasonal unemployment represents a substantial portion of the unemployment in the construction industry; and a significant portion of all unemployment; that seasonal unemployment results in economic hardship for construction employees, employers, and for the consumers of construction services; that such unemployment constitutes unnecessary and wasteful misuse of the Nation's manpower resources; that stabilization of construction operations may be expected to have a correspondingly stabilizing effect on construction employment and costs; and that it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the economy as a whole, and manpower policy in particular that positive and expeditious action be taken by public authorities and private groups to regularize construction employment.

"(b) It is therefore, the purpose of this title to provide for the conduct of a study of seasonality in the construction industry, with special attention to its implications for national manpower policy.

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Labor, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall study, investigate, conduct research, and prepare a report containing his findings and recommendations concerning means to achieve stabilization of employment in the construction industry and the diminishment of seasonality of employment in such industry, with special attention to its implications for national manpower policy, and shall transmit such report to the President no later than December 31, 1969.

"SEC. 403. Matters which the Secretary of Labor, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and after consultation with other officials of Federal agencies, and with engineers, architects and representatives of labor and management in the construction industry, shall consider, shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the extent to which seasonal unemployment in the construction industry can be reduced without substantial increases in construction costs by means such as—

"(a) the application of modern techniques to reduce the influence of weather on construction activity;

"(b) the resolution of technical problems which have not been solved by existing research and development activities;

"(c) possible changes in contract procedures in allocation cycles; and

"(d) improved planning and scheduling of construction projects."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 15990, to provide for a study of the problem of seasonality in the construction industry, is very clear in its purpose and very simple. It was supported by spokesmen for management, labor, and the Government; and it was approved unanimously by our committee.

Under its terms, the Secretary of Labor, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and after consultation with other officials of Federal agencies and with engineers, architects, and other representatives of labor and the construction industry, shall consider the extent to which seasonal unemployment can be reduced without substantial increases in construction costs.

The report from such a study must be transmitted to the President no later than December 31, 1969.

The legislation does not authorize specific appropriations and it is intended that the cost of the study would come out of the usual funds available to the Secretary of Labor for administrative purposes. We expect the cost to be in the neighborhood of \$300,000.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee and point out that this is an extremely important bill. The construction industry of this country is one of three key props of our economy. This study will try to determine how we can use this important segment of our economy in a much more effective way so as to spread out the work in order to avoid peaks and valleys.

I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky for bringing this very, very significant legislation before the House today and urge its passage.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) is the sponsor of this legislation. Also, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) has been very much interested. I know of no opposition from anyone to the bill.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that as far as the minority on the committee is concerned the bill came out of the committee unanimously, as the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, indicated. Testimony was received from both the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, and from Mr. William E. Naumann speaking for the Associated General Contractors. In his testimony, Mr. Naumann did indicate that an amendment, which was thereafter adopted by the committee, was necessary to enable the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor in making this study, and to provide for consultation therein with the representatives of both labor and management in the construction industry. It is quite clear, as the testimony before the committee indicates, that there is a need for a study of seasonality in the construction industry. This is something which has long been overlooked. In obtaining this legislation we show that we believe this ought to be done and the bill ought to be supported.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15990 is a noncontroversial proposal for a study of one of the most bothersome phenomena confronting the construction industry. I refer to the problem of seasonal shut-downs and accompanying seasonal unemployment.

The bill calls simply for a study, to be conducted by the Secretary of Labor, in co-

operation with the Secretary of Commerce, and with consultation involving construction industry management and labor, with architects and engineers, and other Federal agencies as appropriate. The study, which is to be completed by December 31, 1969, would examine ways and means of achieving greater stability of employment in the construction trades, the application of modern techniques to reduce the influence of weather on construction activity, and possible alterations in contracting procedures and construction planning. The recommendations of the study may well be applicable to both the public and the private sectors, and, if the study produces positive results, it is to be hoped that the lessons learned therefrom would be given very careful attention by the agencies of this Government which are involved in contracting for construction work.

From the materials presented in the hearings, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the construction worker and the contractor alike have a stake in this legislation. The average construction laborer, for example, works only a third of the normal work year. Other construction craftsmen enjoy longer periods of employment but they, too, often fall far short of a year's work in a 12-month period. The contractor, for his part, faces the problem of having his capital investment inactive over a significant part of the year, and he faces in some areas, serious problems in holding together a permanent work force.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to be able to assure the House that this is one bill affecting the construction industry on which labor and management are generally in agreement.

Mr. William Naumann of the Associated General Contractors, testified before our subcommittee during the hearings on this legislation to the effect that his organization supports the purpose of H.R. 15990, with some amendments. One of his proposed amendments would be to have the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce both involved in this study. This bill, as reported by the committee, does precisely that. He suggested that other departments of Government be involved, as appropriate, and that it would be useful for management and labor in the construction industry to be consulted. The bill provides for that Mr. Naumann finally stated that in his opinion, the original March 31, 1969 deadline was unrealistic and that "the deadline should allow at least a year following its enactment." The amended and reported bill sets a new deadline at December 31, 1969.

Seasonality in the construction trades is a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker. As I have said above, it affects the employer and the employee alike, and in many ways it raises the costs of construction to the ultimate consumer, of whom the U.S. Government is one of the most significant. There is already underway within the executive branch consideration of an executive order which would explore the possibilities of scheduling Government construction contracting to offset seasonal patterns of shut-downs and layoffs. Though the consideration of an Executive order toward the same objective, they are certainly not incompatible. The committee, in reporting the bill, emphasized that:

"Nothing in the bill should serve to delay any of the steps currently being contemplated. Nor should the fact that a study is underway serve in any manner to justify delay in adopting positive policies within the scope of Federal contracting authority."

I would like to reemphasize that thought today, on behalf of the committee.

H.R. 15990, Mr. Speaker, should gain the unanimous approval of the House. I urge that the House suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ayres).

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

I wish to commend those members of the subcommittee that handled this bill for the manner in which they dealt with it. I hope that the chairman and myself will be able to improve on it in the next session.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and the bill, H.R. 15990, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 0, not voting 166, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—265

Abernethy, Adams, Addabbo, Albert, Anderson, Ill., Anderson, Tenn., Andrews, N. Dak., Annunzio, Arends.

Ashbrook, Ayres, Baring, Barrett, Battin, Bennett, Betts, Biester, Bingham, Blatnik, Boland, Bolton, Bow, Brademas, Brasco, Bray, Brinkley, Brotzman, Broyhill, N.C., Burke, Mass.

Burleson, Burton, Calif., Burton, Utah, Bush, Byrne, Pa., Byrnes, Wis., Cahill, Carter, Casey, Cederberg.

Chamberlain, Clancy, Clawson, Del, Cohen, Collier, Collins, Colmer, Conable, Conte, Corbett, Cramer, Culver, Davis, Ga., Davis, Wis., Dawson, de la Garza, Delaney.

Dellenback, Derwinski, Devine, Dingell, Dole, Donohue, Dorn, Dow, Dowdy, Downing, Dulski, Duncan.

Eckhardt, Edmondson, Erlenborn, Esch, Eshleman, Fallon, Farbstein, Feighan, Findley, Fino, Flynt, Foley.

Ford, Gerald R., Ford, William D., Fountain, Fraser, Friedel, Fulton, Pa., Garmatz, Gathings, Gettys, Gibbons, Gilbert.

Gonzalez, Goodling, Gray, Green, Oreg., Griffin, Griffiths, Grover, Gubser, Gude, Hagan, Hall, Halpern.

Hamilton, Hammerschmidt, Hanley, Hansen, Wash., Harrison, Harsha, Hathaway, Hawkins, Hays, Hechler, W. Va., Hicks.

Horton, Hosmer, Howard, Hunt, Hutchinson, Ichord, Jarman, Joelson, Johnson, Calif., Johnson, Pa., Jonas, Jones, N.C.

Kazen, Kee, Keith, Kelly, King, N.Y., Kirwan, Kluczynski, Kuykendall, Kyl, Kyros, Langen, Latta.

Lipscomb, Lloyd, Long, Md., McClory, McCloskey, McCulloch, McDale, McDonald, Mich., McEwen, McFall, MacGregor.

Machen, Madden, Mahon, Mailliard, Marsh, Mathias, Md., Matsunaga, May, Mayne, Meeds, Meskill, Miller, Calif., Miller, Ohio.

Minish, Mize, Monagan, Montgomery, Moore, Moorhead, Morgan, Morse, Mass., Morton, Murphy, Ill., Myers, Natcher, Nedzi, O'Hara, Mich., O'Konski, O'Neal, Ga., Ottinger, Passman, Patten.

Pelly, Perkins, Pettis, Philbin, Pike, Pirnie, Podell, Poff, Price, Ill., Price, Tex., Pryor, Pucinski.

Quie, Randall, Rarick, Rees, Reid, Ill., Reid, N.Y., Reinecke, Reuss, Rhodes, Ariz., Rhodes, Pa., Riegle, Rivers, Rogers, Fla.

Ronan, Rooney, N.Y., Rooney, Pa., Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roth, Roush, Rumsfeld, St Germain, Saylor, Schadeberg.

Scherle, Schneebell, Schwengel, Shriver, Skubitz, Slack, Smith, Iowa, Springer, Stanton, Steed, Steiger, Ariz., Steiger, Wis.

Stephens, Stubblefield, Taft, Talcott, Teague, Calif., Thompson, Ga., Thompson, N.J., Thomson, Wis., Tiernan, Tuck, Udall, Ullman.

Van Deerlin, Vanik, Waggonner, Wampler,

Watkins, Watts, Whalen, Whalley, White, Whitten, Widnall.

Williams, Pa., Wilson, Bob, Winn, Wolff, Wright, Wyatt, Wylder, Wylie, Wyman, Young, Zablocki, Zion.

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—166

Abbitt, Adair, Andrews, Ala., Ashley, Ashmore, Aspinall, Bates, Belcher, Bell, Berry, Beville, Blackburn, Blanton, Boggs, Bollings, Brock.

Brooks, Broomfield, Brown, Calif., Brown, Mich., Brown, Ohio, Broyhill, Va., Buchanan, Burke, Fla., Button, Cabell, Carey, Celler, Clark, Clausen, Don H., Cleveland, Conyers, Corman, Cowger.

Cunningham, Curtis, Daddario, Daniels, Denney, Dent, Dickinson, Diggs, Dwyer, Edwards, Ala., Edwards, Calif., Edwards, La.

Elberg, Evans, Colo., Everett, Evins, Tenn., Fassel, Fisher, Flood, Frelinghuysen, Fulton, Tenn., Fuqua, Galifianakis, Gallagher.

Gardner, Glaimo, Green, Pa., Gross, Gurney, Haley, Halleck, Hanna, Hansen, Idaho, Hardy, Harvey, Hébert, Heckler, Mass.

Helstoski, Henderson, Herlong, Hollifield, Hull, Hungate, Irwin, Jacobs, Jones, Ala., Jones, Mo., Karsten, Karth, Kastenmeier.

King, Calif., Kleppe, Kornegay, Kupferman, Laird, Landrum, Leggett, Long, La., Lukens, McCarthy, McClure, McMillan.

Macdonald, Mass., Martin, Mathias, Calif., Michel, Mills, Mink, Minshall, Morris, N. Mex., Mosher, Moss, Murphy, N.Y., Nelsen.

Nichols, Nix, O'Hara, Ill., Olsen, O'Neill, Mass., Patman, Pepper, Pickle, Poage, Pollock, Purcell, Quillen.

Rallsback, Reifel, Resnick, Roberts, Robinson, Rodino, Rogers, Colo., Roudabush, Roybal, Ruppe, Ryan, St. Onge, Sandman, Satterfield.

Scheuer, Schweiker, Scott, Selden, Shipley, Sikes, Sisk, Smith, Calif., Smith, N.Y., Smith, Okla., Snyder, Stafford, Staggers.

Stratton, Stuckey, Sullivan, Taylor, Teague, Tex., Tenzer, Tunney, Utt, Vander Jagt, Vigorito, Walde, Walker, Watson, Whitener, Wiggins, Willis, Wilson, Charles H., Yates, Zwach.

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1968

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the bill (S. 2938) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, having considered and amended the same, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

BACKGROUND

S. 2938 was introduced on February 7, 1968, at the request of the administration. Its basic purpose is to extend expiring provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (MDTA). The committee has added amendments which will contribute to the effective operation of the program.

In the 6 years since its initial passage the MDTA has proved to be a broad-gaged and versatile instrument for meeting the ever-changing challenges inherent in any program designed to develop and utilize to the fullest extent possible the Nation's human resources. Amendments to the basic act in 1963, 1965, and 1966 have contributed substantially to the effectiveness of the manpower program by making it less rigid in its administration and permitting a creative balance between institutional and on-the-job (OJT) training.

Since passage of the act in 1962 more than 1.2 million training opportunities have been authorized. Of these, nearly 740,000 have been for institutional training, over 455,000 for on-the-job training, and 60,000 for part-time and other training.

As of June 1, 1968, over 725,000 persons had enrolled in institutional training programs and 435,000 had completed their training. Approximately 285,000 persons had been enrolled in on-the-job (OJT) training and 155,000 had completed their training; 76 percent of those completing institutional training and 89 percent of those completing OJT were employed when last contracted. Of these placements, 78 percent of the trainees from institutional programs and 93 percent from OJT were employed in training-related jobs.

Statistics alone do not fully reveal the dynamic evolution of the national manpower policy in this relatively short span of time. As MDTA programs have developed, there have been major shifts to meet new or previously unnoticed demands.

Growing awareness of the staggering difficulties facing our most disadvantaged citizens has led to increased focus on their complex training needs. It has become apparent that many in this group need a wide range of services effectively coordinated in the areas in which they live and work. The concentrated employment program (CEP) was established to organize—from several sources—the particular combination of programs needed to reach out to, motivate, provide orientation and job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed in specially selected areas of urban and rural poverty. The realization that Government alone cannot successfully overcome a national problem of such huge dimensions has led to the creation of the new job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS) program, which puts the hard-core to work in private industry. Employers are reimbursed by the Government for the extra costs of necessary training and supportive services at levels substantially in excess of those provided under other OJT projects.

As manpower programs expanded the need emerged for greatly improved planning and coordinating mechanisms at each level of operation. In 1967 a number of Federal departments and agencies, in cooperation with the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor, established the cooperative area manpower planning system (CAMPS), through which Federal, State, and local authorities representing most manpower program components and interests, jointly plan and implement comprehensive community and statewide manpower programs.

In summary, the committee believes that the MDTA has provided a sound base from which to move forward in this critically important policy field. The amendments the committee recommends this year will insure that there will be no break in the progressive development of programs committed to the goal of providing for each American citizen the opportunity for productive employment.

Certain areas in which program improvement is desirable have been brought to the attention of the committee in its hearings and oversight activities, and the most important of these are discussed in the following sections.

EVALUATION AND COORDINATION

The committee anticipates detailed evaluations of MDTA effectiveness and impact before the next extension of the program. The committee expects the Secretary to furnish improved analytical studies. Such studies shall include an evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of MDTA and the various Federal manpower programs, and analysis of comparative and other data on all major work and training programs authorized by MDTA and other Federal laws. The committee is particularly interested in studies that follow up the trainees for several years after they have completed training, and in comparisons in appropriate cases with control groups.

The committee directs the Secretary to arrange for obtaining the opinions of partici-

pants about the strengths and weaknesses of programs and, where practicable, to make use of data and information available from other public agencies.

The committee is particularly concerned by testimony that demonstrated the vast array of Federal manpower programs do not result in any comprehensive manpower policy. Instead, individual acts were written, considered, and amended in rapid succession to meet current crises, real or imagined, with little attention to their interrelations. At the local level there is no single agency or combination of easily accessible institutions where those seeking help can find it. Administrators have been too impatient to await the results of new and existing programs and, consequently, have not allowed time for restructuring them. As a result there has been a tendency to devise instant gimmicks to solve the problems and proliferation of competing programs and agencies.

The committee hopes it will receive in the next Congress a proposal for a comprehensive manpower act to overcome the deficiencies cited above.

The committee feels that, in addition to improved evaluation of manpower programs by the executive branch, the Congress itself needs independent judgments on these matters. In this regard, the committee urges the General Accounting Office to continue and broaden its evaluation of manpower programs already begun in connection with its investigation of the antipoverty program authorized last year in the economic opportunity amendments. The committee feels that the GAO should broaden its activities in this area of program evaluation, as opposed to its traditional auditing emphasis, in order to give the Congress independent reviews of the performance of the executive agencies. This is especially important in the area of manpower programs, which a number of different agencies are involved and where it has proved difficult to develop objective data comparing different programs.

SKILL CENTERS

The committee received considerable testimony that MDTA skill centers are particularly effective in training disadvantaged men and women. An MDTA skill center is a centralized facility for grouping many occupational training programs and supportive services, consequently facilitating a highly individualized schedule for each trainee. A skill center may provide training for 20 different occupations in one facility.

The committee heard convincing testimony that many of these [effective and efficient] skill centers are operating at considerably less than full capacity and are hamstrung by administrative regulations.

Skill centers are presently funded on a project by project basis which results in idle capacity that cannot be shifted rapidly to meet local needs. For example, if there is no project funded for welders for the last 3 months of a year, the welding capacity stands idle. Moreover, there have been sharp peaks and valleys in the enrollment of trainees in skill centers and this has impeded planned and efficient operation.

The committee directs the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work on revisions of the funding arrangements of skill centers. The committee expects that some skill centers will be funded on an annual basis rather than a project basis to determine whether this method of funding will promote ease of administration, guarantee the persons most in need of training are served, and assure proper accountability of Federal funds. If, during the year, a new and different occupational training need occurred, it would be developed and funded with the provisions that the new project stand its share of the additional cost on a prorated basis.

Moreover, the committee expects some skill centers will be used for a long-range pilot

study of skill center operations. These pilot studies should include a comprehensive look at such items as enrollment levels, linkages with the CEP and JOBS program, and characteristics of trainees and results of training.

In particular, the committee is concerned that there is no plan or rationale for linking the operations of the skill centers with the new CEP and JOBS programs. These programs are being administered in large part as though skill centers do not exist. Yet, the committee sought specifically to deal with this problem of linkages between programs in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. Under those amendments, prime sponsors of work and training programs under part B, title I, of the Economic Opportunity Act were to establish comprehensive work and training programs which would provide a complete sequence of all needed services to program participants. The services which prime sponsor could provide included almost every conceivable type of manpower training and employment function, as spelled out in section 123(a) of that act.

The committee expected that this requirement of comprehensive planning together with the provision in one legislation measure of complete legislative authority to conduct all aspects of job training and employment programs would strengthen and encourage the administratively established CEP mechanism. In particular, the committee intended that title I-B prime sponsors and CEP sponsors would have the authority to conduct or otherwise arrange for the conduct of skill training programs and other supportive programs, many of which were already functioning at the local level under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The committee fully expected that title I-B program sponsors would be able to use funds provided under the Economic Opportunity Act to arrange for or purchase such training or other services from MDTA programs, with the joint concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of HEW, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. For example, it was clearly envisaged that a CEP sponsor could use title I-B funds for institutional training activities by subcontracting with an institutional training operator, such as a skills center, to provide those services to CEP participants. The Committee has since learned that the executive branch has not permitted that kind of flexible purchase of services to go forward and the committee expects in the future that any inhibiting budgetary or other regulations preventing this will be eliminated.

CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM (CEP)

The committee was deeply disturbed by the testimony and its investigations concerning the concentrated employment program. The CEP is essentially an administrative mechanism for combining under one local funding source programs under all Federal manpower programs in a concentrated effort to provide employment for the hard-core in urban and rural slums. In theory, CEP would provide an unbroken sequence of services from outreach to counseling after job placement.

The objective of CEP is to get people in jobs. Secretary Wirtz stated that CEP's goal was to place between 100,000 and 150,000 people in jobs through 50 CEP's in fiscal year 1968. In fact, by May 31, 1968, only 21,000 people were placed in jobs; 9,700 dropped out of the CEP program, and 18,000 people were placed in training programs. The Secretary of Labor testified that the results of CEP programs "have fallen short, in most areas, of our expectations." He promised an improved performance in fiscal year 1969.

Some of the problems with the initial CEP's are noted below:

(1) The prime sponsor must make very clear the role of each subcontractor and assure coordination of component activities. Prime contractors must provide firm and ef-

fective administration through unambiguous lines of authority and communication.

(2) New CEP's should plan to have the OJT, job development and job placement components operational on or before intake begins to avoid backlogs and forced suspensions of enrollee movement through the CEP cycle. In cities with both CEP and JOBS programs, it is expected that these components can be provided through JOBS.

(3) New careers, OJT, and job development have been the components most difficult to develop successfully. Greatly intensified efforts must be made to dispel employer resistance and apathy toward training the disadvantaged.

(4) A heavy preponderance of female enrollees in some projects has been caused by the use of large numbers of female outreach workers who don't reach the male potential enrollees. Projects are being urged to emphasize aggressive outreach and recruitment of males, using male outreach workers wherever possible. According to the most recent report the proportion of females is 50 percent.

(5) Inservice training of local CEP staff must be an integral, continuous activity of each project. The lack of sufficient numbers of persons to operate CEP who are knowledgeable in modern methods and approaches to today's manpower problems makes this training mandatory.

(6) Inadequate data systems in some projects preclude generation of operating information needed for effective project management and assessment. A comprehensive records and reporting system for installation in all CEP's should be developed.

Since this program is even now just getting underway it is essential that broad scale evaluation comparable to that undertaken in the first year be continued in order to assess program strengths and weaknesses. Any new program of this complexity requires such assessment if it's to be brought rapidly to its fullest potential.

COOPERATIVE AREA MANPOWER PLANNING SYSTEMS

The cooperative area manpower planning system (CAMPs) is a voluntary interagency effort on the part of eight Federal agencies for the joint development and implementation of manpower and related programs. Under this cooperative agreement, overall coordinated plans of operation for the upcoming program year are developed by each agency for the provision of services for which it is administratively responsible. No agency participating in CAMPs has relinquished administrative control of the program it is authorized to operate; rather, these agencies endeavor to utilize program resources in an efficient manner compatible with statutory provisions.

Under CAMPs, manpower coordinating committees have been established at the area, State and regional levels. Members of the State manpower coordinating committees include representatives of all manpower agencies, the Governor's office, as well as representation from labor, management, and the general public. The primary responsibility of the State and local manpower coordinating committees is the development and implementation of areawide comprehensive plans.

The committee believes that CAMPs system is a promising vehicle for coordinating the plethora of different and largely uncoordinated Federal manpower programs, and for finding a solution to an appropriate Federal-State relationship. Consequently, the committee has included an amendment that will give the States the ability to approve 20 percent of the MDTA funds without further Federal approval, provided the Secretary has approved a State CAMPs plan or similar State plan program.

The early experience under CAMPs is promising. State and local commitment to

the concept has been surprising, but is threatened by several developments. First, CAMPS has been given little authority, no money, and no staff. It is in danger of becoming an after-the-fact information gathering system. Second, many State and local officials view the Labor Department's funding of the concentrated employment program and the JOBS program outside of the CAMPS approved plan as a breach of faith, and an indication that CAMPS is not to be taken seriously. In short, if the CAMPS program fails, it appears at this time that the fault will be Federal. The committee expects that the Labor Department will move to correct its shortcomings in this regard.

In order to do this he will need approval of pending budget requests to provide staff for CAMPS committees.

JOBS PROGRAM

The committee heard considerable conflicting testimony about the job opportunities in business sector program. The program is built around three basic principles:

To engage private industry fully in the problems of the hard-core unemployed.

To pay with Government funds the extra costs of training the disadvantaged for steady employment.

To simplify Government paperwork and make all Government services easily and readily available to the employer.

The administration's goal is to provide jobs for 100,000 hard-core unemployed persons by December 1969.

It is too early to evaluate the JOBS programs. The committee is convinced, however, that in the long run the success of the JOBS program will depend in large part on the acceptance of these disadvantaged workers by their supervisors and fellow workers. It does no good for the president of the company to support the JOBS program if his personnel officers and foremen are not sympathetic and effective in dealing with the new employees. Similarly, it does little good for a corporation president to pledge to take disadvantaged workers if the company does not have the experience or training competence to deal with them. Consequently, the committee urges the Labor Department and the National Alliance for Businessmen to provide sufficient technical assistance to private companies to insure on all aspects of program operation that the disadvantaged workers receive adequate training, counseling and supportive help, and that they remain on the job and can look forward to upward mobility in their careers. In the past, some MDTA, on-the-job training has directed workers into menial dead end jobs.

The committee trusts that the JOBS program will improve the performance of Federal on-the-job training programs in serving disadvantaged workers. In the past on-the-job training programs have neglected disadvantaged workers and when they were included, the supportive services have been inadequate to meet their needs. The JOBS program, which derived in major part from amendments last year to the Economic Opportunity Act, was conceived in part to overcome these problems. Moreover, the committee is also pleased to note that the number of disadvantaged workers in the regular MDTA on-the-job training program has now risen to 50 percent—a substantial expansion since the last extension act.

While the committee approves of the general approach taken in the JOBS program, and indeed gave legislative mandate to this program in section 123(a)(8) of the Economic Opportunity Act last year, it does feel that the program has been mounted in a most hurried manner. The committee has been unable to obtain any thorough evaluations of the so-called test program, upon which the JOBS program was modeled, and it appears that this major new effort was mounted without any real evaluation of what was to be its pilot effort. The committee feels that

where Federal programs so deeply involve the use of resources in the private sector, very careful groundwork should be laid in order to avoid constant redesign of the program after it is underway, in a manner which discourages private sector participation. One particular problem which has come to light is that many companies are apparently now willing to hire and train the hard-core unemployed without any Federal reimbursements, and it may be that Federal funds are an unnecessary inducement in many cases. The committee hopes that the Department will develop procedures to assure that Federal reimbursements are not offered unnecessarily and will not be used by business simply because they are available.

TABLE 1.—ENROLLMENTS OF DISADVANTAGED PERSONS IN THE MDTA PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1967 AND FISCAL YEAR 1968 (THROUGH MAR. 31, 1968)

| Period | Percent disadvantaged enrollees ¹ | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Total MDTA program | Institutional training | On-the-job training |
| Cumulative, fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968.... | 56 | 66 | 43 |
| Fiscal year 1967..... | 54 | 64 | 41 |
| 1st quarter..... | 52 | 63 | 42 |
| 2d quarter..... | 54 | 64 | 38 |
| 3d quarter..... | 55 | 64 | 39 |
| 4th quarter..... | 57 | 66 | 43 |
| Fiscal year 1968..... | 59 | 68 | 48 |
| 1st quarter..... | 58 | 67 | 47 |
| 2d quarter..... | 58 | 68 | 47 |
| 3d quarter..... | 61 | 67 | 50 |

¹ Defined as persons having 2 or more of the following characteristics: nonwhite, less than 12 grades of education, unemployed at least 15 weeks, under 22 or 45 years of age and over, handicapped, or a public assistance recipient.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS BETWEEN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING AND INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING

This committee has heard recommendations that would severely limit administrative discretion by amending the MDTA to fix the allocation of funds between OJT and institutional training and to set rigid levels for funding skill centers. On the basis of the record of achievements over the last 6 years, we emphatically reject any such amendments. It cannot be maintained, nor does experience imply, that one pattern of training, or one kind of setting for training, should be relied upon exclusively. Our society is complex, our institutional mechanisms are varied, the needs and desires of our citizens vary. Flexibility, not rigidity, should therefore be built into our manpower development activities.

The skill center is an effective institutional design for delivering services for certain occupational objectives to those it reaches. But it cannot reach all persons. The questions of whether available funds should be applied to a centralized operation such as a skill center or should be used for smaller, more widely dispersed projects should not be written into the statute, but should be resolved by administrative judgments on the basis of such factors as the nature of the occupations for which training is to be provided and the density, the geographic spread, the characteristics and mobility of the population to be served by the program.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty held hearings on S. 2938 and other manpower legislation. Testimony was taken from the 54 witnesses including manpower experts and representatives of the poor people's campaign. This testimony was conducted in 12 days.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF S. 2938

A. Extension of authority

The committee bill extends the expiration dates of basic training programs and of certain experimental and development pro-

grams. The authority to conduct the basic manpower training programs (institutional and on the job) under title II of the MDTA, which is due to expire on June 30, 1969, is extended to June 30, 1972. Title II-D, authorizing training for inmates of correctional institutions, which is now due to expire on June 30, 1969, is extended until June 30, 1970. The provisions of section 104 (labor mobility demonstration projects) and section 105 (trainee placement assistance demonstration projects), which are now due to expire June 30, 1968, are also extended to June 30, 1970.

The committee wishes to emphasize the urgent need for these extensions at the earliest possible date. Uncertainty about the continued flow of funds has already led to a phasing down of manpower programs. States are now in the process of developing their CAMPS plans and need assurance of suitable program and funding authority.

At the present time, these plans cannot be developed with any assurance that all training under title II of the act begun in that year won't have to be completed by December 20, 1969. Programs based on that limitation cannot go as far as is needed or as far as they should go to meet the needs of employers and individuals. Many skill centers schedule training for disadvantaged persons over an 18-month period to include basic and remedial education as well as skill training. Such scheduling is now having to be curtailed because individuals who are just starting now will not be able to complete their training by December 30, 1969. The present termination dates under title II of the act have already begun to affect the job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS) program for involving private industry in a major effort to train disadvantaged persons. We are advised that in most cases cooperating employers expect a full 2 years will be required to properly complete the training of most individuals, and that to offer these employers contracts for 6 to 8 months less than they consider necessary might be seriously damaging to the program.

Already two programs—the labor mobility and the placement assistance programs—have suffered, as of June 30, 1968, a termination of their program authorization. Both these programs have provided valuable lessons from pilot activities, and further experimentation is needed to develop the basis for consideration of permanent legislation.

The committee views with concern the seriously adverse consequences which will flow increasingly from further delay in enacting these extensions of authority under the act.

Regarding title II, institutional and on-the-job training, the act now permits disbursement of funds which were obligated before June 30, 1969, to continue to be made through December 30, 1969.

B. Labor market information

In considering urgent issues affecting the Nation's manpower, this committee has been disturbed by the lack of specific information on a wide variety of manpower problems and by the failure of labor market information to keep pace with growing needs for data to guide legislation and shape public policy. The lack of adequate information also constitutes a serious handicap to sound decisions in the job market by workers, employers, and public authorities.

The growth in size and complexity of the American economy, and the rapidity with which changes have taken place in the structure and technology of economic activity, make it essential that we have available detailed and comprehensive information on the character, magnitude, and dynamics of employment and unemployment, and on the factors which influence them. Increasing social ferment, a rise in expectations of the poor and disadvantaged, and the acceptance by Americans generally of the public responsibility for ending pov-

erty, assuring full employment, and achieving social justice, have heightened the urgency of need for labor market information as a basis for public action.

The committee finds the following to be the minimum requirements for a labor market information system that will provide the factual basis for decisionmaking by public and private users.

(1) *Information on "the nature and extent of impediments to the maximum development of individual employment potential including the number and characteristics of all persons requiring manpower services."*—The persistence of poverty in the face of continuing high employment. The growth has underscored the critical lack of information on the number, location and needs of the undereducated, underskilled, and underemployed. The services needed by these people are varied and require an intensive and individualized approach based on detailed knowledge of the condition of the people and of the methods by which their problems can be resolved. The data required for effective policy and program utilization must necessarily extend beyond the purely economic facts and include the knowledge which can be contributed by a variety of disciplines including the psychological and sociological. A comprehensive labor market information system would serve to identify the size and nature of the problems of disadvantaged individuals and, by providing regular and timely data, serve as a basis for (a) measuring the effectiveness of public action and (b) detecting changes in the composition of the universe of need.

(2) *Information on "job opportunities and skill requirements."*—Testimony by a broad spectrum of Government policymakers, economists, and employment service officials has documented the need for data on current demand for labor and the skills required to fill that demand. There is at present a serious deficiency in information opportunities which can be used for purposes of placement, training, and program. The policy and operational uses of a system of job opportunities information which is provided for under section 106(b) are described in section (b) below.

(3) *Information on "labor supply in various skills."*—Our information on labor demand, as expressed in employment statistics and staffing patterns, has traditionally outpaced our knowledge of labor supply. However, policy and program decisions by business and Government administrators require equally comprehensive information on the extent and characteristics of available workers. It is the considered view of the committee that information on the working-age population, and their actual and potential skills and training needs, should be developed on an area, State, and regional basis. A profile of the labor supply—actual and potential—is a necessary element of consideration in decisions on location or expansion of industry facilities. On the broader basis, information on the available labor supply should give direction and emphasis to manpower and industrial development policies.

A profile of area labor supply should also enable the promotion of employment opportunities appropriate to the skills of disadvantaged workers, and of programs for upgrading their skills and providing for job advancement.

(4) *Information on "occupational outlook and employment trends in various occupations."*—Occupational outlook information has many important uses in guidance and counseling, as a basis for career decisions by individuals and for planning of facilities and programs to meet occupational needs. In order to achieve maximum effectiveness, the present occupational outlook activity must be extended and strengthened and utilized in the broadest framework of labor market services. The committee strongly endorses

the integration of a strengthened occupational outlook service into a comprehensive labor market information service.

(5) *Information, "in cooperation and consultation with the Secretary of commerce [on] economic and business development and location trends."*—Differential growth and locational shifts in economic activity have resulted in underutilization of human and economic resources. Better labor market information is needed (a) by businessmen, to enable them to meet efficiently the manpower needs of relocation or expansion, (b) by public authorities, to estimate and plan policy and program needs and develop remedial programs, and (c) by workers to rationalize their job search and extend their awareness of job opportunities.

The committee feels that the information developed by the Department of Commerce on business trends and economic developments, and by the Department of Labor on labor supply and skill characteristics must be fused to carry out effectively economic and manpower policies.

The legislation outlines the framework for a comprehensive labor market information system. The committee offers the following elaboration to underscore some key elements needed to assure maximum usefulness of that system in meeting challenges posed by growth and change.

Timeliness of data.—The usefulness of labor market information is greatly impaired by delay in availability. No effort should be spared to obtain speedy publication of labor market data. We also strongly recommend the acceleration of processing and publication of administrative data, such as those developed from social security records, and labor market data collected in the census of population.

Dissemination.—Information which is not made available to potential users, or not presented in a form which can be readily understood, analyzed, or interpreted, defeats the purpose of its collection. The committee feels that a strong and continuing effort should be made to disseminate labor market information widely and to present it in forms which are most useful to potential consumers.

Utilization and implementation of information.—The committee considers that this legislation implicitly provides for establishment of such arrangements as may be needed to mesh the development of labor market information with policy and program needs, and the use of research findings for recommending changes and innovations in programs and policies. The labor market information system should also provide the basis for feedback on the effectiveness of policies and programs and innovative measures to capitalize on the results of research.

Local data.—The committee strongly recommends the desegregation of labor market and related data to meet area, State and regional needs. The heterogeneity of labor markets and the varieties of economic structures and situations in the United States limit the usefulness of national data by specific geographic entities below the national level. Such data are needed for local planning (for example, of training facilities and systems) for remedial programs supported by the State or National Government for those localities not sharing in the general progress and for the orientation of varieties of manpower, welfare and other services.

Uses and users of labor market information.—The committee has noted the importance of effective dissemination and utilization of labor market information. In this connection, special attempts should be made to identify current and potential users and to present the information in ways to achieve greater effectiveness. This will require attention to the needs of (1) individual participants (workers and employers);

(2) placement services; (3) training and educational institutions; and (4) policy and planning bodies.

Job opportunities information and job matching program

We have been impressed by the overwhelming consensus declaring the need for regular and timely statistical information on the number, location, and type of job opportunities. The lack of such data, it has been repeatedly noted, is one of the most conspicuous gaps in our knowledge of job market conditions, and the void in information on this vital aspect of employment dynamics contrasts sharply with most other developed nations, where data on unfilled vacancies are collected and published regularly.

The basic uses for such data are clear: Operationally, in a variety of ways, to direct emphasis on placement, guidance, and training programs having the general objective of matching workers with jobs; analytically, as guide to development of economic policy, to show the locus and extent of inflationary pressures on the job market, and to serve as a basis for detecting actual or incipient labor shortages, to provide information to workers, employers, and public bodies on the comparative job situation in different areas and types of jobs, and to shed light on the dynamics of employment not now apparent from the net and average statistics on employment and labor force status.

As a result of a number of experimental and pilot studies conducted over the past few years by the Department of Labor and other organizations, we are convinced that technical problems have been largely overcome and that it is feasible to collect reasonably accurate and useful job opportunities information on a regular and extensive basis. We are convinced in this connection that more information rather than less will help to resolve questions involving the operation of the job market which have important implications for economic and manpower policy.

The committee bill provides for the establishment by the Department of Labor of a nationwide job opportunity statistics program which will provide periodic and timely information on the locus, extent and type of job vacancies; and a program of research and analysis by the Department and through grants and contracts of such uses of the data grants and contracts of such uses of the data shall further the objectives of the MDTA. This job vacancy information is, in particular, to be made available to job placement and related agencies for use in a job matching program.

In this regard, the committee bill provides for the establishment of job matching programs, designed to match the qualifications of unemployed, underemployed, and low-income persons with job vacancies on a National, State, or local basis. The committee feels that a high priority must be assigned to attempting to bridge the gap between available persons and available jobs, and that more expensive and sophisticated job training and development efforts should be a sequel to that primary effort.

The matching of workers with jobs has become increasingly complex even as the importance of this function has grown. A number of developments in technology and technique have demonstrated potentials for large-scale expansion and elaboration of referral, placement, and other manpower services with improvement of efficiencies in speed, effectiveness, and cost.

In order to enhance the employability of workers by reference of their job needs and skills with the greatest number of job opportunities, to reduce the threat of labor shortages and consequent inflationary pressures by the widest exposure of employer needs among available workers, and generally to improve the functioning of the job market, the provision of manpower services

and the availability and utility of current and comprehensive job market information, it is necessary that the application of modern techniques and facilities be accelerated and expanded. In furthering this objective, legislative mandate has been given the Secretary, which in essence directs him to explore and develop the potential advantages from use of electronic data processing and telecommunications systems for storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information, and to exploit these advantages where demonstrated to the maximum extent feasible through expanded use of such devices and systems.

C. Training and related technical assistance

Despite the rapid expansion of manpower programs, surprisingly little has been done to develop or train capable staffs at any level of government.

The committee bill provides for a 2-percent set-aside of funds appropriated each year under titles I, II and III of the act, for the purpose of providing training and technical assistance for the personnel who are needed in the planning, administration, and execution of complex manpower programs. It provides legislative authority for the continuation and expansion of current Department of Labor efforts to develop the full capability of its own staff, other staff of programs for which the Department of Labor has responsibility, as well as other persons working in the expanding and changing manpower field.

The specific training an individual received would be related to his particular training needs and job responsibilities and would have the overall objective of improving his technical performance and functioning within the manpower program. Various appropriate patterns and methods of training could be used. Among other approaches could be the establishment of a National Manpower Institute such as that recommended by the National Manpower Advisory Committee, if it were determined that such an Institute would be a feasible instrument for implementing the purpose of the amendment.

Similarly, various patterns and methods of technical assistance in the planning initiation and operation of manpower programs could be provided through the special assignment of personnel to public or private agencies, institutions, or employers. The particular kind of assistance would depend on the specific needs of the program to be aided and could include guidance in the development of the training techniques and management skills necessary to the efficiency of manpower programs at all levels of operation.

D. Inclusion of American Samoa and the Trust Territories

The committee bill extends the MDTA program to American Samoa and to the Trust Territories. Because of the fiscal limitation on the Government of the Trust Territories, the matching provisions of section 301 of the act are waived in their case. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish the amount of training allowances in both these added areas, as he now may with respect to Guam and the Virgin Islands, because of the inapplicability of the training allowance formula attached as it is in the several States to unemployment compensation levels.

E. Consideration of OJT applications

The committee bill amends section 204(a) to state the intention of this committee that all applications for on-the-job training shall receive consideration by the Secretary of Labor. The Department of Labor has indicated no objection to this amendment. The Department has, however, discouraged applications for OJT when there were no unobligated moneys with which to fund new projects, and the committee anticipates that this administrative practice could continue

to be followed to avoid unnecessary paperwork for the applicant and for the Department of Labor.

F. Limitation on Secretary's reapportionment of funds

The authority for reapportionment of title II funds has been changed to provide that upon 15 days' notice to a State, there may be a reapportionment of funds after the ninth month of a fiscal year. The committee heard testimony that the previous policy of reapportionment after 6 months did not give some States an adequate opportunity to obligate their State allotments. Most of this reapportionment came about in connection with the sudden establishment of the JOBS program, which was achieved in major part by the use of already allocated OJT funds. The committee feels that the withdrawing from the States of promised OJT funds well after the fiscal year had begun was most improper, and believes that the JOBS program, which as we already said was mounted in a most hurried fashion, could have been implemented in a manner which took better account of the commitments of the Department and the justified expectations of the State agencies and the private employers whose OJT contracts were fully developed but never concluded because of the reallocations. As the Department should know, nothing is more apt to discourage private employers who would like to become involved in Federal programs than this kind of changing of the rules in midstream.

G. State administration of MDTA funds

The committee bill provides that, within certain criteria, a State agency may approve project applications which conform to a State plan approved at the Federal level. The purpose of this amendment is to respond to the information before this committee that there have been some delays in funding training projects, which resulted in unfortunate and sometime costly loss of instructors and facilities, plus delay in enrolling trainees.

It is anticipated that with this new authority a State agency may achieve more continuity of programing institutional training. Therefore, to give a State agency an opportunity to deal with genuine time pressures, it is authorized to approve projects in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of the title II funds apportioned to such State. The projects approved by a State agency shall conform to criteria established at the Federal level for institutional training. A State agency should avoid approving a project which has a high cost due to purchase of equipment, minor remodeling of a facility and the like, but shall forward such projects to the Federal representatives for review and approval.

In the light of this increase in program responsibility for State agencies made in the committee bill, the committee feels that the Department of Labor should be most restrained in otherwise cutting back on State responsibilities under the MDTA program. It has come to our attention that the Department has decided to terminate all promotional and development work by State agencies with regard to OJT contracts. In part this decision was made in order to carry out on a State basis the reorganization made in the Federal Government ending the connection between apprenticeship programs and OJT programs, and the committee supports that reorganization. In addition, it was thought that the scaling down of OJT funds, in the light of the establishment of the JOBS and NAB programs, justified the termination of this State activity in that less such contract promotional and development work would be needed. But at the same time, the committee understands that the Department is seeking to add several hundred employees to the Manpower Administration, some of whom will be field personnel who will be charged with, among other things, the pro-

motion and development of these OJT contracts.

The committee feels that the Manpower Administration, and especially the Bureau of Work and Training Programs, is already carrying a very heavy work load in the face of substantial personnel shortages. Hence, the committee expects that where a State agency previously charged with OJT contract development and promotional work has performed in a satisfactory manner and is no longer charged also with supervision of apprenticeship programs, the Department should continue to permit that State agency to perform OJT contract promotion and development functions. That kind of State agency role is contemplated in the new section 301(b), which would allow the State agency to develop and implement such contracts, where consistent with State CAMPS or other plan approved by the Secretary, without project by project approval by the Department of Labor.

H. Study of seasonality of employment in the construction industry

The committee bill establishes a Federal Construction Advisory Council which will study in depth the problem of seasonality of employment in the construction industry and make recommendations to the President by August 1, 1969, and to Congress by October 1, 1969, on ways to achieve the stabilization of employment in that industry.

The construction industry, which represents one-fifth of total unemployment, is particularly susceptible to seasonal unemployment. For a large group of workers, this means the economic hardship of uncertain, fluctuating annual incomes. For the industry, it means needless extra costs. For the Nation, it means unnecessary waste of manpower resources.

Seasonal variations in employment in construction are historically a matter of adjustment to the rigors of winter and the inconvenience of precipitation in other seasons—but they are more than this. They represent the residue of habitual practices common to the industry in days before modern methods of coping with problems of weather were developed. They also reflect a lag in the application of known methods by many of the industry's small firms (which comprise the vast bulk of the industry). Finally, they mirror the failure to resolve technical problems resulting from the small-scale research and development activities of the industry.

The Council will consider these and other issues in the course of its investigation into this critical employment problem. It will also consider ways by which Federal departments and agencies responsible for expenditures of construction funds can contribute to the reduction of seasonal unemployment through improved planning and scheduling of construction, better contract procedures and allocation cycles, and other appropriate actions. The committee believes that the findings and recommendations resulting from such an extensive investigation will be a significant forward step toward the solution of one of the Nation's most pressing employment problems.

Minimum MDTA apportionment

The committee bill includes a provision that no State shall be apportioned less than \$750,000. Under the existing allocation formula some small States have not received sufficient money to mount even a minimum MDTA training program. This floor on apportionments should insure that each State can participate in the program to a significant extent.

The committee is aware that the executive branch has under active consideration action on this subject, which would utilize powers presently available to the President, including especially those relating to construction contracts, to help overcome the adverse employment effects of seasonality in the con-

struction industry. The committee would hope that enactment of this amendment would not defer early action by the President. The committee's view, the broad study which the amendment authorizes, would complement and supplement any executive action looking toward solution of this problem.

[Senate, Oct. 7, 1968]

EXTENSION OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1425, S. 2938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2938) to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the basic purpose of S. 2938, as reported by the committee, is to extend the successful and popular Manpower Development and Training Act for 3 years. The committee has added minor and, I believe, noncontroversial amendments that will contribute to the effective operation of the program.

In the 6 years since its initial passage, the MDTA has proved to be a broadgaged and versatile instrument for meeting the ever-changing challenges inherent in any program designed to develop and utilize to the fullest extent possible the Nation's human resources. Amendments to the basic act in 1963, 1965, and 1966 have contributed substantially to the effectiveness of the manpower program by making it less rigid in its administration, and permitting a good balance between institutional and on-the-job training—OJT.

Just as the Employment Act of 1946 committed the Nation to seek full employment by influencing the demand for labor, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 launched an active manpower policy which would seek to affect the supply of labor. A concern for manpower requirements at all levels, the effects of technological change on job content and displacement, manpower shortages and surpluses, upgrading the employed and employing the unemployed were all involved in the passage of the act. Investment in human capital through programs like MDTA has now been recognized as a vital factor in economic growth and as a primary weapon against poverty.

Since passage of the act in 1962 more than 1.2 million training opportunities have been authorized. Of these, nearly 740,000 have been for institutional training, over 455,000 for on-the-job training and 60,000 for part-time and other training.

Seventy-six percent of those completing institutional training and 89 percent of those completing OJT were employed when last contacted. Of these placements, 78 percent of the trainees from institutional programs and 93 percent from OJT were employed in training-related jobs.

As MDTA programs have been developed, there have been major shifts to meet new or previously unnoticed demands. An increasing emphasis has been placed on training disadvantaged persons. By the third quarter of 1968, 61 percent of those trained were classified as disadvantaged.

But this is just one of MDTA's objectives. As the combined result of original intent and subsequent experience, MDTA has come to have six main purposes: First, facilitating employment of the unemployed; second, reducing poverty; third, lessening inflationary pressures; fourth, meeting labor shortages; fifth, upgrading the labor force; and, sixth, revamping traditional institutions.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty held 12 days of testimony on S. 2938 and related

bills and heard from 54 witnesses including most of the Nation's leading manpower experts and many representatives from private industry. The committee is convinced after hearing this testimony that MDTA is making good progress toward meeting its objectives.

The committee wishes to emphasize the urgent need for these extensions at the earliest possible date. Uncertainty about the continued flow of funds has already led to a phasing down of some manpower programs and will lead to difficulty in recruiting teachers. States are now in the process of developing their plans under the cooperative area manpower planning system and need assurance of suitable program and funding authority.

But, even more important, the present termination dates under title II of the act have already begun to affect the job opportunities in the business sector—JOBS—program for involving private industry in a major effort to train disadvantaged persons. This program has received 165,000 jobs pledges from businessmen or 65 percent over their objective of 100,000 pledges. Under this program employers are reimbursed by the Government for the extra costs of necessary training and supportive services at levels substantially in excess of those provided under other on-the-job training projects.

While it is too early to gage the success of this JOBS program, I am advised that in most cases cooperating private employers expect a full 2 years will be required to properly complete the training of these hard-core unemployed individuals. Consequently, to offer these private employers contracts for 6 to 8 months less than they consider necessary might be seriously damaging this JOBS program. Mr. President, I believe the private employers and the National Alliance for Businessmen led by Henry Ford who entered into this program in good faith should not have their efforts impeded by the uncertainty that stems from the lack for a Federal authorization bill.

Mr. President, this extension bill is a limited bill and does not attempt a basic overhaul of our numerous manpower programs. In its report the committee stressed that it is particularly concerned by testimony which demonstrated the vast array of Federal manpower programs do not result in any comprehensive manpower policy. Instead, individual acts were written, considered, and amended in rapid succession to meet current crises, real or imagined, with little attention to their interrelations. At the local level there is no single agency or combination of easily accessible institutions where those seeking help can find it. Administrators have been too impatient to await the results of new and existing programs and, consequently, have not allowed time for restructuring them. As a result there has been a tendency to devise instant gimmicks to solve the problems and a distressing proliferation of competing programs and agencies.

The committee hopes it will receive in the next Congress a proposal for a comprehensive manpower act to overcome the problems cited above. The bill should authorize manpower services structured along functional rather than program lines so as to lend themselves to tailoring according to community and individual need. We need to integrate the numerous categorical manpower programs now in legislation and provide more flexibility to meet local needs.

Since MDTA research often receives so little attention, let me highlight and praise some of its extraordinary achievements. MDTA research indicated the need for more realistic training allowance and for basic education as a prerequisite for skill training for disadvantaged workers. A research project showed the effectiveness of prerelease training in reducing the appalling cycle of recidivism in our prisons. MDTA research also highlighted

the plight of selective service rejectees and found ways of opening apprenticeships to minority youth. Yet on research to identify and solve manpower problems we spend less than \$4 million—only one-half of 1 percent of the MDTA budget. The Senate would have difficulty identifying a higher return on investment within the entire Federal budget. The time has come to put more money in research.

Mr. President, I would like to mention some of the amendments the committee has added. Despite the rapid expansion of manpower programs, surprisingly little has been done to develop or train capable staff at any level of public service. The committee bill provides for a 2-percent set-aside of funds appropriated each year for the purpose of providing training and technical assistance for the personnel who are needed in the planning, administration, and execution of complex manpower programs.

In considering urgent issues affecting the Nation's manpower, the committee has been disturbed by the lack of specific information on a wide variety of manpower problems and by the failure of labor market information to keep pace with growing needs for data to guide legislation and shape public policy. The lack of adequate information also constitutes a serious handicap to sound decisions in the job market by workers, employers, and public authorities.

The committee was impressed by the overwhelming consensus declaring the need for regular and timely statistical information on the number, location, and type of job opportunities. The lack of such data, it has been repeatedly noted, is one of the most conspicuous gaps in our knowledge of job market conditions, and the void in information on this vital aspect of employment dynamics contrasts sharply with most other developed nations, where data on unfilled vacancies are collected and published regularly.

Consequently, the committee recommends appropriations to develop a labor market information and job matching program.

The committee bill also authorizes an in-depth study of the tremendous problems of seasonality of employment in the construction industry and make recommendations to the President and to Congress on ways to achieve the stabilization of employment in that industry.

The construction industry, which represents one-fifth of total unemployment, is particularly susceptible to seasonal unemployment. For a large group of workers, this means the economic hardship of uncertain, fluctuating annual incomes. For the industry, it means needless extra costs. For the Nation, it means unnecessary waste of manpower resources.

Mr. President, since we are nearing the end of the session we are faced with the unusual situation where there is not sufficient time for a conference with the other body. Consequently, I am proposing, for Senator Clark, a bloc of amendments to the committee bill that will, I hope, make the Senate bill acceptable to the other body. I shall ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed.

The major change in the committee bill is the revision in the study of the seasonal unemployment in the construction industry to make it a joint study by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce. The revision also excludes from the study Federal procurement practices that will be covered by a forthcoming Executive order.

Mr. President, the members of the committee agreed reluctantly to make these changes in the committee bill and to refrain from offering other amendments in order to get an acceptable MDTA bill this session. Senator Clark, for example, would have preferred to offer a large-scale public and private job creation amendment that would meet the major domestic problems of our

time—the lack of employment opportunities for about 5 million disadvantaged Americans who live in our city slums and rural communities.

I know that my Republican committee colleagues also had important amendments which they wanted to offer.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of S. 2938. Its basic provisions are substantially the same as those in S. 2695, which was cosponsored by the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty when I introduced it last fall.

Our hearings reveal that changes necessary to improve the administration of MDTA and the results it is designed to achieve can be divided into two categories. The first of these involves areas where legislative action is necessary. The second involves problems revealed by our hearings which can be rectified by changes or modifications in administrative policies by the Department of Labor but where no legislative action is contemplated at the present time.

I proposed several amendments which were adopted by our Committee which would reassert the rights of States in their relationship with the Federal Government's administration of MDTA programs and which would at least diminish their impact of inadequate funding procedures for small States and States with large rural populations.

Mr. President, I shall now discuss amendments of mine contained in the pending bill which were adopted by our full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I do this for the dual purpose of explaining them to my colleagues and creating legislative history. I shall then make some general comment concerning the restrictions placed upon the Senate's consideration of this proposed legislation.

Four of my amendments constitute a package, which complement each other and which are, together, designed to rectify abuses of administrative discretion by the Department of Labor and to improve the efficiency of the Federal-State relationship in implementing training programs under MDTA.

One of these amendments requires the Federal Government to accept and consider all applications for on-the-job training programs. During the last 2 years, the Department of Labor has at various times instructed its representatives in Vermont and other States that they could not accept OJT training applications, even though the particular State's allocation of funds had not been obligated. I can reach no conclusion other than that the purpose of these instructions was to insure that money would be available for transfer into a national pool to fund programs in our largest urban areas when such action became possible under the law. I realize the funds are urgently needed for programs in our largest cities, but this practice for obtaining additional moneys for this purpose is clearly contrary to the intent of Congress and obviously discriminates primarily against smaller States and States with large rural populations.

Although the action required by this amendment could be instituted by an administrative policy decision, Labor Department officials refused to give me a commitment that such change would be made and, in fact, indicated that it probably would not be made unless my amendment was adopted. Our committee report states:

"The Department . . . has discouraged applications for OJT when there were no unobligated moneys with which to fund new projects, and the Committee anticipates that this administrative practice could continue to be followed to avoid unnecessary paper work for the applicant and for the Department of Labor."

It is easily discernible, however, that there is a tremendous difference between discouraging applications where there are no

unobligated moneys and refusing to accept applications under any circumstances. As the Secretary does have a certain amount of funds reserved for his discretionary use, and as he will continue to create a national pool of unobligated title II money, there are very few situations where he should exercise the arbitrary authority of refusing to accept and consider an application.

This amendment in no way infringes upon the Secretary's discretion to approve or reject OJT applications. It will result in making a record of applications to operate such programs, however, thus presenting some criteria for Congress to use in determining whether small States and rural areas have been arbitrarily discriminated against.

The second amendment in this group prohibits the Secretary of Labor from reapportioning MDTA funds allocated to a State until after the ninth month of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated, and requires that a State be given 15 days' notice of funds to be reallocated during the fourth quarter of a fiscal year.

The primary purpose of this provision is to provide the States with an adequate opportunity to obligate their State allotments and to prevent the Department of Labor from excessive haste in arbitrarily transferring these funds to other commitments.

This has, unfortunately, been done under the present law which permits reapportionment, after 6 months, with 30 days' notice during the third quarter of the fiscal year and no notice during the fourth quarter.

An identical amendment was offered in the other body by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] and is contained in the MDTA bill passed by the House.

The third amendment in this package provides that no State shall be allocated less than \$750,000 for MDTA training programs, regardless of the amount of money which would otherwise be apportioned under the formula contained in section 301 of MDTA.

I initially proposed a floor of \$1 million for each State when this matter was considered by our committee, but agreed to the lesser amount in the interests of obtaining committee unanimity. It should be noted, however, that representatives of the Department of Labor advised our committee staff that the \$1 million floor would not cause any substantial problems or significant reductions in funds to other States.

As stated in the committee report, many small and rural States have received insufficient funds to mount effective MDTA training programs throughout their States, and the floor provided by this amendment is intended to guarantee that every State can participate to a significant extent in these programs.

My final amendment relating to the Federal-State relationship under MDTA provides that a State may approve funds for particular projects without subsequent Federal approval with respect to 20 percent of the money allocated to a State under section 301 of MDTA. In addition, it provides that funding applications for specific projects from the remaining 80 percent of a State's allocation shall be automatically approved unless disapproved by the Federal Government within 30 days of their receipt.

The present practice is for a State CAMPS organization to submit a general plan at the beginning of each fiscal year showing how it intends to spend MDTA funds in relation to OJT and institutional training job slots. Once this general CAMPS plan is approved, it is then necessary for the State CAMPS to submit each proposed training program for specific project and funding approval.

One of the major complaints concerning institutional training is that a group of prospective trainees qualified for a particular course will be available but that, because of inordinate delays in obtaining Federal ap-

proval once the specific program is submitted for funding, these qualified trainees either take other jobs, move away or otherwise become unavailable. It then becomes necessary to select and recruit new trainees for this particular program when Federal approval is obtained.

In addition, our committee hearings show that these delays have at times resulted in the loss of facilities and experienced instructors.

It is my belief that this provision will expedite the approval and implementation of sound training programs. Certain fears have been expressed to me to the effect that the Department of Labor can circumvent the intent of this amendment by engaging in the practice of almost automatically disapproving funding applications nearing the 30 days' deadline and requiring their resubmission in order to continue giving the Federal Board of Review as much time to analyze these proposals as they have taken in the past. I do not think this will occur. I expect the Department of Labor to make every effort to process funding applications under this section in complete good faith and to refrain from disapproving an application unless there is some serious or substantial defect in the program under consideration.

Other reasons for this amendment and guidelines for its administration appear in the committee report. As I agree with them, I shall not repeat them here.

Mr. President, I emphasize the fact that in the form of these four amendments in the bill before the Senate represents modifications of my original proposals and that, as adopted by our committee, they were approved by representatives of the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, another amendment of mine adopted by the committee involves comparability of MDTA training allowances.

This amendment amends section 203 of MDTA to provide that the training allowance for all youths shall be at the same rate, eliminating the differences in existing law between the training allowances for various young people.

The purpose is to equalize payment of training allowances to all MDTA trainees 17 and over so that they will receive the same allowances as other MDTA trainees. The present law does not permit certain young trainees to receive more than \$20 per week training allowance.

This compares to MDTA training allowances ranging from approximately \$30 to \$60 per week for other MDTA trainees, depending upon the State in which they live.

I offered this amendment to the poverty bill last year, and it was contained in the poverty legislation which passed the Senate. The House conferees favored it on the merits, but raised the point of order that it should be attached to MDTA rather than poverty legislation. It was deleted from the poverty bill agreed upon by the conference committee, and I have now incorporated it in an appropriate MDTA bill.

Mr. President, the enactment of this proposal into law is long overdue, although the Department of Labor is strongly opposed to it.

In these days when we hear so much concerning the poverty level of income and proposals for guaranteed annual incomes, one would not suppose there to be much Government support for maintaining weekly incomes at or below \$20. Yet the initial reaction of representatives of the Department of Labor at our committee's adoption of this amendment was one of dissatisfaction, based on their consideration of statistics rather than the well-being of individuals. The reason—if required to pay these trainees a more adequate subsistence allowance, the Department of Labor's record would not be able to reflect such a large number of trainees.

Mr. President, my last amendment which was adopted by our Committee establishes a Federal Construction Advisory Council to study, investigate, and conduct research on seasonality of employment in the construction industry. Under my amendment, the Council would be required to submit a report to the President and the Congress containing findings and recommendations concerning means to achieve stabilization of employment and diminishment of seasonality of employment in the construction industry, with special attention to its implications for national manpower policy.

I am pleased to report, Mr. President, that when I offered this amendment, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished chairman of our Labor Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JAVITS, DOMINICK, MURPHY, and FANNIN requested that their names be added as cosponsors.

Under the language in the reported bill, this Council would be composed of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation. The Secretary of Labor shall be the Chairman and the membership of the Council shall include the Administrator of GSA, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and representatives of labor and management in the construction industry and representatives of the architectural and engineering professions to be appointed by the President.

A bill calling for a similar study—H.R. 15990—was introduced in the other body by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], and favorably reported to the House on August 2. Under the O'Hara bill, the study of seasonality in the construction industry would be conducted by the Secretary of Labor. In addition, it was far less specific as to the matters which should be conducted during the course of the study.

Our staffs have worked out a compromise which I believe is satisfactory and which should be accepted by both the House and the Senate. This compromise provision is set forth in one of the amendments which the floor manager, the Senator from Minnesota, has just offered to the bill reported by our committee. Under it, this study will be conducted jointly by the Secretaries of Labor and Commerce and a report will be submitted to the Congress as well as to the President.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, when this legislation was considered in the House, I offered two amendments that were accepted by the managers of the bill and passed unanimously. Those amendments provided two things:

First. A reinforcement of our intent that the Secretary of Labor shall wherever possible administer the manpower training programs through State agencies equipped to do the job. It is our intent that the Secretary negotiate agreements with the States assigning State agencies the responsibility for promotion, development, funding, monitoring, and other services associated with implementation and utilization of funds apportioned to the States in accordance with section 301 of the act;

Second. That funds apportioned to the State agencies through agreements under section 206 shall remain available to the State agencies providing Congress appropriates not less than \$48 million for the JOBS program and not less than \$31.8 million for the CEP program.

I am withholding these amendments in this body on the assurance that an intensified effort will be made to carry out the intent of the amendments in the House of Representatives. I believe the record is clear in both the House debate and in the Senate that we want these objectives achieved, and

the Secretary of Labor is on notice to do all that he can to bring them about. If he does not, Congress will be forced to act more specifically in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as do other Senators, I think the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is chairman of the Committee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty has given gifted and important attention to the work which we hope will result in the passage of the bill today.

I and others have withheld amendments which we felt were important to the bill because we thought in the interest of the broad objective of manpower training and of dealing with the hardcore lack of employment and manpower in the slums, it was even more important to get the law extended. We stayed our hands, as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has done.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. This is actually the Senator from California's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 12. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IV—SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to provide a method whereby a State may utilize Federal matching funds, together with its own funds for the purposes of supplementing, coordinating and improving the effectiveness of, or correcting imbalances among, the services available from all Federal manpower and related programs seeking to improve the ability of disadvantaged persons to move into productive employment.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 402. The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to grant to any State which meets the requirements of section 403 an amount, for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the supplemental efforts and activities undertaken by a State pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"APPLICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

"SEC. 403. (a) Any State which desires a grant under this title shall make application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as he deems reasonably necessary.

"(b) No grant may be made under the provisions of this title unless the Secretary finds that—

"(1) after consultation with said State, the effectiveness of Federal manpower and related programs seeking to move disadvantaged persons into productive employment within such State can be facilitated or improved by additional State efforts and activities; and

"(2) such application (A) describes how such additional efforts and activities will be undertaken in support of existing Federal

programs, (B) demonstrates that such efforts and activities are not inconsistent with such State's cooperative area manpower planning system plan, (C) demonstrates that such efforts and activities will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title, and (D) provides assurances that the State will pay the non-Federal share of the cost of such efforts and activities under this title.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 404. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations under this title as he deems necessary.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 405. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is unable to be present in the Chamber today and, therefore, I am submitting this amendment for him and the other cosponsor, the senior Senator from New York.

Under this amendment, a State may receive a matching Federal grant to fund employment and training programs designed to coordinate and improve the effectiveness of Federal manpower programs. It will result in permitting States to make additional efforts in training our hardcore disadvantaged and unskilled citizens for productive and meaningful jobs.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from California has discussed this amendment with the chairman of our committee, and that the Senator from Pennsylvania was prepared to accept this amendment as modified.

Mr. President, I have a prepared statement which the Senator from California had intended to deliver when this amendment was considered by the Senate, explaining why it is needed to give the States greater flexibility in manpower and related areas. I ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with attachments, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

In view of the foregoing, I hope that my friend from Minnesota, the floor manager of this bill, will accept this amendment.

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

"STATEMENT OF SENATOR GEORGE MURPHY, REPUBLICAN, OF CALIFORNIA, IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT ADDING SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PROGRAM TO MDTA

"Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 884, and ask that it be read.

"This amendment adds a new Title IV, Supplementary State Program, to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as amended. The purpose of the amendment is to provide states with needed flexibility and freedom in manpower and related areas so that existing imbalances and gaps in present programs may be filled in order to improve, coordinate, and make more efficient and effective manpower programs.

"Mr. President, manpower experts, Congressional committees and various advisory councils and commissions have pointed out the waste, duplication and inefficiency that exist in the manpower area. There seems to be general agreement on the need for greater coordination and on the realization that there is a need to 'make sense' out of federal manpower policy. Although the need for coordination is recognized by everyone, 'coordination' seems much like the saying regarding the weather: everyone talks about it, but no one does anything about it. Various efforts have been made to coordinate the programs, but with little or no success. In fact, the suggestions on coordination have proliferated almost as much as the programs themselves. The Washington Evening Star, in an editorial last month, states 'The federal

government cries out for a rigorous organizational analysis of existing programs that have grown like toadstools. As anyone who labors in federal vineyards can attest, it is extraordinarily difficult to get anything accomplished because of fouled communications lines and encrusted bureaucracy."

"Mr. President, the problems resulting from the proliferation of programs and the multiplicity of funding are not centered at the federal level. To the contrary, they seem to be multiplied at the local level. Dr. Garth L. Mangum, Co-Director of the Center for Manpower Policy Studies, the George Washington University, described the bewildering situation facing local officials. I quote: 'For instance, funds for outreach can be sought from nine program sources, adult basic education from ten (in addition to general education sources), prevocational and skill training from ten, and work experience from five. On-the-job training can be subsidized from five programs and supportive services can be funded from nine sources. Income maintenance is also available to participants under nine programs. The eligibility rules, application procedures, allocation formulas, expiration dates and contracting arrangements vary as widely as the funding sources.'

"Dr. Sar Levitan, also from the Center of Manpower Policy Studies, describes the effect of this program proliferation and multiplicity of funding on the intended beneficiaries of the programs as follows: 'the fragmentation of federally-supported training programs assumes crucial significance when the impact upon clientele is considered. Largely haphazard circumstances determine now whether a youth is assigned to a job corps, neighborhood youth corps, or a manpower development training course. The rationale program would require establishment of coordinated criteria which would help decide to which program a youth be assigned, how he is to advance from one training program to another, and the compensation he is to receive under each. Similar confusion prevails in the training of adults.'

"Even worse, Mr. President, is the lack of coordination between the training programs and available jobs. The McCone Commission in discussing this aspect states 'Finally, there is an apparent lack of coordination between many of the training programs and the job opportunities. All too often a youth in the south central area goes through training, acquires the necessary skill to fill a job only to find that no job awaits him. The results are disastrous. ("Train for What?" he says to his friends).'

"Mr. President, the State of California has attempted to put together the various manpower programs in a logical, coordinated manner. In California a package of bipartisan measures designed to deal with the problems of the disadvantaged in an imaginative manner has been introduced and passed by the California Legislature and signed into law by Governor Reagan. I want to emphasize the bipartisan nature of this effort. Some have remarked that cooperation by the two political parties in California in this an election year was anything short of a 'miracle'. Personally, I attribute this meeting of the minds to the realization of the importance of the problems confronting California and the Country and a determination by the State Legislature and Executive branches to shape programs to match the dimension of the problems. The State rightly has placed the problems of the people before politics of the parties. The effort is strongly supported by Governor Reagan and Lt. Governor Finch, and it is also strongly endorsed by the Democratic speaker of the California Assembly, Jesse Unruh, as well as the Minority Leader in the Assembly, Robert Monagan.

"One of the bills, Assembly Bill 1463, which was introduced by Speaker Unruh, creates a new State Department of Human Resources

and Development to coordinate the programs aimed at the disadvantaged in the State. The State hopes to provide the hardcore unemployed with "an unbroken sequence of services from intake through placement in a job and periodic follow-up and evaluations" so that we will know exactly what is being done and what progress is being made. The intent of my amendment is to break the barriers of bureaucracy that tie up the getting of needed services to our people. Presently, as I just outlined, we force people into existing programs. California hopes to make the focus the individual and tailor programs to fit the individual for employment rather than force an individual into a program. In other words, California hopes to personalize the programs so they serve the needs of the individuals rather than force the individual to conform to the program. To do this, a new civil servant, a "job agent," would be created and assigned the task of securing the necessary training needed by his disadvantaged unemployed client in order to make him employable. To accomplish this, California needs a little flexibility in the use of highly categorical federal aid funds. The utter ridiculousness of federal restrictions and red tape was illustrated by Mr. Jack Mickie, Director of the East Bay Skill Center in Oakland. Mr. Mickie told our Committee that if federal restrictions and red tape were removed and greater flexibility were given to the center they could train "30 percent more trainees with the same amount of money and do a better job, if they will just let us do it."

"Yet, in attempting to enact these creative State programs, the categorical nature of the federal programs, the restrictions and regulations of federal laws and the lack of cooperation by some federal officials have presented serious obstacles to this creative State effort. It certainly is a blow to healthy federal-state relations and a sorry day indeed when a state government is prevented from embarking on a new course because it is straitjacketed by federal rules and regulations.

"On July 15, in a Senate Floor statement, I outlined in detail the difficulties that California has faced in trying to move ahead with its programs. I am pleased that since then there are indications that the federal government has decided to cooperate more. I hope this cooperative spirit continues.

"Mr. President, we hear a great deal of criticism regarding the states. I realize that all the criticism is not without justification. Yet, I also know that all the brain power in this country is not centralized in Washington. This nation is too vast, its problems so different that instant canned solutions cannot be packaged in Washington to adequately deal with all the problems of each state. So, Mr. President, if we want to see our federal system work, and if we want to have the states assume their rightful and responsible place as envisioned by our forefathers, then we must allow creative states, who are willing to face up to their responsibilities, to do so.

"California has attempted to coordinate its manpower programs. I contend such an effort should be applauded and encouraged. My amendment would give a federal green light to this and other constructive state efforts. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment and thus give California and other states encouragement and Congressional approval to get on with the important business of tackling and solving tough domestic problems facing us as a Nation. I urge the adoption of my amendment. I ask unanimous consent that selected statements and correspondence be printed in full at this point in the Record."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty could not be here today, but he endorses the proposal as one

which will encourage State initiative and help meet local experience and needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. GOODELL, and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

"On page 9, line 22, insert at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 8 Section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by renumbering the existing provisions (a) and by adding new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In making arrangements for institutional training financed in whole or in part with funds appropriated to carry out title I, and title II, parts A, B, C, and D of this Act including but not limited to basic education, employability and communications skills, prevocational training, vocational and technical programs, and supplementary or related instruction for on-the-job training whether conducted at the job site or elsewhere, priority shall be given to the use of skills centers as established under the authority of this section."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all the amendment does is to give priority in respect to expenditures under the Manpower Development and Training Act to skills centers, of which there are about 100 in the United States. These centers seek to bring under one roof the many skills and forms of education which are taught under the manpower development and training program.

It will be noted by Members that the report discusses that question and points out the desirability of utilizing the centers which exist, as well as new centers which may be organized.

This section for the first time defines the definition and role of the skill center. It also expresses the intention of Congress, as included both in the House and Senate committee reports, that the skill center is an institution which is of major importance in meeting the goals of MDTA. At the same time the amendment maintains the flexibility of the bill by avoiding the stipulation of a particular level of skill center operation. Under this amendment, it would be our intention that full use be made of existing skill centers before duplicate facilities be established to perform similar functions.

This concept is most promising for the manpower development and training program. The amendment which I have sent to the desk is one proposed in the other body by Representative STREIGER of Wisconsin and passed unanimously in the other body. We understand that it will be entirely acceptable to be included in the bill.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we have no objection to the amendment. It is a good amendment. It expresses the viewpoint of the committee in support of skill centers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments as amended.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2938) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

(See text of Public Law 90-636, below.)

[House, Oct. 10, 1968]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT
OF 1962

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2938) to extend expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—will the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, explain the provisions of this bill as it passed the Senate as compared to the bill passed by the House?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, who has worked so diligently to see these amendments become law, that this bill, for the most part incorporates two bills that each passed this House unanimously. They are H.R. 15990, on seasonality in the construction trade, and H.R. 15045, extending and amending MDTA. We are all acquainted with the good work of the Manpower Development Training Act on which we are now expending about \$400 million annually. If I recall correctly, there is \$400 million in the appropriation bill and in the conference report that passed this Chamber a few days ago. The money by and large for the programs is allocated to the States and training programs are worked up by the State employment offices and the State education people.

Over the 6 years since we have enacted this program, a half million adults and youths have completed training under this program and thousands more have benefited from it. It is a good program.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the Senate version of this bill omits an amendment I sponsored providing for the annualization of skill centers, which this body passed last month. At that time members on both sides of the aisle expressed their support for the skill center as an institution well-suited to deal with the problems of the hard-core unemployed and their intention that skill center operations should be placed on an annual, rather than a project-by-project, basis. I rise to indicate my willingness that this amendment be dropped. Since the Labor Department has now firmly and irrevocably pledged itself to develop procedures which can and will provide for the funding of all future skill center operations on an annual basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy at this time to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As he points out the amendment offered by the gentleman to the original House bill does not appear in the bill before us today. I thought when the gentleman offered his amendment it was a good one. I supported that amendment and I support the idea behind it.

I might say to the House that the gentleman from Wisconsin has so forcefully presented this matter that he has convinced the Department of Labor that he is right, and they have now indicated, in a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAs], that they will undertake to develop ways and means of operating the program in the manner provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman. They feel they have administrative authority to enable them to do this.

Therefore, the gentleman is quite correct. His amendment will be unnecessary if they will carry through with their intent.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Hon. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary and Manpower Administrator of the U.S. Department of Labor, addressed to Hon. JOHN BRADEMAs, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor of this House.

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

"U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1968.

"Hon. JOHN BRADEMAs,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Labor,
Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAs: I am writing to express the strong interest of the Department of Labor in developing more effective funding procedures for skill centers. We are very much aware that the nature of these centers may necessitate a refinement of funding and administrative procedures to facilitate planning for the entire year by skill center directors and local Employment Service offices.

"To explore this matter further, pilot programs are being undertaken in three established skill centers in varied geographic locations: in Syracuse, New York, annual funding has been approved for fiscal year 1969, in Fort Worth, Texas, and in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, such arrangements are in process and should be completed shortly. Plans for these pilot programs provide for elimination of individual training project funding, for maintenance of a predetermined specified trainee capacity at the center, and for the greatest possible use of the skill center as a link between programs. From the experience gained in these three, quite different, centers, a model for funding as well as trainee flow will be developed and applied to all skill centers to insure their effective operation on a year-round basis.

"We shall be glad to keep you informed of our progress and our findings.

"Sincerely,

"STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG,
Assistant Secretary and
Manpower Administrator."

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I appreciate very much the kind words of the gentleman from Michigan—my amendment sought to overcome by legislation a major administrative obstacle which has hampered the further development of skill centers. Effective utilization of skill centers too often has been seriously curtailed by project-by-project funding. I was pleased to see that the Senate report of the Education and Welfare Committee also pointed out that such funding "results in idle capacity that cannot be shifted rapidly to meet local needs." Planning these programs on the basis of a longer time period is an important benefit to be derived from annualization.

To sum up, it is my understanding that the administrative agreement reached now with the Labor Department provides every possible assurance that the problem of annualization will not arise again.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wish to express my agreement with that statement. I think that is a clear statement of the conversation I had with and the view Chairman BRADEMAs has been given by the Department of Labor.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the Senate is a good bill. I have, with the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan, worked on this bill for a long time. It does basically adopt the position of the House.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Michigan, the manager of the bill providing information in advance about their intent.

I simply want to clarify two points before we accept these Senate amendments to the House-passed legislation.

As I understand it, the meat of the bill, in addition to continuing the present program, is in section 12, which sets up a new program of grants to the States for supplementary comprehensive manpower programs on a matching basis, provided that the State programs can only receive grants where their operation will facilitate the Federal related programs, and that includes the guidelines for the disadvantaged and their rehabilitation, and not be inconsistent with the State's cooperative manpower system.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct. These supplemental programs will be funded on a 75-25 basis.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's confirmation. In line with the information supplied, I understand sections 6 and 7 of the House-passed bill were left out, and are therefore not now under consideration; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. If I may respond to the gentleman from Missouri, that is correct. Those were the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] prior to his being appointed to the Senate. If the gentleman from Missouri would examine page 29912 of the RECORD for October 7, he would find there a discussion by the now Senator from New York [Mr. GOODELL] on this provision.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

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

[Public Law 90-636, 90th Cong. S. 2938,
Oct. 24, 1968]

An act to extend expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 104(a) of the Act (LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS) is amended by striking out "1968" in the first sentence of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(2) Section 105 of the Act (TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS) is amended by striking out "1968" in the first sentence of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(3) Section 251 of the Act (PART D—CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS) is amended by striking out "1969" in the first sentence of such section, and inserting in lieu thereof "1970";

(4) Section 304(d) of the Act is amended by striking out "1968" and "1969", and inserting respectively in lieu thereof "1969" and "1970";

(5) Sections 310(a) and 310(b) of the Act are amended by striking out "1969" wherever it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

SEC. 2. Section 106 of the Manpower De-

velopment and Training Act of 1962 is amended to read as follows:

"LABOR MARKET INFORMATION AND JOB MATCHING PROGRAM

"Sec. 106. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall develop a comprehensive system of labor market information on a national, State, local, or other appropriate basis, including but not limited to information regarding—

"(1) the nature and extent of impediments to the maximum development of individual employment potential including the number and characteristics of all persons requiring manpower services;

"(2) job opportunities and skill requirements;

"(3) labor supply in various skills;

"(4) occupational outlook and employment trends in various occupations; and

"(5) in cooperation and after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, economic and business development and location trends.

Information collected under this subsection shall be developed and made available in a timely fashion in order to meet in a comprehensive manner the needs of public and private users, including the need for such information in recruitment, counseling, education, training, placement, job development, and other appropriate activities under this Act and under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Social Security Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal statutes.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall develop and publish on a regular basis information on available job opportunities throughout the United States on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis for use in public and private job placement and related activities and in connection with job matching programs conducted pursuant to this subsection. The Secretary is directed to develop and establish a program for matching the qualifications of unemployed, underemployed, and low-income persons with employer requirements and job opportunities on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis. Such programs shall be designed to provide a quick and direct means of communication among local requirement, job training and placement agencies and organizations, and between such agencies and organizations on a National, State, local, or other appropriate basis, with a view to the referral and placement of such persons in jobs. In the development of such a program, the Secretary shall make maximum possible use of electronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information.

"(c) A report on the activities and achievements under this section shall be included in the report required under section 107.

"(d) Not less than 2 per centum of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of subsection (b) of this section."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 202(f) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(j)".

(b) The first sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking "(i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(j)".

Sec. 4. Section 203(c) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking out the words "at a rate not in excess of \$20 a week" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate which shall not exceed the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including

allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available".

Sec. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by striking out "and the Virgin Islands" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by inserting after "purposes of the Act" the following: ", and except that the State agency for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be paid up to 100 per centum of such costs".

(c) Section 308 of such Act is amended by striking out "and Guam" and inserting in lieu thereof "Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

Sec. 6. Section 204(a) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Secretary shall not refuse to receive for consideration any application from an applicant who desires to conduct a training program under this part".

Sec. 7. Section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by renumbering the existing provisions (a) and by adding new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) In making arrangements for institutional training financed in whole or in part with funds appropriated to carry out title I, and title II, parts A, B, C, and D of this Act, including but not limited to basic education, employability and communications skills, prevocational training, vocational and technical programs, and supplementary or related instruction for on-the-job training whether conducted at the job site or elsewhere, priority shall be given to the use of skills centers as established under the authority of this section."

Sec. 8. The first sentence of section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding before the period a comma and the following: "but in no event shall any State be apportioned less than \$750,000; except that for the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, such amount shall be \$100,000 each".

Sec. 9. Section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended (1) by striking out "sixth month" in the proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof "ninth month", (2) by striking out "30 days" in such proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof "15 days", and (3) by striking out in such proviso ", except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year".

Sec. 10. Section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is further amended by inserting "(a)", immediately after "Sec. 301." and by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(b) Where the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare have approved a plan submitted by a State council with whom they have an agreement under this Act, which plan may be submitted under a comprehensive area manpower planning system or under such other planning requirements as the Secretaries may specify, such State agency shall have authority to approve (1) project applications for an amount not to exceed 20 per centum of the funds apportioned to such State under the first sentence of section 301(a) without further project approval by the Federal Government; and (2) all other project applications which conform to such State plan, unless either of the Secretaries disapprove such project applications within 30 days following receipt of such applications."

Sec. 11. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by inserting after section 308 the following new section:

"TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 309. (a) In carrying out the responsibilities under this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide, directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, training for specialized or other personnel and technical assistance which is needed in connection with the programs established under this Act or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this Act. Upon request, the Secretary may make special assignments of personnel to public or private agencies, institutions, or employers to carry out the purposes of this section; but no such special assignments shall be for a period of more than two years.

"(b) Two per centum of the sums appropriated in any fiscal year to carry out titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be available only for training and assistance authorized by this section."

Sec. 12. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE IV—SEASONAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

"Sec. 401. (a) The Congress finds that seasonal unemployment represents a substantial portion of the unemployment in the construction industry, and a significant portion of all unemployment, that seasonal unemployment results in economic hardship for construction employees, employers, and for the consumers of construction services; that such unemployment constitutes unnecessary and wasteful misuse of the Nation's manpower resources; that stabilization of construction operations may be expected to have a correspondingly stabilizing effect on construction employment and costs; and that it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the economy as a whole, and manpower policy in particular that positive and expeditious action be taken by public authorities and private groups to regularize construction unemployment.

"(b) It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide for the conduct of a study of seasonality in the construction industry, with special attention to its implications for national manpower policy.

"Sec. 402. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, jointly, shall study, investigate, conduct research, and prepare a report containing their findings and recommendations concerning means to achieve stabilization of employment in the construction industry and the diminishment of seasonality of employment in such industry, with special attention to its implications for national manpower policy, and shall transmit such report to the President and to the Congress no later than December 31, 1969.

"Sec. 403. Matters which the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with other appropriate officials of Federal agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with engineers, with other appropriate officials of Federal agencies, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and with engineers, architects, and representatives of labor and man-

agement in the construction industry, shall consider, shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the extent to which seasonal unemployment in the construction industry can be reduced without substantial increases in construction costs by means such as—

"(a) the application of modern techniques to reduce the influence of weather on construction activity;

"(b) the resolution of technical problems which have not been solved by existing research and development activities;

"(c) possible changes in contract procedures in allocation cycles; and

"(d) improved planning and scheduling of construction projects."

SEC. 13. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE V—SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to provide a method whereby a State may utilize Federal matching funds, together with its own funds for the purposes of supplementing, coordinating and improving the effectiveness of, or correcting imbalances among, the services available from all Federal manpower and related programs seeking to improve the ability of disadvantaged persons to move into productive employment.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 502. The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) is authorized to grant to any State which meets the requirements of section 403 an amount, for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of the supplemental efforts and activities undertaken by a State pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"APPLICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

"SEC. 503. (a) Any State which desires a grant under this title shall make application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as he deems reasonably necessary.

"(b) No grant may be made under the provisions of this title unless the Secretary finds that—

"(1) after consultation with said State, the effectiveness of Federal manpower and related programs seeking to move disadvantaged persons into productive employment within such State can be facilitated or improved by additional State efforts and activities; and

"(2) such application (A) describes how such additional efforts and activities will be undertaken in support of existing Federal programs, (B) demonstrates that such efforts and activities are not inconsistent with such State's cooperative area manpower planning system plan, (C) demonstrates that such efforts and activities will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title, and (D) provides assurances that the State will pay the non-Federal share of the cost of such efforts and activities under this title.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 504. The Secretary may prescribe such rules and regulations under this title as he deems necessary.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 505. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

Approved October 24, 1968.

[House, Mar. 4, 1969]

AMEND SECTION 301 OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 497) to amend

section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin a member of the committee?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the right to object.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, though I have reserved the right to object, and I shall not object, I have done so in order to give the gentleman from New Jersey time to explain this very brief bill.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I shall be pleased to do so.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 497 is essentially a technical amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Last year, an amendment to the law included provisions bringing American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the act on the same basis as Guam and the Virgin Islands. When the Senate took up similar legislation, another amendment to the act was adopted setting a funding floor of \$750,000 for each State, with a provision setting a \$100,000 floor for these four territories.

However, the Senate, in offering this amendment, made a drafting error which had the literal effect of giving the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the same floor as the rest of the States—\$750,000 instead of the \$100,000 that was intended.

It was clearly not the desire of the committee that any one of these areas, some of which are quite sparsely populated, should have funds reserved for it in amounts beyond those which are available for other territories similarly situated.

This bill was reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor unanimously with complete bipartisan approval.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

I might further say that this bill was approved favorably, unanimously, by the House Education and Labor Committee, and it has bipartisan support.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from New Jersey ask that the House consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, so that some of us may have an opportunity to speak on this bill or matters pertaining to job training.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as I explained, this is a very simple bill. I am surprised the gentleman from Iowa is raising any objection, because this is an economy move, which will save \$650,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will read the bill.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Senate, Mar. 7, 1969]

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 301 OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R.

497. This request has been cleared by the joint leadership.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate H.R. 497, to amend section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this measure merely brings about a correction of some technicalities connected with this matter, and that it is non-controversial.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator have inserted in the Record an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the House report, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"REPORT

"BACKGROUND

"On September 5, 1968, the House passed, by unanimous vote, H.R. 15045, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

On October 7, 1968, the Senate passed S. 2938, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was subsequently concurred in by unanimous consent by the House on October 10, 1968. This bill also included American Samoa and the Trust Territory in the definition of "State" for the purposes of the act, with specific exceptions to take into account the peculiar fiscal limitations of the government of the Trust Territory.

"Another amendment included in S. 2938 placed a floor on the money to be made available to each State under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act in the amount of \$750,000. This amendment specifically exempted Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands from this floor, setting instead a floor of \$100,000 for each of these territories. Because the floor-setting amendment failed to list the trust territory with the other areas entitled to \$100,000 minimum annual funding, the language of the act, if read literally would now seem to require that the trust territory be allocated a minimum of \$750,000, while Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands are only assured of \$100,000.

"It was the original intention of the proponents of each of these amendments that the four areas in question should be treated similarly. It was most certainly not the intention of the committee last year that any of these areas, some of which are quite sparsely populated, should have funds reserved in amounts beyond those which are available for other territories similarly situated.

"H.R. 497 received bipartisan support and was unanimously ordered reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is no reason why the bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 now before us, H.R. 497, should not be passed immediately.

This bill is identical to one which I introduced on January 16 on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota, S. 279.

The MDTA legislation which we passed last fall contained an amendment of mine which provided a floor of \$750,000 in MDTA funds for each of the States and a floor of \$100,-

000 for Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. Inadvertently the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands were omitted from this latter group. As a result, there is authority in the legislation passed last October to provide \$750,000 for the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. The bill now before us merely corrects this technical mistake by placing the Trust Territories in the group where they should have been originally with a floor of \$100,000.

H.R. 497, therefore, merely carries out what we intended to do last year. In these circumstances, there is no necessity for it to be referred to or considered by our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I urge its immediate passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 497) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

[Public Law 91-4, 91st Cong., H.R. 497, Mar. 19, 1969]

An act to amend section 301 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is further amended, by striking from the first sentence of section 301 of said Act the words, "the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa", and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first

section shall be effective as of October 24, 1968.

Approved March 19, 1969.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT EXTENSION

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 11570) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 by postponing the expiration of title II thereof for 1 year, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The full committee ordered H.R. 11570 reported on November 30, 1971, by voice vote with no opposition.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 by postponing the expiration of title II for 1 year.

MDTA expires in June 1972 and new authorizing legislation is needed so the Appropriations Committee can consider the request for fiscal year 1973's funding as part of its regular proceeding on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill. Without new authorization, Congress will not be able to handle requests for funding for the MDTA institutional or on-the-job training programs. These programs, including the jobs program, are currently funded at about \$750 million, and as of September 1971 had almost 150,000 enrollees.

Unless we enact new authorizing legislation immediately, such successful programs as opportunities industrialization centers, skills centers, and institutional and on-the-job training programs will have to be funded by continuing resolution. Under a continu-

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MDTA

TABLE F4.—ENROLLMENTS, COMPLETIONS, AND POSTTRAINING EMPLOYMENT FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS UNDER THE MDTA, FISCAL YEARS 1963-70
[In thousands]

| Item | Total | Fiscal years— | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| | | 1970 | 1969 | 1968 | 1967 | 1966 | 1965 | 1964 | 1963 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| Enrollments..... | 1,451.4 | 221.0 | 220.0 | 241.0 | 265.0 | 235.8 | 156.9 | 77.6 | 34.1 |
| Completions..... | 987.2 | 147.0 | 160.0 | 164.2 | 192.6 | 155.7 | 96.3 | 51.3 | 20.1 |
| Posttraining employment..... | 773.4 | 115.3 | 124.0 | 127.5 | 153.7 | 124.0 | 73.4 | 39.4 | 16.1 |
| INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING | | | | | | | | | |
| Enrollments..... | 978.4 | 130.0 | 135.0 | 140.0 | 150.0 | 177.5 | 145.3 | 68.6 | 32.0 |
| Completions..... | 654.7 | 85.0 | 95.0 | 91.0 | 109.0 | 117.7 | 88.8 | 46.0 | 19.2 |
| Posttraining employment..... | 484.3 | 62.0 | 71.0 | 64.5 | 90.0 | 89.8 | 66.9 | 31.8 | 15.3 |
| ON-THE-JOB TRAINING | | | | | | | | | |
| Enrollments..... | 473.0 | 91.0 | 85.0 | 101.0 | 115.0 | 58.3 | 11.6 | 9.0 | 2.1 |
| Completions..... | 335.5 | 6.20 | 65.0 | 73.2 | 83.6 | 38.0 | 7.5 | 5.3 | .9 |
| Posttraining employment..... | 289.1 | 53.3 | 53.0 | 63.0 | 73.7 | 34.2 | 6.5 | 4.6 | .8 |

Program became operational August 1962.

Note: Completions do not include dropouts. Posttraining employment includes persons employed at the time of the last followup. (There are 2 followups, with the 2d occurring 6 months after completion of training.)

Manpower legislation which has been amended eight times in the last 10 years can use a new legislative charter. In order to do this the Select Subcommittee on Labor has already held 10 days of hearings. Many witnesses have yet to be heard, and it would be unrealistic to think that Congress could effect a proper transition from MDTA to a new comprehensive manpower program without the required 1-year extension. We must extend the Manpower Development and Training Act, and then we can give the comprehensive manpower legislation the consideration it deserves. The extension of MDTA is not intended to diminish the need for prompt consideration and development of comprehensive manpower legislation by the committee. This extension is merely an interim action to allow the committee sufficient time in which to conduct adequate hearings and to attempt to develop legislation responsive to the Nation's manpower needs.

ESTIMATE OF COSTS

In accordance with clause 7 of rule 13, the committee estimates based upon current program levels under existing authorizations that \$695 million would be incurred

in carrying out H.R. 11570 in fiscal year 1973. There would be no cost in later years as the bill is simply a 1-year extension of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The bill amends the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to extend for 1 year the authority to carry on programs under title II thereof. The existing authority will expire at the end of this fiscal year.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 310 OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 310. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this act shall terminate at the close of June 30, [1972] 1973.

ing resolution, manpower programs may be funded at current levels or the budget figure, whichever is less. Congress would not have flexibility to respond to changing economic conditions.

There is another and just as pressing need to act on MDTA extension quickly. Section 310(b) of the act provides that no funds can be disbursed after December 30, 1972. The practical effect of this provision is that no training agreement extending beyond next December can be signed, and the whole program will grind to a halt because realistic commitments cannot be made. This December 1972 limitation will have a real impact on the program by next January, when it will no longer be possible to sign agreements lasting even 1 full year.

BACKGROUND

In 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed. At that time its primary focus and concern was the head of household with considerable work experience who was unemployed due to automation or other technological advances.

With subsequent amendments in 1963, 1965, 1966, and 1968, the legislation's emphasis changed. The next step was an attack on youth unemployment and then to other groups facing disadvantages in competing for existing jobs.

As a combined result of the original intent and subsequent experience, MDTA has come to have six identifiable objectives:

- (1) Facilitating employment of the unemployed;
- (2) Reducing poverty;
- (3) Lessening inflationary pressures;
- (4) Meeting labor shortages;
- (5) Upgrading the labor force;
- (6) Revamping traditional institutions.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, [1972] 1973.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT EXTENSION

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11570) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 by postponing the expiration of title II thereof for 1 year.

The Clerk read as follows:

"H.R. 11570

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out "1972" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1973"."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be unanimously approved by the Education and Labor Committee. It provides for a 1-year extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

We were unsuccessful in our efforts to enact comprehensive manpower legislation in the last Congress. We are trying again this year, but it would be unrealistic to think that the Education and Labor Committee could report a bill—and much less that the Congress could enact one—before the upcoming expiration of the Manpower Development and Training Act. We must deal with this crisis immediately so that we can deal with the comprehensive manpower legislation properly.

The MDTA expires this June and new authorizing legislation is needed so that the Appropriations Committee can consider the request for next year's funding as part of its regular proceedings on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

Programs under the MDTA, including the jobs program, are currently funded at about \$750 million, and as of September had almost 150,000 enrollees. Unless we enact new authorizing legislation quickly, authorization for these programs will expire next June.

There is another and just as pressing need to act on MDTA extension quickly. Section 310(b) of the act provides that no funds can be disbursed after December 30, 1972. The practical effect of this provision is that no training agreement extending beyond next December can be signed and the whole program will grind to a halt because realistic commitments cannot be made. This December limitation will start to have a real impact on the program by next January when it will no longer be possible to sign agreements lasting even 1 full year.

Mr. Speaker, we need comprehensive manpower reform legislation, and I have publicly committed myself to doing all in my power to get such legislation reported out of the subcommittee and the full committee at the earliest possible date.

But we want sound and constructive legislation and one cannot write a bill properly while a crisis grows with each additional day of deliberation. Let us take care of the crisis. Let us extend the MDTA. And then we can give the comprehensive manpower legislation the consideration that it deserves.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) for bringing this bill to the floor for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11570 is a bill to extend for 1 year title II of the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962.

This extension is necessary to allow the Department of Labor to continue to fund such ongoing programs as opportunities industrialization centers, on the job training and institutional training programs, and area skill centers. These programs are currently serving 150,000 enrollees and are funded at \$750 million.

Last year the Congress adopted a comprehensive manpower bill that restructured the character of manpower delivery systems. Un-

fortunately that bill did not become law and we are facing a further reevaluation of the entire manpower program. In order to carry out the necessary comprehensive review of all of these programs we must extend the existing law for at least 1 year. This extension does not diminish the need for prompt consideration of the comprehensive legislation, but is an interim action to allow the committee sufficient time to hold adequate hearings to properly develop legislation responsive to the Nation's manpower needs.

I urge the Members to adopt this needed legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11570, which I cosponsored with the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), and urge my colleagues to pass this 1-year extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

At the present time there are nearly 150,000 enrollees being trained with various skills under nearly 15,000 projects in local communities across the Nation. Unless H.R. 11570 is passed, these programs will disappear. The Department of Labor estimates that the number of training opportunities to be funded under title II of MDTA in fiscal year 1973 will be 308,500. During these difficult times for the unemployed and underemployed, we must not allow our single most successful manpower training program to end.

There is legislation pending designed to coordinate our national manpower efforts and resources, and which provides for continuation of the vital training programs conducted under title II of MDTA. While 11 days of hearings on this current legislation have been held by the Select Subcommittee on Labor, it will require additional time to permit all interested parties to testify and to develop legislation responsive to the Nation's manpower needs. MDTA programs are generally funded for periods of 40 to 50 weeks and some are funded up to 104 weeks. As the expiration date for title II, June 30, 1972, approaches, funds cannot be obligated for programs extending beyond that date. As a result, ongoing programs lose momentum and in some cases are being phased out. A 1-year extension of title II would permit ongoing MDTA programs to continue during the pendency of comprehensive manpower legislation and allow an uninterrupted delivery of vital training services on the local level.

Numerous witnesses appearing before the Select Subcommittee on Labor during hearings on comprehensive manpower legislation indicated the need to extend ongoing MDTA programs while current legislation is pending.

Dr. Garth L. Mangum, a noted manpower expert, strongly advocated some form of extension of MDTA while the current comprehensive bill is pending. Dr. Mangum indicated that local MDTA programs are grinding to a halt and losing momentum. He stated:

"The failure to extend (MDTA) without something replacing it in the form of some of the bills you are talking about would be that the most effective, and I say that without qualification, the single most effective program of all the programs we have had in the manpower field would simply disappear."

Malcolm Lovell, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, also urged the extension of MDTA. He testified that:

"In view . . . of the scheduled expiration of MDTA authority on June 30, 1972, it will be necessary to extend the life of that law, as is provided in H.R. 11570. . . ."

Ray Torquato, director of manpower training programs for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, appeared before the subcommittee solely to urge extension of the MDTA and "to bring to everyone's attention the problems of administering this fiscal

year's funding appropriation without an extension, because of the way the act must be administered."

The American Vocational Association, through its Executive Director Lowell Burkett and a panel of four State vocational educational administrators, also urged extension of MDTA. One member of the panel very eloquently expressed the problem:

"I believe the Congress should continue MDTA through extension of the present Act until such time as a lasting decision (concerning pending legislation) can be made. With the expiration of MDTA scheduled for July 1, 1972 it is imperative that some action be taken. In case of new legislation, provisions for orderly transition should be included. As the July 1 date approaches, more of our instructors will be leaving. These people represent an investment of time and money, and we are reluctant to see our program personnel ranks depleted because of the uncertainty of the future." (emphasis added)

The projected funding of title II is based upon current year operation levels and includes realistic compensation for known variations. The \$693.1 million projection represents substantially the same funding level as fiscal year 1972, as indicated in the following table:

| MDTA | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (In millions of dollars) | | |
| | Fiscal year 1972 (appropriation) | Fiscal year 1973 (projection) |
| Title II..... | 677.5 | 693.1 |
| Private sector on job training.... | 260.5 | 260.5 |
| Institutional..... | 324.852 | 336.452 |
| Special targeting..... | 52.0 | 52.0 |
| Camps..... | 11.290 | 15.390 |
| Manpower administration salary and expense..... | 28.8 | 28.8 |

Note: The cost difference for institutional training reflects only changes in allowances levels—no changes are anticipated in program levels. The \$750,000,000 figure is the "MTS" appropriations figure (\$748.8) which also includes: Public sector OJT (PSC-MDTA title I), 35.4. Program support (MDTA titles I and II), 42.5, made up of: T.A. & T., 15.9, LMI, 6.815, R.D. & E., 19.768. Computerized job placement (title I)—22.3.

As noted above, the only programmatic increase in funding is institutional training, and that increase is only for changes in training allowances and not in program levels. The training allowance formula under MDTA is linked to State unemployment insurance benefit payments. Section 203(a) of MDTA states that training allowance payments to States for trainees "shall not exceed \$10 more than the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment. . . .". Thus, as State payments to trainees increase, due to changes in State law, the training allowance paid by the Federal Government under MDTA is automatically increased.

The small increase reflected in the fiscal year 1973 projection for CAMPS is a result of two things. First, several programs which had been funded for less than 1 year were annualized, proportionately increasing their funds commensurate with the extension of their duration. Second, CAMPS has picked up the costs of youth coordinator positions previously funded by the President's Committee on Youth Opportunities.

The unemployed and underemployed workers of this country need training opportunities to acquire necessary skills. The chairman of our subcommittee (Mr. DANIELS) has moved with diligence and dispatch to conduct extensive hearings on the total area of manpower training, but it is obvious that we will not finish that task this year. While comprehensive legislation is being developed to coordinate our total approach to manpower needs and human resources, we must not allow our one successful ongoing program to expire. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 11570 and vote for extending MDTA for 1 year.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 11570. In the committee report the section which is most important for us in extending this program are the sentences found on page 3 of the committee report:

"The extension of MDTA is not intended to diminish the need for prompt consideration and development of comprehensive manpower legislation by the committee. This extension is merely an interim action to allow the committee sufficient time in which to conduct adequate hearings and to attempt to develop legislation responsive to the Nation's manpower needs."

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, as Dr. Garth L. Mangum, one of the Nation's most recognized manpower experts has stated in a letter that the MDTA is the foundation of U.S. manpower policy, and he concluded by saying—

"It remains to be seen whether the authors of comprehensive manpower legislation can build even a better superstructure."

I think it is important that we allow this most fundamental and perhaps most successful of our manpower programs to be extended in order both to give the MDTA programs a full chance to continue and the Congress the time necessary to develop the kind of comprehensive manpower legislation which, in my judgment, is so important. I urge adoption of H.R. 11570.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but before I yield back the balance of my time, I do wish publicly to reiterate once again that I propose as the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor to proceed with all due speed to conduct further hearings on manpower legislation and to endeavor to the utmost of my ability to mark up the bill at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 11570.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT AMENDMENT OF 1972

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, having had under consideration legislation to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

S. 3054 deletes the existing provision in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which prohibits the further disbursement of funds under that act after December 30, 1972—6 months after the act's expiration date of June 30, 1972.

That provision has the following effect: Although contracts may be entered into until June 30 of this year under the Manpower Development and Training Act (or under the authority of a continuing resolution if authorization legislation were not enacted by that date), no such contract may make commitments which could give rise to the disbursement of any funds beyond December 30 of this year.

It has been the normal practice for MDTA contracts to make commitments for

1 year. However, since the beginning of this year, the Labor Department has only been able to enter into contracts involving short-term commitments so that no disbursement of funds could take place after December 30. Contracts, including renewals of existing programs, can therefore only extend for a few months, and the result is that many program sponsors lack the assurance needed that the programs funded can complete the full year.

The legislation accompanying this report would correct that situation and enable MDTA contracts to continue to make commitments extending over the period of a full year. In other words, contracts could fund programs for 1 full year, in accord with past practice.

The provision which the accompanying bill would repeal, prohibiting disbursement of funds beyond a date 6 months after the act's expiration date, was contained in the original Manpower Development and Training Act; and in subsequent MDTA extension acts the specified year has simply been changed whenever the specified year in the expiration date was changed.

The committee finds that the 6-month disbursement limitation serves no useful purpose and is an impediment to effective program planning. The restriction is an unusual provision. This committee is aware of no comparable restriction in similar legislation. In fact, in the case of those work and training programs which are funded under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, the only limitation is that imposed in the annual appropriations acts providing that such contracts may extend for no more than 24 months.

ACTION ON COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER LEGISLATION PLANNED SOON

It should be noted that the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 would have consolidated the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and the work and training provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act. That legislation would also have increased State and local control over manpower programs and would have provided considerable flexibility in the planning and implementation of manpower programs. That bill was vetoed in December of 1970. That legislation, if enacted into law, would have taken effect 1½ years prior to the expiration date of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

While the veto message set forth several differences of substance with the Congress on the manpower legislation, the major disagreement between the President and the Congress related to the public service employment title of the bill. Many of these differences were resolved when on July 12, 1971, the President signed into law the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-54), providing for public service employment programs during periods of high unemployment. The legislation had been introduced on January 25, 1971, by Senator Nelson and 31 other Senators of both parties, and the administration gave its support to the legislation while the bill was in conference in June.

In March of 1971 the administration submitted new legislation calling for a special revenue sharing program for manpower. In a hearing on May 6, 1971, the Secretary of Labor was asked to have his department supply information to the Congress analyzing how the allocation of funds under the automatic distribution formula contained in the administration proposal would differ from the current pattern of distributing funds under the manpower programs that would be consolidated into the new legislation. (The committee had received information from manpower experts that drastic shifts in the pattern of distributing the funds could be expected to result.)

Tables containing allocation data were submitted to the committee by the Depart-

ment of Labor on September 15, 1971. (Printed in "Reform of Federally Funded Manpower Training Programs: Background Material," Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, December 1971, pp. 339-365.) Questions concerning the allocation of funds still remain to be explored.

The committee looks forward to the Department's testimony in hearings and to further cooperation and assistance in analyzing the complex fund allocation problems as well as other aspects of the various manpower proposals which will be before it.

Hearings on manpower legislation are scheduled for March of this year. It is the committee's expectation that its work on comprehensive manpower legislation will be completed well in advance of the June 30 expiration date of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The comprehensive manpower legislation before the committee will include the necessary authority to continue the kinds of manpower training currently authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act and will contain reasonable phase-in and planning provisions to avoid abrupt changes in on-going programs.

Programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act are currently funded at about \$750 million and such programs have almost 150,000 enrollees. This legislation would enable contracts to be entered into assuring the continuation of such programs as skill centers, opportunities industrialization centers, and institutional and on-the-job training programs through 1973. The committee believes that, while technical in nature, it is urgently required that this legislation be enacted as soon as possible.

ESTIMATE OF COSTS

S. 3054 has no effect upon the costs incurred in carrying out the Manpower Development and Training Act. The bill makes no change in the authorization but simply makes a technical change in the law to allow disbursements to extend over the same period of 1 year as in the past.

TABULATION OF VOTES

Pursuant to section 133(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the following is a tabulation of votes in committee on a motion by Mr. Javits to report S. 3054 favorably without amendment:

Yeas—17:

Mr. Williams, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Pell, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Taft, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Stafford.

Nays—0.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

The bill amends section 310(b) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to delete the provision that no disbursement of funds under title II (training and skill development programs) of the act may be made after December 30, 1972.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 310. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1972.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of

such termination [Provided, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this act after December 30, 1972].

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT
AMENDMENT OF 1972

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, who is temporarily absent, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 578, S. 3054.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill was read by title as follows:

A bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, it is my understanding that S. 3054 has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a principal sponsor, with Senator NELSON, of S. 3054, and ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I urge that the bill be passed.

The bill would delete a restriction contained in subsection (b) of section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Without this deletion, the Secretary of Labor would be unable to renew or enter into contracts for the continuation of any programs under the act requiring the disbursement of funds beyond December 30, 1972.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is one of our principal authorities at the present time for job training, upgrading, and work experience programs for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons. It is currently funded at \$750,000,000 for this fiscal year and provides benefits to hundreds of thousands enrollees.

Under its authority such crucial programs as the JOBS program—Jobs in the Private Sector; the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer—in-school and out-of-school programs, and other activities, including programs conducted by the States, have been conducted over the years.

The act itself will expire this June 30, 1972.

It is expected that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Education and Labor Committee in the House and the conferees will act prior to that time with respect to a substantial reform of these programs and similar programs conducted under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The administration's Manpower Revenue Sharing Act—and a number of other comprehensive proposals will be considered in that regard; each would repeal the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act authorities.

But in the meantime the Secretary of Labor, in administering the existing programs, is subject to the provision set forth in subsection (b) of section 310, which prohibits disbursement of funds beyond this calendar year.

Mr. President, the effectiveness of existing programs has stemmed in large part from the fact that the Secretary could enter into grants and contracts extending over at least a year's duration, thus providing security to those engaged in the program and, in many cases, insuring the involvement of the private sector.

Without deletion of this section, the Secretary could enter into contracts up until the date of the act's expiration, June 30, but the contract or grant itself could only authorize activities through December 30—for a 6-month period, thus effectively undermining the program through fiscal year 1973.

Mr. President, this bill has the full support of the minority members of the committee and of the administration. In the latter connection I ask unanimous consent that here be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter to me dated January 26, 1972, from Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, which emphasizes the need for immediate action along these lines to permit continuity of program pending enactment of a permanent new manpower program.

Mr. President, for these reasons I urge that the bill be passed so that these vital programs may continue while we act to provide a new legislative base for job and training programs which are so vital to our efforts to combat poverty and to give meaning to efforts of our people to support themselves.

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

"U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
"OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY FOR MANPOWER,
"Washington, D.C.

"HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
"U.S. Senate,
"Washington, D.C.

"DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: As you are aware, it is very important for the manpower training program and our unemployed citizens, that quick action be taken providing continuity of MDTA training programs. Title II of the MDTA expires June 30, 1972. Section 310(b) stipulates that no funds may be disbursed after December 30, 1972. In order to permit time to close out and complete payment for training services, we cannot approve new projects which extend beyond October 30, 1972. This means that we cannot now, with FY 1972 funds already appropriated, establish training of more than a few months duration. Each week that passes further limits our capability to fund meaningful training programs.

"In light of the pending Manpower Revenue Sharing Act and related manpower legislation which would replace the expiring MDTA, the House passed last session, a bill extending the expiring provisions for one year. The bill, S. 3054, introduced by you and Senator Nelson would delete the proviso in Section 310(b) terminating disbursements next December 30, but would not permit new projects after June 30, 1972. Enactment of this bill or the one passed by the House would provide the immediate legislative action needed to permit continuity of program pending enactment of a permanent new manpower program. As you know, the President has proposed July 1, 1973, as the effective date for manpower revenue sharing. The House bill would authorize continuation of existing programs to that date without need of additional interim legislation.

"Sincerely,

"MALCOLM R. LOVELL, JR.,
"Assistant Secretary for Manpower."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

"S. 3054

"An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is

amended by striking out the colon and the following: "Provided, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1972."

"SEC. 2. That all real property of the United States which was transferred to the United States Postal Service and was, prior to such transfer, treated as Federal property for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), shall continue to be treated as Federal property for such purpose for two years beyond the end of the fiscal year in which such transfer occurred."

AMENDING MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND
TRAINING ACT OF 1962; APPOINTMENT OF
CONFEREES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

"S. 3054

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out the colon and the following: "Provided, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1972."

"SEC. 2. That all real property of the United States which was transferred to the United States Postal Service and was, prior to such transfer, treated as Federal property for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), shall continue to be treated as Federal property for such purposes for two years beyond the end of the fiscal year in which such transfer occurred."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion. The Clerk read as follows:

"Mr. PERKINS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3054 and substitute in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 11570, as passed as follows:

"That section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out "1972" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1973."

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 11570) was laid on the table.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 3054 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PERKINS, DANIELS of New Jersey, MEEDS, QUIE, and ESCH.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND
TRAINING ACT OF 1962—CONFERENCE RE-
PORT

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. I ask unani-

mous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Robert C. Byrd). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, which reads as follows:

"CONFERENCE REPORT (S. REPT. No. 92-725)

"The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

"That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: That (a) section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is amended by striking out '1972' the first time it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof '1973'.

"(b) Section 310 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2620) is further amended by striking out the colon and the following: 'Provided, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1972'.

"Sec. 2. All real property of the United States which was transferred to the United States Postal Service and was, prior to such transfer, treated as Federal property for purposes of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), shall continue to be treated as Federal property for such purpose for two years beyond the end of the fiscal year in which such transfer occurred.

"And the House agree to the same.

"GAYLORD NELSON,
"EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
"WALTER F. MONDALE,
"ALAN CRANSTON,
"HAROLD E. HUGHES,
"ADLAI STEVENSON,
"JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
"BOB TAFT, JR.,
"J. JAVITS,
"RICHARD SCHWEIKER,
"PETER H. DOMINICK,
"J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,

"Managers on the Part of the Senate.

"CARL D. PERKINS,
"DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
"LLOYD MEEDS,
"ALBERT H. QUIE,
"MARVIN L. ESCH,

"Managers on the Part of the House."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, the conference agreement on S. 3054 simply extends the Manpower Development and Training Act for 1 year—until June 30, 1973. In addition, the prohibition in existing law which provides that funds to carry out contracts entered into prior to such expiration date may not be disbursed later than 6 months after such termination date is deleted by the conference agreement.

The conference agreement also provides that for purposes of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally impacted areas, Federal property transferred to the U.S. Postal Service shall continue to be treated as Federal property for 2 years.

Mr. President, this bill has the unanimous and bipartisan support of all conferees from both the Senate and the House.

It is urgently needed so that on-going programs will not be interrupted. I urge its adoption at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator

will yield, I think the agreement of the conferees was unanimous, and the extension is certainly needed. I hope the Senate will agree to it.

I was the principal sponsor with Senator NELSON, of S. 3054, the Senate provision. In light of the unlikelihood of getting a new reformed manpower system in place this year, this extension is very desirable. I urge, however, that we press for reform at the earliest opportunity and I introduced yesterday S. 3421, the Community Manpower Training and Employment Act to that end.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is one of our principal authorities for job training, upgrading and work experience programs for economically disadvantaged, unemployed and underemployed persons at the present time, benefits to hundreds of thousands of enrollees.

Under its authority such crucial programs as the JOBS program—jobs in the private sector; the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer in-school and out-of-school programs, and other activities, including programs conducted by the States, have been conducted over the years.

It is important that these programs be continued while reform is considered.

The conference report also includes the Senate provision granting a 2-year grace period to school districts which have been receiving Public Law 874 impact aid payments on the basis of workers employed on property which has been transferred to the Postal Service. This is necessary because the change of the Post Office Department to a public corporation affects the eligibility of postal properties under the impact aid programs. Thus some 700 affected school districts are provided a needed phaseout period after Federal activity has ceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

"The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the House to the Senate bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

"The points in disagreement and the conference resolution of them are as follows:

"1. The House-passed amendment would extend the authority conferred under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act for one year beyond the existing law's expiration date of June 30, 1972, by inserting in lieu thereof the termination date of June 30, 1973.

"The Senate-passed bill does not contain the above provision.

"The Senate recedes.

"2. The House-passed amendment would extend for one year the existing law's provision that no funds to carry out obligations entered into prior to the termination date may be disbursed later than December 30, 1972—six months after the termination date.

"The Senate-passed bill would delete this six months limitation altogether.

"The House recedes.

"3. The Senate-passed bill also contains the following provision, providing that for

purposes of Public Law 874, relating to assistance for schools in federally impacted areas, Federal property transferred to the United States Postal Service shall continue to be treated as Federal property for two years.

"The House passed H.R. 11809 on December 6, 1971, containing the same language as section 2 of the Senate-passed S. 3054.

"The House recedes."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement that the conference report be printed as a Senate report be waived, inasmuch as under the rules of the House of Representatives it has been printed as a report of the House.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3054, AMENDING
MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
ACT OF 1962

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3054) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with inasmuch as it has been printed in the RECORD and has been available since March 29, 1972.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, first let me compliment the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the distinguished chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee whose work and leadership have brought this conference report to the floor for our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, S. 3054 extends for 1 year title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and authorizes a grace period of 2 years within which school districts which lost Federal property when the U.S. Postal Service was created could continue to receive impact assistance while phasing out of that program.

The MDTA extension is necessary to allow the Department of Labor to continue to fund such ongoing programs as opportunities industrialization centers, on the job training and institutional training programs, and area skill centers. These programs are currently serving 150,000 enrollees and are funded at \$750 million.

Last year the Congress adopted a comprehensive manpower bill that restructured the character of manpower delivery systems. Unfortunately that bill did not become law and we are facing a further reevaluation of the entire manpower program. In order to carry out the necessary comprehensive review of all of these programs we must extend the existing law for at least 1 year.

An amendment was added by the other body to S. 3054 which had the effect of extending for 2 years—one of which is the current fiscal year—the practice of counting postal employees for the purpose of determining entitlement for funds under the Federal impact aid program. This legislation was necessitated by the conversion of the Post Office Department to the Postal Corporation. Identical legislation has also passed the House under suspension of the rules.

Under the present impact aid program school districts having Federal property which is transferred to other ownership during a school year continue to receive their impact aid payments for that school year and for 1 additional year after the transfer has occurred.

When the U.S. Postal Service was created earlier this year and the General Services Administration transferred the post offices under its jurisdiction to this new corporation, over 700 school districts unexpectedly lost property which the Office of Education had considered Federal property for purposes of the impact aid law. And then the general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare compounded the problem by ruling that these particular transfers of Federal property could not qualify for the normal grace period because of a quirk in the definition of Federal property contained in Public Law 81-874.

The simple purpose of this bill is to correct the inequity caused by this opinion and to make these districts eligible for the same kind of grace period as all other impact aid districts. This period will allow them to finish this year with the impact money which they have already budgeted and to continue 1 more year while they make plans to lessen their reliance on impact aid or to eliminate their participation altogether.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report on S. 3054.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, authorization for title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act expires on June 30, 1972. The act also provides that no expenditures for that title can be made after December 30, 1972.

The House bill provided for a 1-year extension of the authorization under title II and also provided that no expenditures pursuant to this new authorization could be made after December 30, 1973.

The Senate bill did not provide for an extension of the authorization under title II of the MDTA. In addition, it deleted altogether the termination date for authority to expend funds.

The conference report provides for another year's authorization for the Manpower Development and Training Act, because it is unrealistic to expect that we can enact new comprehensive manpower legislation before June 30, 1972.

Since its original enactment, the MDTA has contained a proviso limiting expenditures to a period ending 6 months after the end of the authorization. This is a very unusual provision, which was put into the original MDTA because it was a new and untried program. After 10 years of operation, this special proviso probably serves no useful purpose, and the House receded on the Senate provision that deletes it altogether.

The Senate bill also contained a provision to continue treating property of the U.S. Postal Service as though it were Federal property for purposes of the impact aid program. An identical provision was contained in H.R. 11809, which was favorably reported from the Education and Labor Committee and passed the House under suspension of the rules on December 6, 1971.

The House conferees accepted this provision.

I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPRENTICESHIP WEEK IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, rarely has any group gone as unsaluted and un-

mentioned as the young group of men who are studying to inherit the load of progress. The trade apprentice trains for a number of years so that he might become a master of his trade, whether it be carpenter, electrician, ironworker, or one of the many other trades. As the highly skilled worker of the future, the apprentice represents the builder of America's future.

I rise today to call attention to this group of young Americans and to salute them and the trade unions and contractors' associations that have developed the apprenticeship training programs across the Nation. I would also like to submit into the RECORD a proclamation by William Egan, the Governor of Alaska, setting aside the week of April 16, 1972, as "Apprenticeship Week in Alaska":

PROCLAMATION: APPRENTICESHIP WEEK IN ALASKA

Progress in Alaska depends upon the strength of its construction industry and the skills of the hands of workers who can build a better Alaska.

Whether a new project in our State be the erection of a new home, school, or office building; or the challenge of a mammoth project such as the trans-Alaska pipeline; Alaska's construction industry is vital to the future of our great State.

It is desirable to employ as many Alaskans as possible in the construction trades—as carpenters, electricians, iron workers, painters, plasterers and cement masons, plumbers and pipefitters, sheet metal workers, and others.

Through the joint, cooperative endeavors of Alaska's trade unions and contractors' associations, apprenticeship training programs are creating highly skilled resident workers from the talents that lie in Alaska's youth.

In addition to learning the skills of a worthwhile trade, apprentices are gaining the attributes of good citizenship and responsibility—building their character as they build their job skills.

Alaska's trade unions and contractors' associations have dedicated their apprentice training programs to fashion a highly skilled, resident work force of Alaskan citizens.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim the week of April 16-22, 1972, as "Apprenticeship Week in Alaska" and urge all citizens to honor those trade unions, contractors, and employers who have worked together for the success of our apprenticeship programs; and to recognize our Alaskan young people who will play such an important role in building Alaska.

Dated this 6th day of April, 1972.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as the able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) departs from this great body, I want to add my good wishes to those that have been offered by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

F. BRADFORD MORSE has been a familiar figure in the Nation's Capital since 1953, having come to Washington after having served his country with honor and dis-

tingtion during World War II, and practicing and teaching law in his native State. Five years as an employee on the Senate side were followed by 2 years with the Veterans' Administration.

Evidently "BRAD" missed the challenges of life on the Hill, but when he returned it was to the other side of the Capitol. His first election to the House of Representatives occurred in 1960 and he has been reelected five times. This is quite an accomplishment when we consider the fact that Massachusetts is very much a two-party State.

While serving in the branch of Congress that represents the people, BRADFORD MORSE has made the best use of his great talents as a lawyer and educator. His constituents have had a well-qualified and experienced champion to look after their interests in Washington. He has not, however, been content to remain a mere parochial servant. As a member of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs, MORSE has been a staunch defender of America's interests throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, as our colleague of many years retires from this Chamber, where so much history has been made, my best wishes for his future health and happiness accompany him.

SENATOR MCGOVERN IN THE SOUTH BRONX

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN fulfilled a long-standing commitment last Friday when he returned to the South Bronx. During the 2 hours he spent meeting with people, discussing housing and drug rehabilitation programs, and getting an exchange of views on his own policies and programs, Senator MCGOVERN demonstrated an awareness of and sensitivity to the urban crisis that greatly impressed all of those who came in contact with him.

I am convinced that GEORGE MCGOVERN offers the best hope for the kind of activism and leadership that is required if the cycle of despair and blight that afflicts our cities is to be halted.

And for those who may be skeptical of Senator MCGOVERN's appeal in the black and Puerto Rican communities, I commend to their attention the following column by Jose Torres, as it appeared in last Saturday's New York Post:

CAMPAGNING IN NO-MAN'S LAND

(By Jose Torres)

The three politicians walked through South Bronx as if they were walking on Fifth Av. I don't know if they were really aware that Simpson St., is now probably the toughest street in town.

Nevertheless, they walked and they smiled at the crowd which followed them and they shook hands. There were a few Secret Service men who were obviously worried, but Presidential aspirant Senator George McGovern seemed confident. And so were Rep. Badillo (D-N.Y.) and Bronx Borough President Abrams.

"Do you know who that man is?" someone asked a Puerto Rican woman who shook

hands with the three politicians. "Of course," she said with a broad smile. "Herman Badillo."

"No, I'm talking about the big man there." "Are you deaf?" screamed the woman. "Herman Badillo."

"Who are you going to vote for in the Presidential elections?"

"Herman Badillo. Who else?"

Even the many reporters who followed McGovern seemed shocked by the sight of a building abandoned by its landlord, in which human beings still live. As faces began to appear at open windows to look down at the crowd walking through garbage in the building, TV cameras focused on the scene of decay. It was a sad view.

McGovern, wearing a gray suit with red and blue stripes, walked slowly, shaking his head in disgust with what he saw. He seemed to be walking through a No-Man's Land. And the people who forced smiles as they looked down from their windows were the forgotten people—those who have lost confidence in the politicians' promises.

But somehow, the Puerto Ricans who came to see who the man was walking with Herman Badillo, were instantly impressed.

"This Macover reminds me of Kennedy," said a young man who shook hands with the South Dakota Senator. "McGovern," another Puerto Rican corrected.

As the three politicians entered their car, many of the Puerto Ricans who had assembled near them, began to applaud. The politicians smiled back.

Then, they went to SERA, a bilingual drug center on Hoe Av., where McGovern was met by ex-drug addicts and drug addicts who are under treatment. As the three politicians toured the well-kept building, someone handed a button to the Presidential aspirant. The letters D.M.Z. were conspicuously in the center of the button.

"It's ironic," said McGovern to the large crowd at the center, "that while billions of dollars are being spent on that tragic war in Vietnam and with the expansion of it with the bombing of the DMZ area, the government doesn't have adequate monies to help those helping in this DMZ (Drug Mending Zone) program."

The Senator went on to say that while there are 2,000 young veterans walking the New York Streets who had become junkies in the mud of Vietnam, there are no funds to help them in the jungle of our own streets. "It is a shame," McGovern said, "that the government could find them when it wanted them to kill and die in Vietnam and now they ignore them when they come back addicted to hard drugs."

The drug center, which helps about 400 of the 300,000 addicts of this city, cannot expand its program because of lack of funds. "We work over 15 hours a day," explained Frank Marrero, an official of the center.

One thing makes the Puerto Rican people in the Bronx quite proud: Senator McGovern's most important political kickoff since becoming a serious prospect and potential winner as a Democratic candidate for the Presidency of this unhappy country, was held in the South Bronx, in a Puerto Rican neighborhood. That's something that was noticed by some of the most sophisticated Puerto Ricans who came out to see McGovern.

Although I was a little worried about the possibility of confrontation with some members of the more than 50 gangs in that section of the Bronx, two gang leaders on the scene seemed to be happy to have Badillo walking there in the company of a possible U.S. President.

"Nothing has been done for our people here," said one of them, "but I know the limitations of Badillo. And I also know where the power resides. Now this McGovern is here looking at this place, he knows how this place looks, he didn't get it from some puppet working for him, he came himself. That's what we need. We need people like

him to come over and not only see, but feel our tragic situation. I'm for that."

Surprisingly, McGovern had come to one of the worst poverty pockets in this country and not one heckler was in sight. Not one man protested his presence here.

"Bobby Kennedy couldn't have been better received," said an older Puerto Rican from Simpson St. "In fact, I think that he's the only candidate who resembles Bobby. I'll pray for his victory, and I'll vote for him."

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN SEYMOUR HALPERN, PET TURTLES SPREAD SAMONELLA

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the disease known as salmonella is a major health hazard among children and senior citizens in the United States. In an effort to stem the tide of this disease and to reduce the estimated 300,000 cases which occur each year, I introduced H.R. 12303. The Salmonella Prevention Act of 1972.

The act would impose needed controls on the interstate shipment of disease-carrying pet turtles and impose uniform Federal regulations on the sale of turtles throughout the country. Many States have begun to set their own health standards in regard to the sale of pet turtles, but we need a national approach to this problem.

I was quite pleased to read a fine article in *Trial* magazine about the spread of salmonella. The American Trial Lawyers Association should be commended for their efforts to acquaint the public with the dangers of salmonella. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this article, which I will now insert into the RECORD:

PET TURTLES SPREAD SALMONELLA

Reporting in the January 1972, issue of the AMA's *Archives of Environmental Health*, a team from the Washington State Department of Health and the Division of Epidemiology of Seattle-King County Health Department highlights again the danger of pet turtles as an important source of human salmonella infection.

Salmonella disease in man is contracted by the ingestion of material contaminated with salmonella bacteria. The disease is of variable severity. Usually, it manifests itself in 12-48 hours after introduction of the organisms into the human gastrointestinal tract by nausea, vomiting, abdominal cramps, diarrhea and fever. The symptoms most often last only a day or so, with complete recovery thereafter. But in some persons the illness becomes protracted and severe, resembling an attack of cholera. And in a few patients there results a long, disabling and even fatal illness. Many individuals have no symptoms but remain carriers of the salmonella bacteria and spread infection to others, particularly if they are food handlers and dispensers.

Turtle-associated salmonella, infections in humans in the United States were first reported in 1963, and since then outbreaks of human salmonellosis from imported as well as domestic turtles have been found in Michigan, Minnesota, Washington, Oregon, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Connecticut. Also, investigators in several states have discovered that a relatively high percentage of turtles and the water in which they are

kept in wholesale and retail stores are contaminated with salmonellae and, therefore, a source of human infection.

This is particularly true for turtles handled as pets at home or in school by children whose sanitary habits are generally conducive to the spread of contamination to the intestinal tract, by, for instance, the frequent putting of fingers into their mouths.

In the present study of 21 cases of salmonellosis reported in the state of Washington, the most probable source of infection was traced to turtles in 20 and to a chameleon in one. Of the 103 family members investigated, including the index cases, 48 were ill or had stool specimens testing positive for salmonellae.

In addition, salmonellae and related organisms were found in an appreciable number of turtle-tank water samples obtained at wholesale and retail outlets in the state.

Since millions of turtles are sold each year in the United States as household pets, and since salmonellae and other potentially infecting organisms have been isolated from approximately 50% of retail store aquariums, a large reservoir of such infection exists in this single source. Thus, infecting organisms are being introduced by this means into a sizable number of homes in the United States annually. Also, compounding the problem of spread of salmonella from turtles to humans is the frequent access in the household of dogs and cats to the turtle bowl—thereby increasing the possible reservoirs of infection.

Control measures that need universal adoption to ensure that turtles marketed in the United States and free of salmonella infection advocated by the Washington State team include: (1) the hatching of turtles in a sanitary environment; (2) the feeding to breeding turtles of only food products known to be free of salmonella; (3) the interstate shipping of only those turtles which have been examined bacteriologically and found to be salmonellae-free; (4) the shipping of turtles only to wholesale and retail stores that maintain salmonellae-free storage and display facilities; and (5) the selling to wholesalers, retailers and private customers only turtle foods shown to be salmonellae-free.

An essential part of an effective program to prevent transmission of salmonellae from turtles to humans necessitates the maintenance of salmonellae-free storage and display facilities by wholesalers and retailers. This requires that wholesalers and retailers of turtles put new shipments of the reptiles into disinfected water tanks or other containers that do not hold turtles from prior shipments.

In addition, all precautions must be employed to see that the tanks or other containers and their filtering equipment, heaters, etc. are adequately cleaned and disinfected prior to use and that the turtles are fed only salmonellae-free food.

Practical enforcement of such measures, however, probably would need the passage of restrictive state and federal regulations and such may soon become necessary to reduce the potentially serious health hazard of turtles to humans.

GRAFFITI ERADICATION

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the problem of graffiti is one that has faced man almost since the time he began building walls.

Graffiti has been discovered on the walls of Pompeii by archeologists excavating the ruins of that ancient city.

Reporters covering the President's trip to China discovered graffiti on the Great Wall.

Graffiti has often been the source of American folk humor, but now it has become a blight which contributes only to ugliness.

In my city of Philadelphia a campaign will begin today to remove the existing graffiti all over the city as well as stopping the further defacing of property.

All segments of the community: the city government, public and private schools, civic organizations of all types, and private companies and businessmen have joined in this effort.

At this time, and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I enter a description of this plan into the RECORD:

CAMPAIGN AGAINST GRAFFITI

The City today launched a grass roots campaign against graffiti which will involve all the segments of the community. The campaign is aimed at removing graffiti as well as stopping further defacing of property through community and family action, peer pressure and persuasion.

City Representative and Director of Commerce Harry R. Belinger said the campaign will begin Monday, April 24, in conjunction with the city's annual Clean Up, Paint Up, Fix Up Week Parade, which traditionally opens spring cleaning activities in Philadelphia.

"The campaign is one of persuasion as well as cleanup," Belinger said. "We realize that it takes these young defacers only minutes to mar a surface which will take weeks to clean up. We hope they will stop and consider the damage which graffiti does to our city's image as well as the appearance and viability of their own neighborhoods."

Belinger said that he has met with officials of both school systems, representatives of the paint industry, ministers and clergy, as well as various civic and community groups to urge their support of this program.

The City's 3200 Clean Blocks involving 400,000 Philadelphians will participate in the anti-graffiti campaign by working in their own neighborhoods to remove graffiti from wooden surfaces by painting over it.

Both the public and parochial school systems will observe Monday, April 24 as "Anti-Graffiti Day," and hold classroom discussions on the problem and explore solutions to it. During the week, through their various student councils, they will also participate in school clean-ups and in some instances in neighborhood clean-ups.

The senior high school students in both systems have submitted "Anti-Graffiti Posters" in a contest sponsored by the City to determine a slogan for the campaign which will be publicized and reproduced on posters for display throughout the city later this summer.

Belinger added that 260 Home and School Councils of the public school system have pledged their support to the program and members will urge their own children as well as the students in their schools to participate in anti-graffiti clean-ups in the schools and in their communities.

He added that schools that have bad graffiti problems are being urged to grow ivy on the school walls since this is a great deterrent to graffiti writing because it makes it impossible to place graffiti over the ivy and it will also cover any graffiti on the walls.

The three largest local paint retailers—M. A. Bruder and Sons, Inc., Pinnaren and Haley, Inc., and Dutch Paints—are solidly behind the program—Belinger said.

"These paint retailers have agreed to give a 10 percent discount to neighborhood and clean block groups, and schools groups who purchase paint next week to cover over graffiti," he said.

Belinger added that these civic minded businessmen have even gone a step further by asking all their store managers to put spray cans out of reach in their paint stores and to exercise judgment in selling these cans to responsible young people.

The stores will display empty spray paint cans mounted on masonite with epoxy cement that cannot be removed. Purchases of regular paint cans can be made at the counter, however.

"It is a known fact," Belinger declared, "that most spray cans used in graffiti-writing are normally stolen and not bought. This action by these paint retailers will make it extremely difficult for youngsters to get their hands on spray cans."

He added that it would be very helpful if all local businessmen who sell spray paint cans would follow the actions of these paint retailers because it would be a positive step in helping curb graffiti.

He also appealed to all local business and food store chains that sell "Magic Markers" to remove these items from prominent display in their stores and have them purchased only at the counter at check-out time. Magic markers, he noted, are another source of graffiti-writing.

Belinger added that the three local paint retailers have also provided \$100 each for prize money in the "Anti-Graffiti" poster contest held in the public and parochial school systems.

The Archdiocese of Philadelphia, the Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches have also given their support to the campaign. They will announce from church pulpits on Sunday the campaign and ask for their respective congregations' cooperation.

The Television and Radio Advertising Council has agreed to air anti-graffiti messages on the City's 20 radio stations supporting the City campaign and urging community cooperation in helping stem the tide of graffiti writing.

Belinger stated that a meeting with labor leaders will be held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel on Thursday, April 27, at noon, to gain their help in this campaign and to obtain their ideas on stopping graffiti-writing. SEPTA and the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce have indicated they will actively support the program, he added.

He said, "This is just the beginning of an all-out year-round effort to stop this distasteful practice of inane writing on walls, buildings and wooden surfaces throughout Philadelphia. We welcome everyone's ideas, support and cooperation in this effort."

EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY WEEK IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a proclamation by William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, dated April 10, 1972. It designates the week of April 23, 1972, as Equal Housing Opportunity Week in Alaska. I believe that this proclamation demonstrates that it is the sense of Alaskans that all

people are entitled to the same housing advantages regardless of race, religion, or color.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the people of Alaska and their Governor for expressing this ideal, and submit a copy of this proclamation into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

PROCLAMATION OF EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY

In recognition of the rights of all the people to equal housing advantages, the Congress of the United States passed the Fair Housing Law four years ago. There is a need from time to time to remind our people of this statute.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development has adopted regulatory procedures and a master plan for equal housing opportunity. The Fair Housing Law guarantees every citizen equal housing opportunities through the Department of Housing and Urban Development's effective administration of the conciliation procedure, through the United States Attorney General's office, and by individual suit in the courts.

Agreements often call for a change in the system of developer or apartment owner so that housing discrimination does not recur. The conciliation agreements, therefore, have a ripple effect that reach far beyond the original cause.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim the week of April 23-29, 1972, as Equal Housing Opportunity Week in Alaska and call upon all citizens of the State to become acquainted with the procedures of the noble ideal expressed in this statute and to dedicate themselves anew to carrying out the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

Dated this 10th day of April, 1972.

THE UNITED NATIONS—A GOOD PLACE TO CUT

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, whenever it is suggested that Federal expenditures be reduced, the spenders ask, "Where would you cut?" As my time is limited, I will not list all the places where reductions ought to be made, but will concentrate on just one.

In 1971, before Free China was expelled from the United Nations, the United States had 7.5 percent of the total population of the membership of the organization and 7.6 percent of the total area. Net assessments for that year totaled \$163,728,655, of which \$56,332,170, or 34.4 percent, was paid by the United States.

In 1972, with Communist China occupying the seat that Free China held for more than a quarter of a century, the United States will have 5.9 percent of the total population and 7.1 percent of the total area. We will still pay 31.5 percent of the net assessments.

The United States has also been the chief bankroller for the various subsidiaries of the United Nations Organization, as the following table shows:

| Agency | Total 1970 | United States 1970 | United States percent |
|---|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Relief and Works Agency for Palestine refugees..... | \$36,672,928 | \$22,750,000 | 62.0 |
| Development program..... | 244,965,083 | 115,086,782 | 47.0 |
| Children's Fund..... | 33,815,939 | 13,245,380 | 39.2 |
| Food and agriculture Organization..... | 29,937,201 | 11,722,692 | 39.2 |
| Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organi- zation..... | 35,764,395 | 12,747,443 | 35.6 |
| World Health Organi- zation..... | 64,723,300 | 21,680,810 | 33.5 |
| International Labor Organization..... | 25,234,194 | 5,424,463 | 21.5 |
| Total..... | 471,113,040 | 202,657,570 | 43.0 |

Note: Contributions from nonmembers have been excluded.

While I am as anxious as anyone else to help feed the hungry, heal the sick, house the homeless, educate the illiterate, and elevate the living standards of those who are less fortunate than we, I feel that it is high time that other nations began increasing their payments so the financial pressure on the American taxpayer can be eased. If the programs are meritorious, as some of them undoubtedly are, all the nations that are members of the United Nations organization should be not only willing, but eager, to pay according to their ability. On the other hand, if some of them continue to shirk their responsibilities, we ought to discontinue our contributions and limit our help to our existing foreign aid programs. Many of the activities carried out by the various instrumentalities of the United Nations could be taken care of more efficiently and less expensively by various religious and charitable organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of the places where we ought to make substantial cuts in spending. Perhaps, if we made some reductions in our contributions, some of the other nations might be shamed into increasing theirs.

LABOR POSES PROBLEM FOR REDS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since we are quite obviously preoccupied with many questions relative to our domestic economy, it is often felt that the problems which beset us are major headaches which are not found elsewhere.

An article by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, which appeared in the San Diego, Calif., Union of April 9, analyzes complications within the domestic economy of the Soviet Union. A study of this editorial would, at least, have us appreciate the virtues of our system and the progress that we are making in contrast to the continued inefficiency of any Communist government.

The article follows:

LABOR POSES PROBLEMS FOR REDS

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

Western reports on Leonid Brezhnev's speech to the Soviet Trade Union Congress centered on his foreign policy views.

This was only natural in light of President Nixon's coming May visit to Moscow and rumors that Brezhnev may go to Peking in June.

But the Soviet chairman spoke for 90 minutes and his speech ranged over the full sweep of Russian affairs.

Its domestic sections provides a startling insight into Russia's labor troubles. A chronic manpower shortage dogs the Kremlin, accentuated by alcoholism, slackness, absenteeism, foot dragging, job hopping, etc.

Brezhnev did not mince words. He was almost evangelistic as he berated the labor leaders and demanded that they raise production and efficiency and enforce discipline.

"Wages everywhere must be earned," the chairman said. "... do not shirk to observe the strictest discipline during work."

Without referring to the appalling problem of alcoholism in Russia, he denounced the way workers use their leisure.

"Often this time is frittered away pointlessly and sometimes it directly harms the person himself, those around him and ... the interests of society," he said. "Free time is not time free from responsibility to society."

His attempt to make the trade unions responsible for the failure of the workers, however, is ludicrous. In the first place Soviet labor unions have no power.

Their members are not elected by the workers to represent their interest. They are part and parcel of the Communist apparatus.

Brezhnev, like his predecessors, faces a blank wall—the innate ineffectiveness of the Communist system, its top-heavy bureaucracy, its central planning, low standard of living, boredom and mediocrity.

Rather than suggest remedies, Brezhnev can only exhort his listeners, trying to whip up enthusiasm among the workers for empty "moral incentives" and by full-blown, demagogic rhetoric.

He talks of the "true Socialist worker" as an idealist who is "an uncompromising enemy of any petit bourgeois attitude—any vestige of the past...."

"People throughout the world judge our working class on the basis of what a working man is capable of doing under socialism, thereby judging the capabilities of the Socialist system," he said.

If that's true, Brezhnev can't be very optimistic.

POLICE AWARDS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing dramatic decreases in District of Columbia crime—decreases which the President, the Police Chief, District of Columbia policemen, and those of us in Congress who worked on the District of Columbia crime bill can all be pleased about.

There has been some pessimism, however. Some have suggested that the decline really just represents a pushing of crime from the city to the suburbs.

But the most recent annual report of Montgomery County Police Superintendent K. W. Watkins gives reason to hope that this pessimism is unfounded.

The report shows that while the population of the county rose 3.9 percent, part I serious crimes in 1971 were 3.3 percent above their total in 1970. In other words, the rate of serious crime per unit of population does not seem to have increased. If my figuring is correct, it appears to have dropped from 3,690 per 100,000 population 1970 to 3,667 per 100,000 population in 1971.

The county police department's rate of solving crimes was 21 percent, an increase over the 18 percent of 1970.

In this effort by the Montgomery County Police Department to hold the line and, then, decrease crime, public support is important. Morale and spirit—and, I think, the statistics on crime—are improved when organizations recognize policemen for their work. In this regard, I submit from Superintendent Watkins' annual report a list of awards made by private groups to policemen during 1971:

AWARDS

POLICEMAN OF THE YEAR (KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS)

Detective Corporal Harold H. Freneau was presented the Knights of Columbus' Medal of Merit in recognition of his selection as Montgomery County Policeman of the Year for 1970.

The 11-year police veteran was cited for "outstanding service protecting the lives and property of the citizens of Montgomery County" by John E. Staskus, Deputy Director, District 11 of the Knights of Columbus.

Corporal Freneau, 34, joined the police force as a patrolman in 1960, was transferred to the Detective Section in 1967, as Private First Class, and promoted to Corporal in 1968, and assigned to work on narcotics violations.

The Knights of Columbus citation recognized his "initiative and perseverance ... when he carried out investigations of numerous narcotic cases that ultimately led to apprehension and indictment of offenders ..."

"For his excellent performance of duty wherein he displayed to a high degree the traits of initiative, devotion to duty, and investigative skill, it is our privilege on behalf of a grateful citizenry to award the Columbian Medal to Corporal Freneau as the Montgomery County Policeman of the Year," the citation concluded.

BETHESDA KIWANIS CLUB AWARDS

Again this year the Bethesda Kiwanis Club held an awards luncheon for Montgomery County police officers for outstanding achievements during the year. The officers were selected from the four police districts and the following officers received awards:

Pvt. David R. Barnes, Pvt. Jerry Brandt, Pfc James Buchanan, Pvt. Louis Ciamillo, Pfc John DeVries, Jr., Pfc Robert Easter, Pvt. James Fetrow, Pvt. James R. Fitzgibbon, Jr., Pfc Bernard J. Gillespie, Pfc Albert Guglielmini, Pvt. Harry W. Hamilton.

Cpl. Robert C. K. Howell, Cpl. Paul G. Hrapchak, Pfc George Killany, Pfc Charles E. Lake, Pvt. John T. Mayhew, Cpl. John L. Mey, Cpl. Michael H. Miller, Pfc Phillip Preece, Sgt. Robert B. Renfrew, Pfc Richard Stone, Pfc David Triggs.

These awards are based on outstanding police conduct, including investigatory police-community relations, and acts of bravery.

SILVER SPRING LIONS CLUB

This year the Silver Spring Lions Club held a dinner meeting honoring 11 officers from this department with awards for outstanding achievements. The following officers were selected:

Pvt. David Barnes, Pvt. Louis Ciamillo, Pvt. James Fitzgibbon, Pfc Ingrid Gibson, Pfc Albert Guglielmini, Pfc Georgia Killany.

Pfc Charles Lake, Cpl. John Mey, Cpl. Michael Miller, Pvt. John Shigo, Pfc David Triggs.

SILVER SPRING KIWANIS CLUB

Sergeant John Baker was honored by the Silver Spring Kiwanis Club on June 29, 1971, and was presented a silver platter for his outstanding devotion to duty. Engraved on the platter was, "The Silver Spring Kiwanis proudly presents to John W. Baker, Policeman of the Year Award."

WHEATON KIWANIS CLUB

The Kiwanis Club of Wheaton honored Pfc Arthur Sonntag, school coordinator from the Wheaton-Glenmont police district, as Police Officer of the Year (1970). Pfc Sonntag was presented with a plaque at a dinner meeting for his professional attitude, his high interest, and his demeanor which are reflected in all his endeavors.

AMERICAN LEGION AWARDS

During 1971, the Johnson-Hood-Graham Post No. 151 of the American Legion selected the following officers and presented them with certificates honoring them as "Police-man of the Month":

January: Pfc George Hanville, Pvt. Louis Colantoni.

February: Sgt. Robert B. Renfrew, Pfc Richard K. Stone.

March: Pvt. Michael J. Day, Pvt. Kenneth E. Hames, Pfc Rodney T. Ingels, Pvt. William Leek, Cpl. Forrest Pifer, Pvt. Richard Winkler.

April: Pfc Volly K. Stafford, Pvt. William Kalagher.

May: Sgt. John Baker.

June: Pvt. Michael Jones.

July: Pvt. William Campbell, Pvt. Michael Dennis, Pfc Steven Hargrove, Pvt. Victor Mills, Cpl. John Schlotter, Pvt. Lawrence Tressler.

August: Pvt. Francis Young.

September: Pfc Robert B. Easter, Pvt. Jerry E. Brandt.

October: Pvt. Peter Knight.

November: No awards made.

December: Pfc Kenneth E. Hames.

Special American Legion Department of Maryland Awards were made to Pfc Charles Lake and Pfc Volly Stafford at the American Legion convention at Ocean City.

The awards are based on letters received from citizens complimenting the officers for "courtesy, compassion, and consideration" displayed toward their fellow men.

BAY OF PIGS AND VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the April 21, 1972, edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Bay of Pigs and Vietnam" sets forth some interesting points regarding those two campaigns which apparently have gone unnoticed by some of our colleagues in the House as well as most of the several candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination.

I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

BAY OF PIGS AND VIETNAM

(By C. L. Dancy)

This week was the anniversary of the ill-fated "Bay of Pigs" fiasco, when we dumped

1350 Cuban exiles on the beach and abandoned them there, at the mercy of Fidel Castro's militia.

It was an incident about which much more is known today than was—and from which we seemed to have learned all the wrong lessons.

We know now that the operation was master-minded by a bunch of civilian experts in everything from politics to Latin American affairs—while the professional military were only casually consulted and their advice ignored at the highest level . . . and not employed at all at the critical levels of supervision and management.

At the time it was attempted, Castro's militia was green as grass. His air force was a few jet trainers. There were no Russians aboard.

Soon after, there were thousands of Russians, the biggest Latin army in the hemisphere, MIG fighters, bombers, fast boats, missiles—and even eventually an attempt to stack long range, nuclear war-head rockets there.

Why? Because the invasion attempt was made?

No. It is pretty clear today that the Cuban military boom, with the Russians eagerly taking a hand was inspired because we failed, and especially because that failure came in a faltering of the will at the last minute when the President and his civilian advisers cancelled air cover for the effort without even consulting the military people.

This left the handful of carelessly armed bombing planes of the Cuban invaders and their supply and landing ships at the mercy of the little jet trainer air force Fidel had . . . and left the invaders stranded on the beach without support, and even without full equipment, much less ammunition flow and supplies.

Shortly thereafter, in fact, President Kennedy moved General Maxwell Taylor from the joint chiefs into the White House with him.

That act tells us pretty plainly Kennedy's own reaction and judgment as to where the "Bay of Pigs" plan went wrong—and it answers all the "whiz kids" who had so eagerly tried since to pass the buck off onto the military they were, in fact, superseding.

And it is no longer a secret that it was this apparent finching and faltering on the eve of the Bay of Pigs adventure that not only doomed it for sure, but convinced the Russians that they could make a "giant step" in the form of a direct off-shore nuclear threat to the United States—and we would "chicken out" in the crunch.

So they tried it.

Kennedy fooled them. He stood up and quarantined even the Soviet Navy, and when we didn't flinch, the Russians were the ones to fall back.

But that most dangerous thermonuclear confrontation in the whole history of the "atomic age" came about as the price of failure and the appearance of moral weakness.

Failure is deadly dangerous.

The appearance that in the crunch, we will tolerate anything, is deadly dangerous.

Such were the real causes of World War II because they fed Hitler's assurance that he could get away with anything and take the wildest risks.

Such were the bases for the eager exploitation and adventurism of the Soviet Union each time they have made a powerful maneuver—under Stalin, under Khrushchev, and, sad to say, with Brezhnev and Kosygin, as well.

U.S. capability—in physical power and power of will—have proven to be the key, every time, to reasonable approaches and sobriety in the Kremlin.

Whatever the theoretical possibilities, these have been the practical realities . . .

and the real security of hundreds of millions of Americans and others rests upon it.

Nothing has been more important to the future of this earth than that President Nixon should not flinch and fall back in Vietnam when Hanoi busted the "understanding" wide open by launching its home army in an all-out invasion against South Vietnam.

The "deal" was that we would cease the continuous bombing offensive against the North so long as they did not escalate their forces in South Vietnam. The invasion was a challenge in more ways than one, reaching far beyond Hanoi and Saigon.

Would we close our eyes, forget the "deal," and not expect them to keep their part of the bargain?

It is now the temper of the United States that "anything goes" and we will shrink back and pretend anything rather than meet such a challenge?

This is what Moscow wanted to know before the Nixon visit.

Should they be reasonable or unreasonable? And would any deal made be one we would keep but that we would never hold them to?

The answer that was given had to be given, if anyone cares to build international reciprocity and thereby a hope of genuine peace in the future.

MAJ. GEN. I. G. BROWN ADDRESSES TEXAS NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 Maj. Gen. I. G. Brown, Director of the Air National Guard, delivered an excellent address to the annual conference of the National Guard Association of Texas, which was held at San Antonio.

In order to make those remarks readily available for all who are interested in our national defense, and particularly in our National Guard and Reserves, I am having it inserted in the RECORD. The address follows:

SALUTATION

(By Maj. Gen. I. G. Brown)

Last year I discussed the possible implications of the total force concept—more modern equipment, wholesale changes in roles and missions, close scrutiny of all of our operations by the active forces, and continued restraints on funding while undertaking a larger and more important role in the total defense effort.

I am sure both Army and Air National Guardsmen will attest to the fact that this is what has occurred the past year. And since the total force concept has been in effect, I will give you the bureau's version of what it has done, is doing, and possibly can do to and for the Army and Air National Guard programs.

To be very candid, I'm not sure that we all see the total force concept in the same light. We believe the intent of the total force concept is to modernize, strengthen and utilize the National Guard and Reserve forces to the highest levels possible. This is a result of reductions in the active services and because Guard and Reserve forces can be sustained at lower activity rates and at lower cost levels than can full time forces.

To both the Army and Air Guard, it has very definitely placed more emphasis on

modernizing our equipment: aided us in implementing a program we have sought for years, increased technician manning strengths, and spotlighted the necessity of making our units more responsive and combat ready, because of our structure, our management procedures are unique. This has opened the door to many problems peculiar to Guard and Reserve programs upon which the active forces are conducting a penetrating analysis. One primary example is the increased attention higher levels are giving to our retention and recruiting problems, which are much more complicated and involved than in the regular forces.

The penetrating analysis has made us appear less professional, less responsive to active force requirements, more rigid than flexible in our adaptability to change, and in many cases, far from combat ready.

This attitude has developed for several reasons.

Many active force leaders feel the total force concept implies that all Army and Air Force regulations, policies, directives and manuals should apply to the Guard as it does to the active force. We agree to the extent that our resources and time permit, but if we apply all of these to the Guard, our units would cost the same as an active unit, so why have a Guard?

It is true, however, that if we are expected to be immediately ready for combat deployment, with modern, integrated equipment, we have to have the essential resources to fulfill this requirement. If the total force concept means we are to have identically trained, manned, equipped units as the active force, then every incentive—bonuses, pay and allowances, educational opportunities and so on—should apply likewise to both forces.

As long as we have 2 days drill per month and 15 days annual training, and a full time force of only 20 percent or less on continuous duty, we can not be expected to be as responsive or combat ready as a fully manned and equipped active force. We can meet any combat readiness or response capability the services demand of us, but to do this in the more sophisticated weapons systems we are acquiring, we need additional resources, and operable effective equipment, and we all recognize it is a little more difficult to train Army Guard troops because of the different organizational levels which have to fit into the overall structure, and because of the missions involved and the difficulty of training large masses of people in the accessible environment needed, but, the Army as well as Air Guard, has proven that active force requirements can be met when adequate resources are supplied.

Somewhere along the line those responsible for the total defense posture of our Nation are going to have to come to grips with the problem of reconciling the pure definition of total force concept with its practical application, the differences now existing must be reconciled.

On the air side, the 33 conversions we completed in calendar year 1971 were the most difficult challenges we faced, many units did not receive adequate leadtime notices—many received aircraft, most of which were Vietnam aircraft and, because of combat, required extensive work, and aerospace-ground-equipment (age) was very slow in coming in. Transitioning into new systems is never simple and requires intensive training of our specialists for the new systems. Facilities often were inadequate to appropriately support the new aircraft, and resources were difficult to acquire to alleviate this problem.

The Army Guard was converting to the G/H series TOE and this caused problems in many areas. Any reorganization, change of equipping or manning tables or conversion are bound to cause consternation among the troops. But the Army did get some overseas

training time in and tested round out training with Active Army units.

The Army aircraft inventory just about surpassed the air side last year and much of the new equipment is first line, including Huey helicopters, the sophisticated flying cranes, and factory-new OH-58 Scout helicopters.

As many of you are vividly aware, the Air National Guard has, during the past year, again proved to be an essential and dynamic element in the military force of the United States. Demands are continuously being made upon our units in virtually all fields of endeavor. The response of these demands has been most notable and we may all take pride in our achievements. "Responsiveness" and "total commitment" are terms that we feel best describe the Air National Guard's acceptance of its responsibilities.

As of 1 May 1972, we will have started the sixth year of operation of air refueling support for European based tactical fighters. General Didear's 136th Air Refueling Wing, one of the initial participants in this mission, has provided absolutely superior service to USAF and the National Guard.

Both Army and Air programs became deeply involved in retention and recruiting and minority recruitment. It was an eventful year and one of transition, marked with ups and downs all along the way.

That was last year—and I see no change ahead except maybe even closer scrutiny by our active force partners.

The future of the total force concept!

Well, gentlemen, one way or another—it has to work. Secretary Laird told Congress recently, "we can not have adequate U.S. forces that are 1.4 million below 1968 active duty peaks, unless we put comparable emphasis on strengthening, training and equipping a fully manned National Guard and Reserve under the total force concept." He also said in his 1972 budget message to Congress, "we mean to have National Guard and Reserves manned, equipped and trained to mesh, on quick notice with our Active Forces." He added that "over the past decade, we have had too much talk and too little action in making these (Guard and Reserve) units combat ready."

Neither the American public—nor its political leaders—are in any mood to fund an active force large and strong enough to meet our national security needs, and there is grave reservation about the Guard forces, too. But we believe that the Guard and Reserve Forces are going to be a vital—and large part—of the defense forces during the current decade. Whether it is accomplished the way we think it should be largely rests in our own hands.

We have to revive professionalism and participation to have dedicated, enthused, flexible, innovative and far-sighted leadership. We have to have understanding, firm but tolerant leadership. We cannot forget for 1 minute that all individuals deserve respect and dignified treatment. We must have leaders who listen to their men and who sincerely attempt to reconcile grievances and complaints. We absolutely must have leadership that demands the best from all his personnel and who within his power gives his men the same in return.

Though our technician forces represent the firm, steady hand of guard stewardship on a full time basis, it must be recognized that nontechnicians represent 80 to 95% of our total force. With dispirited, unproductive and unchallenged nontechnicians, our units can only suffer the consequences, which in the current total force concept definitely means the death of the unit.

The best interests of both technicians and nontechnicians are of utmost importance to us in the bureau and the DOD, as are the best interests of the entire Guard program. When we issue a regulation that uniforms are to be worn by technicians or

that haircuts are to conform to active force standards, it doesn't necessarily mean that we are in complete agreement with these decisions. These are the only decisions we can make or the decisions which, in our opinion, are in the best interests of the National Guard as a whole.

To show you how uncertain things are, four years ago we worked on a congressional bill for full technician retirement credit. We had assumed the bill was dead and would have to be reinitiated. All of a sudden—two weeks ago—to the surprise of everyone—it was passed nearly unanimously out of the Senate Post Office and Service Committee to be presented to the Senate. I can't even predict the fate of the bill but at least we're a step ahead of where we were.

I'm going to wrap up this discussion with you by briefly addressing three topics that we feel must be looked at as one—these are retention—recruiting—and public attitude toward the Guard. I say this because the public attitude plays a most important role in retention and recruiting. If Guard service is a nasty word in the public mind—if the public maintains little interest or no respect for military or National Guard programs—we are going to be unsuccessful in both retention and recruiting which will be the death of the Guard. To succeed in either area, we must first direct or complete efforts toward public, employer, and family support of the National Guard.

We have several things going for us but only Guardsmen themselves can disseminate these points to those outside the Guard.

The very vital role of the Guard in today's defense structure must be stressed and the total force concept must be explained. We must close the communications gap between the military and civilian communities and we must create an era of understanding, both in and outside the National Guard.

Business and political leaders and families can understand the importance of the national guard when it is explained to them—and when they are convinced the guard is and will be combat ready and responsive in event of any emergency requiring additions to the active forces. But, conversely, our commanders must understand the plight of the employer who has a small staff and is forced to relinquish the use of some of his vital employees for extra guard duty.

As both the army and air guard become more federal mission oriented, as we must under the total force concept, we find some state and federal leaders less enthusiastic about the national guard. This attitude is likely to increase as civil disturbances wane and the national guard image as a protector of life and property fades from lack of use.

The only antidote for this dilemma is an informative, widespread and consistent public information program which highlights the important national defense role of the national guard—the economic value of guard expenditures in your area—the increased skills and training the guard furnishes the civilian community—and last, but certainly not the least important, the community action role of the guard. Every community action project we undertake wins friends and supporters for our program. And, I am firmly convinced that we not only win supporters for the national guard through our nation-wide "operation patriotism" program, but additionally we help unite Americans to go forward as a united peoples toward attainment of a better world for all. We are facing a difficult period in the national guard. We must sustain a more combat ready, responsive posture, in a zero draft environment, and in a climate where public understanding and support for the military is at an extremely low point. The active forces are constantly analyzing our management of

resources and conduct of our overall program in view of the emphasis on our federal mission. We can expect only minimum essential increases in funding despite the increased requirements placed upon us and the added workloads of obtaining more sophisticated weapons systems.

Again, under these conditions we must increase retention and recruitment; we must produce effective minority recruitment programs; we must maintain the morale of our men and women and conduct an extensive community information and community action program. I must congratulate you outstanding guardsmen of Texas for being one of the leaders of the nation in fulfilling all of these vitally necessary requirements. Failure in any of these areas will jeopardize the existence of the units involved.

It's a challenging picture I've painted but that's just the way it is, I'm optimistic that our army and air guard commanders are capable of meeting this challenge.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in your conference.

PRICE CONTROL "ENFORCEMENT"

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times carried an article detailing one individual's frustrations with trying to get the Internal Revenue Service to investigate a price increase complaint. The amount involved was small, but the principle is not.

Few enough people even realize when they are being charged prices which violate price controls; to have such a lack of assistance for those who do realize it and complain about it is inexcusable.

I include the article at this point:

COMPLAINT ABOUT PRICES—HOLD ON—
HAVE FAITH

(By Philip Shabecoff)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—As of last week, about 80,000 complaints of possible violations of wage, price and rent controls had been lodged with the Internal Revenue Service since Phase Two began last November. This is a journal of what happened—or rather did not happen—to one of those complaints.

Feb. 13. Went to Alexandria, Va., and parked car in underground garage. When paying, seemed to recall that price just recently was 30 cents for first hour instead of the 50 cents now being charged. Asked attendant for base price list. Attendant grinned, scratched his head and said he was new there and did not know what it was all about.

Feb. 14—Looked up the number of the local Internal Revenue Service office in the District of Columbia telephone book, and after about a dozen rings it was answered by a man who said "taxpayer service." Asked if this was where one reported price violation. Voice answered yes, and asked what "complaint was about?" Recited grievance and was told to "hold on."

A few minutes later a female voice came on the line and asked, "What is your complaint?"

Repeated suspicions and then was told, "Okay. Hold on."

Female voice returned shortly and asked if the parking lot attendant had been asked for the price list. Replied in the affirmative.

"Okay. Hold on."

A few minutes later still another voice was heard at the end of the line. "This increase—did it involve a rented apartment?"

In calm voice replied that no, the complaint was about a parking lot and that two other I.R.S. officials had already been told about it.

"Okay. Hold on."

The female voice returned and asked for home address and said that revenue service would report on disposition of the complaint.

Feb. 16—Receive letter from I.R.S. saying complaint had been received and was being investigated.

Feb. 28: Hearing nothing further, called I.R.S. again and asked what had been done about complaint.

"Yours is not the only complaint, you know," said a female voice with a hint of asperity in it. "We get over 1,000 calls a day. These things take time."

Apologetically asked if an answer was still to be expected.

"Have a little faith in the I.R.S.," said the female voice. "We will get in touch with you to tell you the results of our investigation."

March 13: Faith in I.R.S. still alive but decided to reinforce faith with another call. Phone rang a dozen times and then voice answered, "The lines are busy; hold on please."

Four minutes and 20 seconds later a woman picked up the phone, listened to recitation of complaint and query on what had been done about it.

"Did you write your complaint in a letter?"

Informed that, no, the complaint had been made by telephone, the revenue service official said, "Oh, well that's at a different office downstairs. I can't transfer you but I'll give you the number."

Phone at other end of new number rang 25 times with no answer. Redialed original I.R.S. number.

"The lines are busy, hold on please."

When still another answered, took precaution of asking her name. It was Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Smith was sympathetic after listening to short, unhappy history of violation complaint. She carefully explained regulations involved and suggested that maybe it was not a violation anyway.

Agreed that maybe it was not a violation but that possibly it was and added it would be nice to know, one way or the other.

"Hold on," said Mrs. Smith.

Five minutes later Mrs. Smith was on again. "I checked with your investigators and they didn't have anything on your complaint. I asked our technical staff to look into it. We'll be in touch with you."

March 20—"The lines are busy, hold on please." After minute or so reached Mrs. Smith who said that she could not find any trace of complaint. "Where did you say you made the complaint? Where did you say the alleged violation took place, Baltimore? Oh, Alexandria. Let me check our other offices."

March 27—Mrs. Smith phoned office. "Sorry, we can find no record of your complaint. I suggest you submit it in form of letter." Thought about resubmitting complaint in form of letter.

April 7—Again thought about resubmitting complaint in form of letter.

April 21—Decided against resubmitting complaint in form of letter.

HARD LABOR BUILT THIS NATION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that every economic and social change which has occurred in this country can be traced to the labor of its working men

and women. Those who work with their hands, as well as those who work with their head, are responsible for this Nation attaining the highest standard of living of any which ever graced the face of the earth.

On Sunday, April 9, I had the honor and privilege of sharing in a public tribute to 108 men who toiled in the steel mills of Clairton, Pa., for a combined total of 3,605 years and 8 months. Their accumulated labor represents a total of more than 7 million man-hours. It represents the conversion of muscle and minutes into a serviceable product, vital to the national economy. It represents steel for autos, bridges, and buildings; steel for the defense of America and steel for the development of underprivileged countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the men honored that evening were members of Local 1557, USWA, who were retired during 1971. It has become the custom of the local to recognize the achievements of their members and I believe Mr. Daniel Hannan, president of Local 1557, and those who planned and participated in this tribute are to be commended for acknowledging the contribution these men made to all Americans and people everywhere.

It is with pride I insert the names of the honorees and their years of service into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

James E. Abraham, Jr., 19 years; Michael J. Anthony, 31 years, 2 months; George N. Baich, 27 years, 9 months; Albert G. Barone, 38 years; Ernest G. Barone, 36 years; Amerigo Bartolini, 30 years, 9 months; James Belland, 37 years, 8 months; Stephen Berchok, 34 years, 8 months; August J. Bertise, 20 years; Charles E. Biddle, 23 years.

Chester Boal, 29 years; Elmer Bowers, 35 years; Clyde A. Boyd, 47 years, 8 months; John E. Bricker, 30 years; John W. Bronkowski, 34 years, 7 months; Samuel Brown, 31 years; Edward O. Caton, 42 years, 9 months; Joseph M. Chasko, 35 years; Frank Cheplic, 33 years; Henry L. Christian, 19 years; Edwin S. Christy, 34 years, 1 month; Roosevelt Claybrook, 40 years, 8 months; Paul V. Conn, 17 years, 6 months.

Donald C. Crawford, 34 years; 6 months; Carl Dearfield, 44 years; John Driver, 22 years, 6 months; Elmer P. Eckert, 30 years; Louis M. Evans, 47 years; John R. Flynn, 26 years; Fred E. Foster, 15 years; Herman Frantz, 34 years, 3 months; Russell O. Fraser, 44 years, 5 months; James J. Gantz, 23 years; Ivy Garland, 31 years; Elio Ginanni, 34 years, 6 months; Joseph J. Grossi, 24 years; William Higgins, 30 years.

Nelson Hilliard, 19 years, 6 months; Henry R. Hood, 31 years; Charles Hopkins, 32 years; John M. Hrezo, 48 years; Albert Jackson, Jr., 23 years, 6 months; Daniel Kadar, 46 years; Lawrence M. Kaltenbaugh, 44 years; John Kelly, 21 years; George B. Kemple, 42 years; Alexander Kozieniak, 15 years; John J. Laptosky, 15 years; Charles LeMon, 28 years, 9 months; Robert E. Lewis, 35 years, 3 months; Matthew Little, 28 years, 2 months.

Edmund Lloyd, 20 years, 4 months; Patricio Loera, 39 years; Donald R. Luker, 37 years, 10 months; Michael Luksick, 42 years, 5 months; James V. Lundy, 45 years; Joseph F. McAtee, 42 years; Samuel McDonald, 45 years; Louis Maddox, 29 years; William Marovich, 38 years, 8 months; Thomas Maxey, 24 years, 11 months; Joseph J. Mayzel, 44 years, 3 months; Jacques Moragne, 43 years; Vincent J. Nardone, 35 years, 4 months; Roy W. Nordine, 42 years; James W. Patterson, Jr., 45 years; Kermit Payne, 44 years, 9 months.

Carl W. Penn, 35 years, 2 months; Russell W. Pfluger, 34 years, 9 months; Leonard D. Pickering, 35 years; Michael J. Popp, 30 years; John T. Price, 17 years, 10 months; Alfonso Rawls, 33 years, 8 months; Argyle Robinson, 45 years, 7 months; John Roman, 35 years; Joseph Ruzich, 28 years, 6 months; William V. Sacco, 40 years, 9 months; John F. Schultz, 44 years; John Shamber, 32 years; Hugh J. Shaw, 25 years, 7 months; Benjamin P. Simmons, 28 years, 7 months; Albert Smith, 43 years; Everett Smith, 23 years, 5 months.

James R. Smith, 41 years, 11 months; Alexander P. Stirbis, Jr., 35 years, 4 months; Joseph P. Stofka, Jr., 38 years; Clarence R. Sumney, 27 years; Stanley Sydorak, 25 years, 10 months; Curtis Tate, 28 years, 7 months; James B. Thomas, 34 years, 3 months; Michael Trbovich, 44 years, 6 months; John A. Tucci, 32 years; Charles A. Uhrinscko (Urinsco), 29 years; Francis J. Volpe, 29 years; Arthur F. Waldbaum, 47 years, 6 months; Eugene C. Walsh, 29 years, 3 months; John R. Walton, 43 years, 10 months.

John W. Webb, 41 years, 8 months; James Weightman, 45 years; Thomas H. Weightman, 29 years; James E. Williamson, 25 years; Thomas A. Wise, 39 years; Francis B. Wolf, 43 years; Adam Wood, 46 years; Stephen P. Woytko, 48 years; William Yesensky, 25 years; Steve N. Zonca, 41 years; and Samuel J. Gotto, deceased, 31 years.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH IS DISAPPOINTING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, opponents of abortion have been deeply shocked and dismayed by the recommendations of the Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Despite President Nixon's public opposition to abortion as an acceptable form of birth control, the Commission recommended the denial of life to unborn babies as a method of limiting the population growth of the Nation.

A group of students sharing my horror at the prospect of casually engaging in a practice akin to murder for the stated purpose of "controlling the population" was also horrified at the Com-

mission's report. The students have written President Nixon expressing their dismay. Mr. Speaker, I now request permission to insert their letter into the RECORD.

STUDENT UNION,
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
College Park, Md., April 3, 1972.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On April 3, 1971 you said in part: "... I consider abortion an unacceptable form of population control... For, surely, the unborn have rights, also, recognized in law, recognized even in the principles expounded by the United Nations."

And, now a year later, as we students of the middle-Atlantic area gather in conference to help protect human life, it seems especially appropriate to urge that you reject the recommendation contained in part II of the Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future that calls for the liberalization of state laws to provide abortion services supported by public funds.

We support your stated position and encourage its continuation. We ask that you not only reject the commission's report, but that you direct the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to insure his research agencies do not use public funds for abortion research in contravention of public law.

Specifically, the Center for Population Research, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health is reported to be exploring the use of microwaves and ultrasound in performing abortions. Section 1008 of Public Law 91-572 prohibits use of Federal funds whose expenditure it authorizes for any such purpose.

Finally, we are confident you will recognize our concern and accept our support of your stand against abortion. We ask that you deliver a telling blow against anti-life factions throughout this country by further courageous action.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. KOLB,
Chairman.

MARK VACCARO,
Vice-President, Public Relations.

MONICA S. THEIS,
Vice-President, Research.

RUTH HARDESTY,
Secretary.

FARLEY: NIXON CAN BE BEATEN

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the Scranton Pennsylvania Times on February 14, this year, printed an interview with James A. Farley under the title: "Farley: Nixon Can Be Beaten."

I thought my colleagues would be interested in the views of one who has played such an important role in the Democratic Party over the years. As a former National Chairman of the Democratic Party, he has drawn on a wealth of experience and though our views on the McGovern Commission, and other matters differ, his observations are of interest and give a perspective to a now almost historic era in Democratic Party politics.

The full text of the article follows:

[From the Scranton Times, Feb. 14, 1972]

FARLEY: NIXON CAN BE BEATEN

(By John Mosedale)

NEW YORK.—James A. Farley, who's been right in his day, thinks President Nixon can be defeated in his re-election bid.

The 83-year-old former Democratic national chairman and so-called "Kingmaker" of the Roosevelt administration, sees the nation's unsettled economic state as the President's vulnerable point. But he warns against any split in the Democratic party, such as the one following the Chicago Convention debacle of 1968.

His credentials are burnished by one of history's astonishing political prophecies. He founded observers in 1936 by correctly predicting that Alfred M. London, the Republican presidential candidate, would carry only two states.

A framed copy of that prediction, written for newspaper reporters, hangs at the entrance to the Madison Ave. offices where Farley serves as board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

NEVER MISSED

He says he has never missed calling, the result of a presidential election.

"In my judgment," says Farley, speaking carefully as befits a man who believes "the only thing a politician has to offer is his word."

"The President is going to be on the defensive, defending his campaign promise to balance the budget. He's wound up with three large budget deficits the Democratic leaders won't let him forget. There's not any doubt that there is a sort of unrest nationally."

"We've been through a depression, although a lot of people wouldn't refer to it that way. Along with the high cost of living there's been an increase in all kinds of taxes. Here in New York, the sales tax is 7 per cent. Some citizens moved to Florida to live on pensions or Social Security. Some don't have enough income to carry on due to the increased cost of living."

"Take the West Coast, with Lockheed and Boeing difficulties affecting thousands in California and Washington. Now people out of work and trying to support a family are not overly concerned about China. Unless we have a relapse in Vietnam, it looks as though we're on the way out. Otherwise, that's not a matter of concern—it's the cost of living that affects them."

He sits, tall as an Irish oak, behind a cluttered desk. The voice, like his handshake, is still firm. A crowded public life is reflected in office wall photographs of presidents—he has been on "speaking terms with seven"—and Popes—he has known five. There are other emblems, "the big and little fellows," he calls them.

He mentions "a substantial state official" who told him "in preparation of the 1971 budget, there was an expected 10 per cent tax revenue. Fact of the matter is that 2 per cent is what they collected. And that's what causes a lot of states and cities to be in trouble. Now they're seeking help from the federal government, but the federal government's in the same kind of fix."

Friendly to Sens. Muskie, Humphrey, and Jackson, he won't make his preference known now.

NIXON'LL LOSE IF...

All of this means "Nixon can be defeated and will be defeated." But Farley sounds a caveat: "If the Democrats come out of the convention without serious differences. A repetition of Chicago would be tragic, but there's no reason why there should be. All the candidates have a chance to make their positions known."

He expresses little sympathy with those who reject the will of the party "if they don't have their own way." (Early in his relationship with Franklin D. Roosevelt, he

refused to follow Roosevelt's lead in supporting a maverick for state officer. "I stuck with the organization choice because I was a party man, strongly opposed to rebels.")

Similarly, he takes a dim view of the reforms initiated by the McGovern Commission, aimed at assuring an open convention. "As one who played a vital role in the Democratic party for years, I don't feel the reforms could add anything to the final result. Many think they're necessary, but I don't happen to be one of them."

Should President Nixon be re-elected, Farley does not see his effectiveness limited by the 22nd Amendment, barring presidents from serving more than two terms. It is a matter close to heart. In one of the most celebrated splits in political history, Farley broke with Roosevelt over the third-term issue in 1940. Today, he believes that FDR served his last years "not in good physical shape. I feel certain that affected his decisions."

In spite of the bitterness of the break, Farley regards FDR as the most impressive president he has known, although "the greatest man and the one who had the most influence on me was Pope Pius XII."

Farley believes that he himself would have been history's first Catholic president if nominated. Celebrated as "Genial Jim," a man who could connect thousands of names and faces from coast to coast, he served eight years as Roosevelt postmaster general. "I was by far the best-known of the cabinet, including (Secretary of State Cordell) Hull, and I say to you very humbly, that I am one of the few men who is legendary in his own lifetime."

The presidency could seem hardly more exalted than Farley's Horatio Alger success story in politics and business. He was born in the Hudson River community of Grassy Point, N.Y., his father died when he was a boy.

He started his business career as a bookkeeper and headed his own contracting firm when he was still a young man. He was named Democratic committeeman at 20; two years later, the largely Protestant and Republican residents of Stony Point elected him as the first Catholic town clerk.

WAY TO WASHINGTON

Farley became Democratic chairman of Rockland County, hitching his wagon to the Alfred M. Smith star. Four years later, he was elected to the state Assembly. FDR won his first gubernatorial term with a 24,000-vote margin. The next time out, with Farley serving as state chairman, the margin was 725,000 votes and the road for both men pointed to Washington.

Circumstances for young people entering politics are totally different today, but Farley would remind them to "work hard and always tell the truth."

"May I say to you, very humbly that I never lied to anyone in my life. Across the country, you can never find anyone I lied to. My mother said, 'Jimmy, always tell the truth. It saves a lot of embarrassment, because you don't have to remember what you said.' That's as true now as it was a thousand years ago."

A believer that if you can't say something nice about someone, don't say it, Farley tends to pass over Republican presidents in silence. But he thinks President Kennedy "was destined to be a great president, if he hadn't been stricken down."

"I tie Johnson with Truman. I always felt that Truman would go down in history as one of our great presidents, included in any list of our six greatest. And I'm absolutely convinced that when historians of another day write in proper perspective about the Johnson administration, he will go down as a great president who, by his determination, brought about more beneficial legislation in civil rights than any other.

Roosevelt had a lot of effect on the economy, but not on civil rights."

Although it surprised him, Farley believes that Johnson's decision to step down was wise. "The problems and pressures of another year in office might have affected his health."

A widower, father of three children and a grandfather of 10, Farley is undismayed by the future. "I've always been optimistic and I'm optimistic now. We're having our problems, but they won't be permanent. Every generation of Americans has faced problems, and every generation has handled them better than the generation before."

A token of that optimism, almost hidden by photographs of the mighty, stands on a side desk. It is a small watercolor of a pastoral idyll: A Catholic church, a small schoolhouse "and out there to the left is where I played baseball as a boy. That was the model for the stamp when baseball celebrated its 75th anniversary. They took the cross off the top of the church so non-Catholics wouldn't be offended." The memory clearly amuses him.

SUMS HIM UP

Amid all the memorabilia, however, there is a constant. It is a battered card Farley carries in his wallet. He says he has quoted from it frequently on the banquet circuit.

It's attributed to "Andrew Oliver, Boston, Eighteenth Century," but you feel that it sums up Jim Farley.

"Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is no other in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm."

"There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul, nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor."

"With all its temptations and degradations that beset man, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

HADASSAH: A GLOWING HISTORY AND A BRIGHT FUTURE

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Hadassah—the Hebrew form of the name of the heroine of the Book of Esther—has been a significant factor in American Jewish life for six decades, through years of war and rumors of war. Beginning in 1912 with only 12 women, it has since become the largest Jewish women's organization in the world. Its membership today includes some 325,000 in 1,378 chapters in every State and in Puerto Rico.

Its initial objectives—as the Women's Zionist Organization of America—were the improving of health conditions in Palestine through the operation of a visiting nurse service and the encouragement of Jewish and Zionist education in the United States. Today Hadassah helps interpret Israel to the American people, provides basic Jewish education for American Jews, sponsors the largest Zionist youth organization in the United States—Hashachar—and operates Zionist youth camps in this country. In Israel, Hadassah supports a nation-

wide medical and public health system, including child-welfare and vocational-educational programs; provides maintenance and education for young newcomers through Youth Aliyah; and participates in the Jewish national fund land purchase and reclamation.

To a remarkable extent, Hadassah represents the fulfillment of a dream—the vision of Henrietta Szold, born in Baltimore in 1860. Her life-story is among the most inspiring in the annals of Jewish history. Daughter of a learned and zealous rabbi, she achieved fame in her own right by her literary and editorial achievements and by zeal for the Zionist cause. After founding Hadassah in 1912, she continued to give wise, patient, and energetic leadership.

She once said:

I see no sense in any movement which is not built up slowly.

During World War I, Hadassah sent a medical unit to Palestine, which opened hospitals and dispensaries in the major centers. Later, its medical and health activities were widely extended. The Youth Aliyah—immigration—movement was organized under the auspices of the Jewish agency. Today a vast network of curative, diagnostic, and research activities are maintained. The Hebrew University—Hadassah Medical School, the only medical school in Israel, opened in 1949. The Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center was dedicated in 1960. The Henrietta Szold School of Nursing was opened in 1918 at the end of the war.

Throughout the years, Hadassah has helped more than 100,000 children to take their responsible places in the Israeli community, including many rescued from Germany during the Second World War. Kfar Szold, a settlement of young German graduates of Youth Aliyah, was established in her honor.

In a troubled world, Hadassah has been a beacon of good-will and compassion, manifesting, as a legacy from its founder that wisdom which, enlightened by conscience and energized to suffering, is the hope of the world. May the women of Hadassah by sensitivity continue in years to come to fulfill the words of the Prophet Zachariah:

Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Execute true judgment, and show mercy and compassion every man to his brother.

Just a few days ago I had the pleasure of reading in Newsday a most interesting article written by Rhoda Amon which tells of how Hadassah's strength and dedication continues after 60 years.

I am sure my colleagues in the House will find this article most fascinating and for their pleasure and information, I include the Newsday article in today's RECORD:

[From Newsday, March 29, 1972]

HADASSAH IS 60—AND CHANGING

(By Rhoda Amon)

Hadassah, conceived 60 years ago by convention-flouting, knicker-wearing, social pioneer Henrietta Szold, and matured in purple-rouged mink, now wears sweaters and blue jeans.

The Zionist women's organization, founded to perpetuate Jewish culture in America and to aid the people of Palestine (now Israel), is the nation's largest women's group. Its mem-

bership of 325,000 raised \$21,000,000 last year to support Hadassah medical and educational programs in Israel. Less publicized, and, so far, less effective, has been Hadassah's American Affairs Action program aimed at educational problems and poverty in the U.S.

But despite its formidable dedication and undeniable good works, Hadassah, like the much maligned Jewish mother, has suffered from image trouble: the stereotype of the bejeweled, carefully coiffed, canasta-playing club woman—although Hadassah leaders say this was never really true. Anyway, they say, Hadassah is changing.

Most of the new members (5,000 joined last year) are young marrieds such as Bonnie Behar, who conducts Hadassah study meetings in dungarees, talking about such things as the Black Panthers in the U.S. and Israel. Mrs. Behar, 28, founded a Hadassah chapter soon after she and her psychologist husband became "the second Jewish couple" to move into Old Wethersfield on the Connecticut River.

"If anyone had, told me five years ago—or even three years ago—that I'd be heading a Hadassah, oh wow," says Mrs. Behar, whose younger brother is a Yoga priest in Greenwich Village.

Although she's a third generation Hadassah member (her mother, Irene Ruza, is president of the Queens New York region), young Mrs. Behar says her Hadassah style is different than her mother's. "I'd retch before I could go to a luncheon in a hat and gloves," she says.

She shares the impatience of the intensely serious young for members of an older generation whom she considers frivolous. "My mother can put up with people I can't stand for two minutes," she says, "people who don't know about anything except what they're wearing."

Her mother takes a more tolerant view. Mrs. Ruza says she suspects that the image of the "Hadassah lady in a mink stole" is a figment of "our own tribal self-deprecation."

Besides, she adds, the chic Hadassah woman at a donor's luncheon is "not just going for a meal. She's contributing to Hadassah's Youth Aliyah, for instance, which rescued 135,000 children from Nazi Germany, and to vocational training and education and hospitals and medical care for children whom she will never see."

At a luncheon and fashion show given by the Suffolk County region of Hadassah, Judith Epstein, former national president, delivers a fiery speech, no less impassioned after more than 50 years on the circuit, imploring the 225 suburban housewives to keep Israel alive and make Jewish life in this country more glorious.

Later, the 76-year-old great-grandmother reflects on her beginnings as an avid Zionist just out of Hunter College in 1916: "Some of our group were immigrants or the children of immigrants who remembered the terrible pogroms in Russia and Poland. We dreamed of a Jewish homeland but didn't expect to see it in our lifetime. At that time it was sort of queer to be a Zionist," she recalls, as a silvery made-in-Israel gown is modeled by a young Hadassah housewife.

She describes the typical Hadassah woman today as "family-oriented, not likely to go into a career or become involved with women's lib. At these luncheons, the conversations are likely to be about the cost of food," she says.

Of Hadassah's efforts to reclaim the restless young who turned their back on Jewish family traditions, she says, "We tell them, 'Why go to India to find what you are seeking? We will give it to you right here.'"

Many young Hadassah women say they joined because of family connections. Their mothers belong. Grandmothers, too. Some were turned off during college days but came back after they married. "They become al-

most anti-Jewish until they have children, then they become devout," says one young member. Some go so far as to "keep kosher," although their mothers do not. "Confidentially, my mother-in-law belongs and I thought it would be a good idea if I joined," says a recent bride.

But Randy Weisbad, 19, a Hadassah daughter who came to the luncheon to baby-sit, says she isn't sure what Hadassah really is, or, for that matter, what Judaism is. "Most young Jews don't know what Jewish is, except it is not being Christian," she says. "I went to the temple school but they didn't teach us anything about being Jewish, just stupid things like how many Jews fought in the Revolutionary War. What I want to hear," she says, "is that Jewish is beautiful."

Marjorie Shukow, 23, a graduate art student at C. W. Post, says she is beginning to feel more positive about Hadassah: "The older I get the more positive I feel."

A trip to Israel, she says, helped her understand "where all that energy is going."

Marjorie's mother, Blanche Shukow, president of Suffolk's 2,000 member Hadassah, says, "I always knew that when I grew up I'd be a member. My mother was an officer and it seemed like a prestigious thing to be."

Blanche's mother, Goldie Warshaw, joined Hadassah in 1930 after she moved from Brooklyn to Huntington. "I wanted to meet Jewish people," she says.

The late Fannie Zornberg, before she died in her 90th year, had led her grandchildren to Hadassah by awarding them life memberships (a \$150 donation).

"My mother-in-law always said she wanted to give us something we wouldn't exchange for size, fit or color," explains Mrs. Doris Zornberg, who runs a Garden City bridal shop.

But her middle daughter, Ellen, a 23-year old sportswear buyer, says her gift of Hadassah didn't mean much initially: "I always thought of Hadassah as an older ladies' group, something my aunts belonged to." What changed her thinking she says, was the formation of an "under-30" group composed mostly of Zornberg granddaughters and friends, and named for Fannie Zornberg. It took a bit of pushing for the name, Mrs. Zornberg confesses, because Hadassah prefers to give its groups symbolic Hebrew names such as *Chai*, meaning "life."

"I'm happy to be part of a young people's group," Ellen says, "we have a social function. . . ."

"That's not true," interrupts her younger sister Ann, 17, who spent last summer with an American teenage group "building roads" in Israel. "You have to become involved in Israel to see that it (Hadassah) is real. . . ."

"I think you're wrong," replies Ellen.

Susan Zornberg Lummis, 27, interrupts both her sisters to tell of her own return to Judaism as a way of life, after growing up in Garden City, a WASP-oriented community.

"We felt so isolated," Mrs. Lummis says. "I just wanted to run away from Judaism. But now I see it as a good communal way of life." Hadassah, she says, has brought her closer to her family.

Her husband, William (Bud) Lummis, born and raised a Catholic, sometimes gets so carried away at Hadassah functions, he stands up and "pledges. But if we give \$10, that's a lot," Mrs. Lummis says.

In recent years, Hadassah has made tentative moves to diversify the energy formerly concentrated on aiding Israel. Hadassah's American Affairs program, which seeks to educate members on current American issues ("We don't take a stand on busing, for instance, but we want to know the pros and cons"), was expanded three years ago into an American Action program.

Nassau County's 14,000 Hadassah members are encouraged to tutor in schools, aid in the poverty program (particularly in

teaching nutrition) and donate blood, according to Miriam Driesman, an avid Zionist since age 8 when she joined the "Young Judea" movement, now combined with Junior Hadassah and called Hashachar or "The Dawn."

"We're not just fund-raisers, we're also concerned with being informed American citizens," says the region's president. Nassau Hadassah is holding a public affairs institute Monday at Molloy Catholic College.

Although some volunteer projects have faded, many members, such as Betty Ann Friedman, a Nassau Hadassah vice president, have remained deeply involved. Mrs. Friedman serves on the board of Mobilized Community Resources, and on the Economic Opportunity Commission's community information committee. "It's like dropping a pebble in the pond, the circles spread and spread," she says.

However, Hadassah volunteers sometimes find their local community improvement efforts somewhat more frustrating than raising money to dredge Haifa Bay or build the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center.

"We got all enthused about the city's 'paint-a-park' program," reports Carol Weir, president of the Jackson Heights Adina (friend) group. "The city was going to give us paint to fix up Traverse Park," she recalls, but the paint didn't arrive until winter when enthusiasm had waned.

Adina is one of a number of young women's groups split from the mother chapter in the last few years in the effort to recruit young people. "Our girls don't go to Hadassah luncheons," she said. ". . . we go out with the children and sell balloons, things like that."

Cathie Sabot, 25, says her Dimona group in Kew Gardens, mostly "liberated young housewives," gets together twice a week, not always for Hadassah business: "We shop together, talk, play with each other's children, and one group is dieting together."

In Suffolk's Wilshire Greens development, young housewives formed the Kings Park Hadassah this year. At one of the first spring programs, according to president Marion Levy, a landscaping expert will advise the new homeowners. What does that have to do with Hadassah?

"We'll tie it in with the Jewish National Fund reforestation—planting trees in Israel," Mrs. Levy explains.

There is always the tie-in. Although Hadassah holds members to its original Zionist goal ("a model utopian state based on Jewish law") and to their annual quota for Israel ("It's an inner compulsion; we couldn't live with ourselves if we didn't"), Zionist leaders smile on a number of variations that keep members happy and attached.

"But I will never get used to dungarees at Hadassah meetings," confesses Judith Epstein, adjusting her mink hat on snowy-white hair.

MOSCOW CONFERENCE: BRIEFING FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, at an early date President Nixon plans to visit Moscow for conferences with high leaders of the slave empire known as the U.S.S.R. In preparation for it, he will be briefed by those guiding the formulation of U.S. foreign policies, which include members of the Council on Foreign Relations of New York—CFR.

In his book on the Invisible Government—Western Islands Press, 1962—Dan Smoot summarizes the history of the Council on Foreign Relations and states that its ultimate aim is the same as the ultimate aim of international communism: To create a one-world socialist system and make the United States an official part of it. This means the dismantling of the U.S. Constitution, which the President of the United States is bound by oath to "preserve, protect and defend"—article II, section 7. Richard M. Nixon was listed in the Smoot book as a nonresident member of the CFR.

Dan Smoot has written a briefing for the President in preparation for the coming Moscow visit emphasizing that whenever we negotiate with Communists any kind of agreement concerning national security we invite disaster.

In order that our colleagues may have the benefit of Dan Smoot's briefing, which differs from the President's anticipated briefing, I include it as part of these remarks along with related news clippings:

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT—A BRIEFING FOR THE PRESIDENT

Alluding to the unbroken series of wrong decisions which our government had made in dealings with Soviet officials, James Forrestal (Secretary of the Navy and later the first U.S. Secretary of Defense) said: "Consistency never has been a mark of stupidity. If the diplomats who have mishandled our relations with Russia were merely stupid, they would occasionally make a mistake in our favor."

That was in 1945. It would be as difficult now as then to find a "mistake in our favor" that any U.S. President has made in dealing with the Soviets since Roosevelt first embraced them in 1933. President Nixon's consistency—in breaking his specific promises to American voters, in order to make deals that benefit the Communist slave empire—threatens to be more disastrous than that of any previous President.

Before Mr. Nixon went to Communist China, he was briefed on the thoughts of Chairman Mao, so that the Communist dictators would be pleased with him. Presumably, before his trip to Moscow in May, he will be briefed on what to say and how to act in order to please the Communist dictators of Russia. As a gesture, but without any hope that it will be seen in the White House (or heeded if seen), I want to present another kind of briefing—a briefing that ought to make a President of the United States blush and apologize for ever having considered a trip to visit the Kremlin.

Fifty-five years ago—March 15, 1917—a revolution in Russia forced the Czar to abdicate. He was taken into protective custody; and Alexander Kerensky formed a Provisional Government. Bolshevik leaders were in exile at the time: Lenin in Switzerland, Stalin in Siberia, Trotsky in the United States. But they returned and, on November 7, 1917, bolsheviks overthrew the Kerensky Government. A small group of political gangsters, they established themselves in power with a prolonged orgy of human butchery.

Such a system of "government," initiated in a bloodbath that horrified the civilized world, and founded on economic and political dogmas that could bring only poverty and slavery, should have been doomed to early failure in the enlightened Twentieth Century. Yet, 55 years later, Communist tyranny, extending over one-fourth of the land area of the earth, controls more than one-third of the world's population. Does this prove that

there is something genuinely dynamic in the economic and political dogmas of Communism? No! Communism has survived and spread because it has been rescued, at every major crisis in its history, by the non-Communist nation which it has always openly designated as its primary enemy—the United States of America.

In June of 1918—after having silenced opponents—the Soviet regime of Lenin and Trotsky tried to establish diplomatic relations with the United States. American recognition would strengthen the Soviet regime economically and give it respectability, both at home and abroad. Our government rejected the bolsheviks' numerous overtures for diplomatic recognition. On October 27, 1919, Robert Lansing (then Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State) explained to Congress why. He said:

"The purpose of the bolsheviks is to subvert the existing principles of government and society the world over . . . They have built up a political machine which, by the concentration of power in the hands of a few and the ruthlessness of its methods, suggests the Asiatic despotism of the early Czars."

In 1920, Bainbridge Colby (who had replaced Lansing as Wilson's Secretary of State) explained, in even stronger terms, our nonrecognition policy. Yet, in 1920, the Wilson Administration did lift its ban on commercial relations with the Soviet Union.

The bolshevik seizure of power in Russia (accompanied not only by mass murders, but also by a repudiation of all debts and confiscation of private property) precipitated a great famine and civil war. By 1921, approximately 14 million people in Russia had been killed. Nothing could have saved the Soviet regime but outside help, and the United States Government provided it.

During the Harding Administration (1921-1923), the American Relief Administration (under the direction of Herbert Hoover) distributed more than \$63 million worth of food inside Russia. The Soviet regime took credit, of course, for the relief thus given the starving population—the result being that American aid not only saved the Soviets economically, but politically, making their survival possible.

In 1924, the death of Lenin set off a power struggle between Trotsky and Stalin. In 1928, Stalin triumphed, and instituted a "new socialist offensive."

Stalin launched the first five-year plan for rapid industrialization. Because of the commercial agreements made by the Wilson Administration in 1920, the Soviets were able to get machinery and technical assistance from the United States. Russian engineers came to the United States for training in American factories and universities, while American engineers helped build basic industries in the Soviet Union.

Stalin's crash program of industrialization produced, however, another great famine, and disorder bordering on civil war. Farmers, resisting the confiscation of their land for collectivization, were killed or sent to slave labor camps in Siberia. Ten million, 300 thousand persons were "liquidated" in the Ukraine; 4,500,000 in Byelorussia; 422,000 in the Caucasus. Western businessmen having learned that it was impossible to do business with Communists, the limited sources of credit that the Soviets had previously had in Western nations began to dry up. Worst of all—from Stalin's viewpoint—was the danger of war with Russia's ancient enemy, Japan.

Only one thing could save the Soviet tyranny at this juncture: diplomatic recognition by the United States Government. Though warned by Hoover holdovers in the State Department that American recognition of the Soviet regime would fasten slavery on the Russian people and preserve Communism as a threat to world peace, Franklin D. Roose-

velt granted diplomatic recognition in November of 1933.

Hope of successful rebellion was temporarily crushed inside the Soviet Union; commercial credit again became available in Western nations for the Soviets; and, Japan was mollified. The Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs said:

"If those two countries [the U.S. and U.S.S.R.] continue in favorable relations for years to come, they will teach a lesson to the world that capitalism and communism can agree. And if that is realized, it will be unnecessary for Japan to fear communism."

Following American recognition of the Soviets, Stalin liquidated millions of his enemies, or suspected enemies, in bloody purges that lasted until the eve of World War II. Meanwhile, the Roosevelt Administration built an unbroken record of giving the Soviets everything they wanted, asking nothing in return: permitting them to ignore their old \$628 million debt to us; to persecute and murder American nationals in Russia; to harass our Embassy officials; to set up their espionage, sabotage, and subversive networks in America, despite their treaty promise not to do so.

When World War II began, Stalin joined Hitler as an ally. While propagandists in the United States were filling Americans with fear and hatred of the Nazis, relatively little was said about their partners, the Communists, who were playing jackals to the Nazi beasts of prey. In the rape of Poland, for example, the Nazis annexed 72,866 square miles of Polish territory in the west; the Communists annexed 77,620 square miles of eastern Poland. The Communists also annexed Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and parts of Finland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

On June 22, 1941, Hitler abruptly turned on his Communist ally. Stalin's purges of the Thirties had liquidated so many military officers that the cumbersome, poorly equipped Soviet forces were without adequate command. Nothing could have saved the Soviets from utter destruction except massive outside aid; and the American Government gave it.

Senator Robert A. Taft and former President Herbert Hoover, among others, warned that Communism posed a grave danger to the United States—and urged Roosevelt to stay out of the war and let Hitler and Stalin, two of the bloodiest tyrants in history, destroy each other. To no avail: massive American "lend-lease" aid started flowing to the Soviets almost six months before Pearl Harbor.

When war came to us, it came from the Pacific. Yet, Roosevelt starved our operations in the Pacific, where an enemy actually threatened our homeland, giving first priority to aiding the Soviets in Europe.

During World War II, the Soviets received \$11 billion worth of supplies and equipment from us under the lend-lease program. Without our aid, the Soviet armies would have been immobile and helpless before the onslaught of the Germans. During the last two years of lend-lease, we gave the Soviets mountainous quantities of materials for the building of industries after the war: entire industrial plants, oil refineries, railroad rolling stock, merchant ships, aircraft, trucks, tractors, machine tools.

Though the Soviets refused to help us in the Pacific theater—even to the extent of breaking diplomatic relations with Japan—we made no protest when they entered the war against Japan only six days before the surrender. Soviet Siberian armies, equipped and supplied by America, occupied Manchuria and Korea, stripping them of more than a billion dollars' worth of war booty, setting up Communist puppet governments before withdrawing.

Armed, in part, with weapons and supplies that the Soviets had taken from the

Japanese in Manchuria, or had obtained from the United States, the Communists began the conquest of Mainland China.

At the close of the war, we gave the Soviets and their Communist puppet governments billions of dollars (through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), thus financing the Communist conquest of a tier of European states from the Baltic to the Adriatic. By needlessly permitting the Soviets to occupy Germany and Czechoslovakia, we enabled them to kidnap scores of German scientists (who provided the scientific and technological knowledge for postwar development in Russia) and to loot from those nations industrial plants and equipment. Our postwar aid to European nations along the Iron Curtain funneled more industrial goods into the Soviet Union; and Soviet agents in the United States obtained our atomic-energy secrets.

All of this permitted the Soviets to be credited as a major nuclear power within a few years after World War II, whereas her socialist economy, unaided, could not have provided the bare necessities of life.

In 1953, Joseph Stalin died. This was another dangerous interval for the Soviets. The most monstrous dictatorship in history was suddenly without a dictator. Very soon, the Communist slave empire started to blow apart at the seams. In June of 1953, three months after Stalin died, there was rebellion in East Germany. This defiance of Soviet tyranny was so electrifying to the people enslaved by Communism that its reverberations spread all the way to Siberia, inspiring an attempted rebellion in Vorkuta, where 250,000 slave laborers mined coal to fuel Soviet industries.

Again, our government helped save the Soviets at a critical moment. Afraid that the turmoil in East Germany might aggravate the delicate situation in Berlin and precipitate war, the Eisenhower State Department maneuvered to help keep the anti-Communist movement in Germany divided and leaderless, until Soviet tanks and machine-guns suppressed the uprising. Then, Eisenhower gave the Soviets American food to placate the people of East Germany. When the East German rebellion died, the rebellion in Vorkuta died also; and the flame of hope was extinguished behind the Iron Curtain.

Three years later (1956), the people of Poland and Hungary revolted. Once again, the Soviet slave empire was about to disintegrate; and, again, the U.S. Government helped save it. The most serious revolt was in Hungary. The Eisenhower State Department exerted pressure to prevent Hungarian freedom-fighters from getting Spanish aid through West Germany.

Two years later, the Eisenhower Administration performed another great service for the Soviet Union by agreeing to a moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere.

During a series of nuclear tests in 1958, Soviet scientists observed that X-rays, spewed out by a nuclear blast, are absorbed by the atmosphere; but, when emitted above the atmosphere, X-rays travel with the speed of light for thousands of miles carrying enormous energy. The Soviets stopped their tests and started experiments to utilize the X-ray phenomenon for development of an anti-missile weapon. In order to halt our nuclear research meanwhile, they launched a worldwide propaganda campaign for a moratorium on nuclear testing.

On October 31, 1958, representatives from the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. met at Geneva for the first "test-ban talks." They agreed to suspend all testing of nuclear weapons while the talks continued. Eisenhower kept the agreement, permitting no American nuclear testing during the remainder of his Administration. Kennedy continued the ban.

The Soviets violated the moratorium, to the extent necessary for experiments to develop an X-ray missile killer. By late summer 1961, they were ready to set off nuclear

explosions in and above the atmosphere to test the weapon on which they had been working. Abruptly announcing that the moratorium was ended, they conducted testing until they had enough information to proceed with an anti-missile weapon. Then, to keep us from research testing of a similar nature, the leaders of the Soviet Union demanded more talks to end nuclear testing.

Complying with Soviet wishes, President John F. Kennedy continued to prohibit American nuclear testing, though he acknowledged (March 2, 1962) that Soviet developments had put the Free World in grave danger; that the United States "cannot make similar strides without testing in the atmosphere as well as underground"; and, that "in many areas of nuclear weapons research we have reached the point where our progress is stifled without experiments in every environment."

Despite objections by top military men and leading scientists, our government signed a test-ban treaty with the Soviets in July of 1963. The Senate ratified it two months later.

Unless we violate or repudiate that treaty, we cannot develop effective defense against missiles—a defense with which the Soviets are already credited. The Soviets, of course, were violating the test-ban treaty while it was being negotiated; and they have violated it frequently and with impunity ever since.

"Liberals" have acclaimed the test-ban treaty of 1963 a great triumph of diplomacy. President Johnson used it as a steppingstone toward several other treaties with the Soviets—the most dangerous of which was the Outer Space Treaty of 1967. By signing that treaty, we promised not to use space for military purposes—knowing full well that military use of space could become vital to the survival of our nation; knowing full well that the Soviets will use space as they please, contemptuous of their treaty pledges and contemptuous of us for placing our trust in them. In fact, the Soviets have been violating the Outer Space Treaty ever since it was written.

Uniformly, our agreements and treaties with the Soviets have always ended in disadvantage for us, great advantage for them.

To Communists, the give-and-take of negotiations means that Communists take and the other side gives. If they want an agreement to bind the other side, Communists may promise something in return; but they never keep a promise that requires them to do something they do not want to do or to refrain from doing something they want done.

Consequently, whenever we negotiate with Communists any kind of agreement having anything to do with our national security, we invite disaster. We limit our activities in order to comply with the terms of the agreement, but the Communists do not.

This is the grim prospect that faces our nation as President Nixon prepares for his Moscow trip, expressing confidence that he will get concrete results in talking with the Soviets about strategic-arms limitation and other forms of disarmament.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Apr. 20, 1972]

U.S.S.R. BUILDS NORTH VIET AIR FORCE

While President and Mrs. Nixon polish up their wardrobes in order to make a good impression in the Soviet Union, the Soviet Communists are concerning themselves with much more practical matters, such as speeding up their aid to Communist North Vietnam.

Of course, if you drag out the war long enough, you give your enemy a chance to build up his defenses and his strength. So what is happening in North Vietnam is what any intelligent person could have anticipated.

North Vietnam, with the aid of the USSR,

is going to develop an air force with which they can bomb Saigon and make our own air power in support of South Vietnam of no avail.

The incredible thing is that this Soviet buildup of the North Vietnamese air force has been permitted to go on without any protest from the United States. As Mr. Khrushchev said a long time ago of the United States, "When you spit in their face, they call it dew."

President Nixon will now go to Moscow to talk about peace and the Soviet dictators will say behind their hands to each other, "What a fool this man is, coming over here and being nice to us while we are getting ready to cut the United States' throat in Vietnam."

And they will be right.

WILLIAM LOEB, Publisher.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Apr. 20, 1972]

SOVIET BUILDS UP NORTH VIET AIR POWER

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The arrival in North Vietnam of a large Soviet military delegation of bomber and defense experts is being closely watched by the Joint Chiefs of Staff here and by the U. S. military commands in Saigon and Pearl Harbor.

The Russian delegation is headed by Air Marshal Pavel Batitsky, a Deputy Defense Minister and Commander of Soviet Air Defense Forces. His surprise appearance in Hanoi with the Air Force delegation is viewed here to be of major military significance for two reasons.

Marshal Batitsky is the Soviet's number one expert on the use of the new SU-7, medium range Russian attack bomber. The appearance of Marshal Batitsky's delegation follows the arrival of more than 20 of the SU-7's in North Vietnam.

For several months, American intelligence authorities have been gathering information showing that the Russians had completely modernized the North Vietnamese Air Force and that Moscow is responsible for the increased aggressiveness of its pilots.

This aggressiveness of the North Vietnamese Air Force already has shown up in the air over Laos. Soviet-made MIG-21s have been attacking U. S. aircraft bombing Communist bases and supply routes in Northern Laos. Unsuccessful attempts also have been made by the North Vietnamese pilots against high-flying American B-52 bombers.

Even more disturbing are reports that the 200-aircraft North Vietnamese air force is planning a series of sneak attacks against U.S. military installations. Most likely targets are the Big B-52 bomber bases in Thailand and the four American Navy aircraft carriers now operating off the coast of Vietnam in or near the Gulf of Tonkin.

With the arrival of the SU-7s in North Vietnam, Hanoi now has the capability to carry out such sneak attacks for the first time. From bases in North Vietnam, the SU-7, have sufficient range to strike targets anywhere in South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, or in the waters of Vietnam.

The tremendous speed of the SU-7s make these Soviet jet bombers more than a match for most of the aircraft now being used to defend the Navy's carriers operating in the Vietnam waters.

The sinking of an American Aircraft carrier, carrying anywhere from 75 to 125 aircraft and several thousand personnel, is known to be one of Hanoi's top military objectives.

In recent weeks, North Korean crews trained in SU-7s in that country have arrived in North Vietnam via Communist China. The voices of the North Korean pilots have been picked up by American listening stations which monitor plane to ground voice transmissions in North Vietnam.

This means that the North Korean pilots are now flying both SU-7s and MIG-21s. The MIG fighters would be used to fly protection for any bomber strikes against American carriers or B-52 bases in Thailand.

The voices of the Chinese and Soviet pilots flying in military aircraft over North Vietnam have been picked up in recent weeks by U.S. monitoring stations. The Soviet pilots are training North Vietnamese in the operations of the SU-7s and the MIG-21s. The mission of the Chinese Communist pilots in North Vietnam is still a mystery.

The Soviet buildup of the North Vietnamese airforce, which the U.S. has permitted to go on without even a diplomatic protest, is only part of the increasing military aid the Kremlin is sending to Hanoi.

More than 200 Iron Curtain vessels, carrying everything from SAM, ground to air missiles to Soviet tanks and rockets, have unloaded at North Vietnam ports since January 1. Included in the deliveries are a number of FROG missile launchers, capable of firing ground-to-ground rockets nearly 60 miles. The rockets are being installed along the North Vietnamese coast and in fire bases just above the Demilitarized Zone, separating North from South Vietnam.

In addition to the 140mm rockets which are being positioned in the DMZ, the Russians have delivered the longer-ranged 200mm rockets. These rockets will permit the North Vietnamese to outgun the South Vietnamese and American forces still remaining in South Vietnam.

The 200mm rockets can shoot the U.S. 175mm "Big Tom" field guns. As a consequence, American and South Korean forces are being compelled to erect strong defenses capable of withstanding rocket bombardments.

The build-up of military supplies in North Vietnam clearly indicates that the Russians are backing Hanoi's plans to try to have an impact on the coming Presidential campaign and election by launching a series of military offensives in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia during the summer and fall months.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF JOHN ARTHUR THOMAS AT NEWARK'S CRISPUS ATTUCKS-MARTIN LUTHER KING MEMORIAL PARADE—1972

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 it was my great privilege to participate in the city of Newark's annual parade to honor the memories of two great black Americans—Crispus Attucks and the Reverend Martin Luther King. Both gave their lives for our country, Crispus Attucks on the field of battle to win independence for America and Martin Luther King in a peaceful campaign to win equity, dignity, and respect for black Americans. It is a source of pride to me that Newark each year sets aside a day to pay tribute to them.

This year the parade was fortunate to have as its keynote speaker Mr. John Arthur Thomas, founder of the Crispus Attucks Society. Mr. Thomas delivered an eloquent, memorable address which truly conveyed the purpose and spirit of the occasion as one when black Americans can let their dreams "throughout

the length and breadth of this land be the beacon of light that rids this Nation of hypocrisy, racism, and disunity." Mr. Thomas' address is one that offers inspiration to all who seek to further the ideals of equality, justice, and unity in America, and I insert it in the RECORD. The address follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY JOHN ARTHUR THOMAS, FOUNDER, CRISPUS ATTUCKS SOCIETY AND CRISPUS ATTUCKS PARADE COMMITTEE

Our own Mayor Kenneth Gibson, visiting Black municipal chief executives from across our nation, members of the Newark City Council, visiting dignitaries representing various levels of government and multi-racial organizations from near and far, welcome guests who have filled the stands here at City Hall and most important of all any Black Brothers and Sisters of every age and category. I feel good! I feel good because the 7th Annual Attucks-King Memorial Parade is a living reality and Black people within the sound of my voice and throughout this nation know that "they are somebody."

As is my custom, whenever I am asked to participate in celebrations of this kind, I would like to pause to inject some of the poetic music of our late and lamented Black Poet Laureate, Langston Hughes. So apropos for the auspicious occasion is an often-neglected expression of Hughes' entitled "Dreams." It reads thus:

DREAMS

Hold fast to dreams
For if dreams die
Life is a broken-winged bird
That cannot fly.
Hold fast to dreams
For when dreams go
Life is a barren field
Frozen with snow.

—LANGSTON HUGHES.

Unfortunately, in this era of change, conflict, confusion, chaos and cajolement, men and women and children seemed to have lost sight of the significance of dreams and dreamers. So frequently, the "rhetoric of the day" espouses how nonsensical it is to consume one's time in the process of imaginative reflection, or to exchange ideas with those purported to have fanciful visions of the future. To this I say, learn what constitutes the ingredients of a dream or what it entails to be truly classified as a dreamer. Summarily, the ingredients of a dream are:

- A desire to chance the status quo
- A vision for the future
- A high level goal or objective
- An introduction to a plan of action
- A notion that affects people
- An element of doubt or fear and a
- Need for God's assistances

Likewise, the dreamer must desire to be an agent of change, he must think on a high level, he must understand his introductory role, he must anticipate possible failure, but above all he must seek heavenly assistance.

At this point, some of you in the audience may say "what does all of this talk about dreams and dreamers have to do with the Attucks—King Parade, with music being the soul of freedom, or with Black leadership in general? Well, I know I have the answer to these inquiries. First, our early Black martyr, Crispus Attucks—whom we honor today—was a dreamer. Often at night and perhaps frequently in the daytime, as he embattled the shackles of slavery on the Framingham, Massachusetts farm of his owner, he dreamed of one day being a free man. History tells us that once having achieved the objective of escaping to freedom, Attucks had reveries of sailing the seven seas.

Finally, his dream of leading men to action became a reality although it was inadvertently stymied at the Boston Massacre.

Few people in the universe can honestly deny that our modern martyr Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. possessed all of the qualifications of a man of vision. He sought the Almighty in all of his laudable undertakings. He often spoke of anticipated failure possibilities. He constantly elucidated high level goals and objectives and as we all know, he was brutally taken from us because he was America's most significant agent of change. We all know that Dr. King "had a dream!"

But Brothers and Sisters, dreams as an end in themselves are only a conglomerate of fanciful visions. Dreams without implementation or dreamers, without supportive action, are doomed to failure. As is often deleted in textbooks of American history, the true meaning of the dedicated theme of today's parade "Music—The Soul of Freedom" remains a mystery to a multitude of Americans—Black and White. Slaves who dreamed of freedom used work songs, spirituals and songs of joy to develop a network of communications that provided underground railroad schedules, hiding places for travelling escapees, warning systems and general information to keep Black people informed of the plans and actions of slave owners. Take such well known hymns as:

"We Shall Meet Beyond the River
Where He Leads Me I Will Follow
Wade in the Water (children)
No Room in the Inn

Throw Out the Lifeline and We will Meet
Him In the Sweet By and By"

These and many other songs had more than one meaning to our Brothers and Sisters of the past. However, what is significant to note is that the Blacks knew how to keep a secret. One of the hurdles of present day Blacks in America is that they must tell everything they know. No wonder we are the most researched and studied group in this country! We provide the researcher all he needs to know without a struggle. We make it easy for friend and foe alike to know our plans almost before they leave the drawing board. Perhaps, we need to start singing some new songs which will tell us one thing and tell our enemies another. Perhaps, we should write songs that can show us the routes of the present day underground railroad to true freedom and equality. Perhaps, also, we must re-learn the significance of communicating with a plan, rather than communicating to impress.

Another important factor related to songs of freedom and my final point of the after-Black Leadership—is Trust. Our Brothers and Sisters of the past could never have achieved their objectives without trusting one another. The future development of Black leadership in America must be built upon a super-structure of trust and humility. I add the component of humility because a source of conflict in Black leadership has been the failure of leaders of one Black group to humble their position to others for the sake of Black Solidarity.

However, the ingredients of trust and humility will still produce fruitless leadership without the component of respectability. Not only followers respecting leaders but leaders respecting the philosophy, plans, actions and dreams of other leaders. No one Black leader has insight to dictate policies and procedures for all Black Americans—in past, now or in the future!

Finally, in summary let me reiterate the lines of Hughes:

Hold fast to dreams
For when dreams go
Life is a barren field
Frozen with snow.

Let not the dreams of this day end in frozen waste. Let not the dreams of this day fade into the darkness of planned decentralization of Black Americans. Let not the dreams of this day lead Black children astray.

APRIL 24, 1972.

Rather, let the dreams of Black Americans throughout the length and breadth of this land be the beacon of light that rids this nation of hypocrisy, racism and disunity. Then posterity will say the true light of America was in the "Souls of Black Folk."

WORLD AIRWAYS HAILS BREAKTHROUGH IN AUSTRALIAN AIR CHARTER

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the largest supplemental air carrier in the Nation, World Airways, headquartered at the International Airport at Oakland, is one of the pioneers in the field of charter air transportation and its contributions to it have been great.

Mr. Edward J. Daly, chairman of the board, has recently issued a press release pertaining to an understanding reached with the Australian Minister for Civil Aviation in connection with low charter transportation to the great continent of Australia.

I include Mr. Daly's statement as part of these remarks:

WORLD AIRWAYS HAILS BREAKTHROUGH IN AUSTRALIAN AIR CHARTERS

OAKLAND.—Edward J. Daly, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of World Airways, today welcomed last Friday's announcement by the Australian government that charter flights on World Airways from the United States to Australia can begin in 1973.

Daly said that the announcement by Australia's Minister for Civil Aviation, Senator Robert Cotton, clearly indicates a growing awareness in Australia of the need for low-cost charter transportation between that country and America, and a realization of the advantages such charters will bring to the Australian economy.

"Under this new authority," Daly said, "World will operate 21 roundtrip charters carrying some 3,500 members of medical, dental and legal associations. The value to Australian tourism of this program should exceed \$2 million."

Daly, who heads the world's largest charter airline also commented warmly on the far-sighted and positive attitudes and efforts of Australian government officials, tourism leaders and members of the press whose actions have now led to the initiation of a new era of cooperation and tourism growth between Australia and America.

"While we are extremely appreciative of the award of 21 charter trips," Daly went on, "in all honesty it should be regarded as only symbolic of what can be done. I sincerely hope that next month's bilateral charter meetings between our two governments can effect a still more liberalized attitude that will permit an increasing number of American citizens to visit a wonderful land they have read about and seen countless pictures of, but hitherto been unable to afford to visit."

"As Senator Cotton has so ably stated," he continued, "the Australian government is well aware of the need to stimulate the general growth of Pacific air travel and the consequent benefits of this to Qantas and the other scheduled airlines."

World's Chairman also called attention to

the potential parallel between U.S.-Australian charters and the U.S.-European charter market as described by U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman, Secor D. Browne. In a recent London address, Browne pointed out that newly available, low-cost air charter services have made possible a new era of mass tourism whose far-reaching economic, cultural and educational benefits are now widely recognized and enjoyed.

Daly expressed his opinion that a similar situation between America and Australia can provide a substantial and immediate enhancement of tourism between the two nations. He suggested that Senator Cotton and other Australian officials may have had the trans-Atlantic situation in mind in granting World permission to become the first American charter airline to fly Inclusive Tour Charters to Australia.

Daly again turned to Secor Browne's London remarks wherein Browne stated that "low cost charter availability is taking on the character of a right which governments are increasingly being expected to protect and promote."

In company with senior World Airways officials, Daly last year conducted an extensive survey trip to Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Southeast Asia. World Airways' President, General Howell M. Estes, Jr., is presently concluding a current re-survey trip which has involved visits with government and travel industry officials in Australia.

ROSENTHAL AND ADDABBO SEEK QUEENS AGING OFFICE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and good friend from the seventh district of New York (Mr. ADDABBO) and I today call upon Mayor Lindsay to open a branch of New York City's Office for the Aging in the Queens. There are already three such branches in Manhattan and one each in the Bronx and Brooklyn.

Queens has the second largest elderly population in the city—247,286, according to the 1970 census figures—and showed the largest elderly percentage increase of all boroughs in the past decade—42 percent.

Senior citizens of Queens County continue to visit our offices requesting information regarding their rights and assistance in fighting bureaucratic entanglements. Based on the success of other branch offices of the Office for the Aging, we feel a Queens branch would effectively serve as an advocacy and coordinating agency for the elderly.

The New York Office for the Aging administers the reduced fare for the elderly program, which entitles senior citizens to ride subway trains and buses for half the usual cost. The office coordinates public and voluntary programs for elderly people in addition to serving as an information center.

Mr. ADDABBO and I feel that the Office for the Aging, with its few vested interests, could be uniquely responsive to the plight of Queens' senior citizens.

We are inserting in the RECORD at this point our letter to Mayor Lindsay.

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Mayor of New York City, City Hall,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MAYOR LINDSAY: No matter how rewarding the lives of our elderly should be, all too often senior citizens spend their "golden years" in a fight for survival. We know you share our commitment to making the lives of the elderly comfortable, healthy and productive. The problems of the elderly are overwhelming; our response must be strong, swift and directed at correcting the conditions the elderly perceive as most oppressive.

Your stand on this issue has been made clear through the establishment of the New York City Office for the Aging. You and the personnel of the Office for the Aging are to be commended for its fine work, especially as an information center and advocate for the city's elderly.

Yet, the senior citizens of Queens County continue to visit and write our offices requesting information regarding their rights and assistance in fighting bureaucratic entanglements. They find their problems dealing with government agencies almost as severe as the hardships they suffer due to completely inadequate income, unsatisfactory health care and insufficient housing and transportation. The elderly in Manhattan have three branch offices of the Office for the Aging to turn to for help, and Brooklyn and the Bronx each have one. The elderly in Queens do not have a single Office for the Aging which will act on their behalf.

This is particularly distressing since Queens has the second largest elderly population in the City (247,286) and has the most dramatic growth in elderly population (42% in the decade 1960-1970).

A branch office of the Office for the Aging, with a relatively small volume of administrative responsibility, could effectively serve as an advocacy and coordinating agency for the elderly in Queens. Such an office, with few vested interests of its own, could be uniquely responsive to the plight of Queens' senior citizens.

It is our firmest conviction that a Queens branch of the Office for the Aging is vital to ensuring that the lives of the elderly are changed from a fight for survival to a time of freedom from anxiety and abuse.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Members of Congress.

TAIWAN CAN AND WILL HOLD OUT ALONE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in their wild scramble to make friends with the mass murderers who rule mainland China, our Government and the United Nations have not hesitated to offer the Republic of China as a sacrifice to gain favor in Peking. But all that I saw and heard on my visit to Taiwan during the Easter recess of Congress convinced me that these people can and will hold out alone—and prove to the world that freedom works.

The leaders of Free China know the menace of communism more intimately than we ever did, and far better than we know it in these times when so few care to think and talk about it. Chiang Kai-

shek and Mao Tse-tung have been locked in combat for the future of their country since before I was born, more than 40 years ago. Though now geographically divided by the Formosa Straits, they still represent a fundamental and continuing conflict in their land whose final outcome will not only determine China's destiny, but will have an enormous impact on the history of the world for generations to come. Far too many Americans have forgotten the tens of thousands of soldiers from mainland China—more than 95 percent of those taken prisoner in the Korean war—who resisted all pressures to return to their homes, demanding to go to Taiwan instead. In Taiwan, I saw films of 14,000 of these men arriving. Their first thought was not for their own personal security, attained after so much suffering and risk, but for the liberation of their homeland.

In Taiwan, to write and speak intellectually against communism is to demonstrate academic respectability—the exact opposite of the situation unfortunately prevailing in most of our colleges and universities. Membership of the Asian People's anti-Communist League in Taipei reads like a Who's Who of Government and Education in Free China. On the basis of my own anticommunist writings, I was honored as an academician of the China Academy and invited to submit research papers periodically. These people simply cannot understand why we have become so blind to this enormous danger that threatens us all—how we could ignore the solidly established facts about what communism really is.

During my 3 days in Taiwan, I conferred with the Vice President of the Republic of China, C. K. Yen, who is second only to Chiang in their Government, and also with the Chief of Staff of their armed forces, the Minister of Economic Affairs, the Minister of Information, the Deputy Foreign Minister, and the Deputy Minister of Education. I spoke at one large meeting, appeared on Chinese television several times, and had an opportunity to observe the ordinary people, who seemed prosperous, happy, and hard working. The overall impression was one of much greater strength even than I had expected. Red China by itself is not, I am convinced, going to be able to conquer Taiwan and its people. Only with U.N. help might they manage it.

Contrary to what might have been expected, I found no overt anti-Americanism, despite Taiwan's recognition that our new China policy has betrayed their cause, but rather a firm resolve never to let us or anybody else surrender them to communism, and to show by their amazing economic successes that free men can still and always vastly outproduce slaves. For example, last year Taiwan, with its 15 million people, did \$4.1 billion worth of foreign trade, while the comparable figure for the Red-ruled mainland, with 750 million people, was \$4.2 billion. Taiwan's trade this year is projected at a value of \$4.8 billion, which should clearly surpass the mainland. Taiwan produces more bicycles—one of the chief means of transport for Chinese—than the whole of the mainland.

Chinese on Taiwan consume 216 kilowatt-hours of electricity per person per year, compared to just 13 per person on the mainland. The largest newspaper in Taiwan has more than double the circulation of the largest newspaper on the mainland.

The appeasers in our Government may think that having done all they could to sell out free China, they can forget about it. But the free Chinese will not go away quietly. I do not believe they will go away at all, but remain to remind us by their very presence that even American lack of honor cannot destroy all hope for China.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XVI

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am presently circulating a "Dear Colleague" letter on the telephone privacy bill (H.R. 13267), which has already been cosponsored by 28 Members.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates and organizations, and opinion polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individuals or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement on March 9, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 14th sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Wadsworth, Ohio, April 4, 1972.

Re: H.R. 13267
Representative LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: Having failed miserably to get anyone in the Ohio legislature to sponsor a bill exactly like your Telephone Privacy Act (this some seven years ago), I now read of your current efforts in our local newspaper.

More power to you!
If you need help to enact this bill, please count on me.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my Congressman, Charles Mosher, with a request that he lend his efforts to the successful adoption of your most needed of laws.

Very truly yours,

LEE'S SUMMIT, Mo., April 6, 1972.

HON. LES ASPIN,
HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Thank you for introducing H.R. 13267, the Telephone Privacy Act.

Truly the commercial abuse of the telephone is on the increase and is infuriating to me. Many telephone solicitors have little regard for time of day or night when calling.

I have written my views to my Congressman, Mr. Randall, and I hope that he and others will support your bill.

Yours very truly,

ALEXANDRIA, Va., April 6, 1972.

DEAR REP. ASPIN: I just read in the paper that you had introduced a bill to stop unsolicited commercial phone calls. I've never written a Congressman before—but I feel very strongly that unsolicited commercial calls are an invasion of privacy and are a great nuisance. The main offenders seem to be the land resort companies—some of the same companies calling back again and again. You have to answer the phone as it could be an important call, but many's the time I've had to pick up a baby from the tub or leave a cooking dish to be burned on the stove or rush in from outdoors, etc., only to find it's a commercial come-on. I'm really furious and aggravated about these interruptions. So more power to you and good luck on the bill. I'm one of the so-called "silent majority" so when I finally say something in a letter, it's an indication of how much I resent being bombarded at home by these advertising gimmicks.

Sincerely,

LAUREL, Md., April 5, 1972.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: In the evening addition of today's Evening Star, I saw reference to your pending bill prohibiting unsolicited telephone calls.

I wholeheartedly support this measure. My telephone is for my convenience, not some promoter's.

Please continue in this fight against ever increasing invasions of privacy.

Sincerely,

IMPROVING ALASKAN HOUSING

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the housing in rural areas of Alaska is substandard partially because Alaska has a unique and severe climate in which to construct housing. There does exist, however, much research and expertise on construction in the Arctic environment, but unfortunately this information is not generally known or being used to the best advantage.

It is for this reason that the Alaska Rural Development Council passed a resolution requesting the University of Alaska to provide for compilation of a pertinent bibliography of technical information pertaining to rural housing to be made available to relevant individuals and organizations. I commend this resolution and am inserting into the RECORD a copy of it for my colleagues attention.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING IMPROVING ALASKAN HOUSING

Whereas housing in the rural areas of Alaska is substandard; and

Whereas Alaska has a unique and severe climate in which to construct housing; and

Whereas the environment differs considerably from that of most of the other forty-nine states; and

Whereas there are many State and Federal agencies involved in the building and financing of houses and Alaska; and

Whereas there exists much research and expertise on construction in the Arctic environment; and

Whereas this information is not generally known or being used to the best advantage

Therefore be it resolved that the Rural Housing Committee of the Alaska Rural Development Council, requests the University of Alaska to provide through a graduate, or similar type project under the guidance of the Alaska Development Council compilation of a pertinent bibliography of all technical information pertaining to rural housing and that this information be made available to individuals, communities and State and Federal agencies.

March 15, 1972.

BEFUDDLED THINKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, much of the criticism of the President's decision to respond to the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam by bombing military targets in the North has been motivated by the political complications that are inherent in a presidential election year.

The Tri-City Advertiser, an independent publication serving south suburban Chicagoland, very properly comments on the obvious political reaction of Democratic Party spokesmen in an editorial in the April 19 issue:

BEFUDDLED THINKING

Of significance at this time is a statement printed in the press and attributed to the Chairman of the Democratic Party, just a day or so ago.

Monotonous repetition of news is not desirable to readers and we repeat the statement at the risk of displeasing some of you.

Yet the political situation has come to such a stage of rampant conjecture, irresponsible statements flavored with hatred and apparent desire to bring forth all that is bad for the country in a vain desire to gain prestige for personal ambition, that we feel obliged to bring it before you.

Chairman O'Brien was reported as saying that the Democratic Party is in a mess. The debt from the 1968 campaign reportedly stands at some \$9 million. The profusion of candidates seeking office lends no harmony to the campaign and the chairman is reported as warning the candidates to quit slamming each other, criticizing everything, and get down to the serious business of telling the people what they intend to do about the problems. So far none has.

The usual topic for ending the war is the loss of lives of our boys, naturally to be lamented by all of us. Yet that is war and we all know it.

Let those who complain of our losses of men in Viet Nam take a look at the loss of lives in another area—Traffic Accidents—where thousands of lives were lost in the year just

past. That is a major area of disaster, as we all know, and absolutely unmentioned by the political candidates.

One reaches the conclusion that these men are seeking solely to flare the headlines for personal advantage without regard to the simple, ordinary rules of uprightness and fair dealing.

We venture to proclaim our opinion that most of them have a stupid evaluation of the inherent intelligence possessed by Mr. American Citizen which means that such citizens know the difference between being smart-alecks and being smart.

From where we view the situation we would venture the opinion that President Nixon must be befuddled at the antics of those who seek to discredit him for his actions in not stopping a war he never started.

Almost everyone of us knows that.

THE CRUMBLING PROBLEM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Dallas Times Herald concerning the deterioration of our space program. The article concerns itself with the future of one of the most successful Government programs of modern times and I commend its reading to all in this body.

THE CRUMBLING PROBLEM

The "peeling" problem on the surface of the lunar lander of Apollo 16 was adjudged to be a matter of small importance. But the space program itself has a crumbling problem. And that is of grave importance, not only to the national space effort but to the nation's progress here on earth.

The U.S. space program's difficulties have progressed beyond the point at which funds and manpower began peeling away, as the applause from Congress and the public turned to skepticism and calls for economy. Today there is a danger that the most successful government program of modern times may be allowed to collapse.

Unlike most government programs, the space program's problems stem not from repeated failure but from brilliant success. It has been not only the most outstandingly effective government mobilization of money, brains and industry, but it has succeeded in making that which seemed impossible a few years ago look like simple routine today.

Back in 1957 when Sputnik stunned and shamed Americans, we responded with a crash program to catch up with the Russians in space and beat them to the moon. In the process of doing that, this country forged to the forefront of nearly every field of future-oriented technology.

Though the focus was on space travel, from the beginning the spinoff of products, processes and techniques began to have almost immediate effects on our lives here on earth. Everyday applications of the products of space research are myriad, from the pyroceramic materials in our coffeepots, to the Teflon coatings on our power tools, to the monitoring equipment used in heart wards in our hospitals to the fuel cells that offer hope of pollution-free earth transportation.

But Americans soon came to take space miracles for granted. And by the time Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon, there were already cries that the money spent on space ought to be devoted to welfare, urban prob-

lems and other earth-bound ailments of our society. Even as an American landed on the lunar landscape, the gigantic effort that put him there began to crumble away, its funds cut, its technical team broken up and scattered.

The present mission is the next-to-last moon mission. After that, all of the space administration's hopes have been placed on one project, the space shuttle. Other, more ambitious experiments have had to be scrapped for lack of funds. The lone survivor, the shuttle, would allow more economical space travel because it is a reusable vehicle to launch spacecraft. Even that project, upon which the hopes for the survival of the space program ride, is under attack by liberal Senators who want to divert the money into social welfare programs that are signal failures.

It is a curious example of false economy. The money that would be allotted to the preservation of the space program is a drop in the bucket compared to the tens of billions that this country spends on social welfare. Yet the technology that the space program promises offers the best opportunity we have for improving the lives of all mankind—the poor as well as the rich.

At a time when the nation is desperately seeking more and better new jobs, we are allowing thousands of existing jobs in the challenging aerospace career fields to wither away.

The aerospace industry offers more than space spectacles today and progress for tomorrow, it also provides a large share of the employment in this country and particularly in this area. According to the Texas Employment Commission, 48,300 Dallas workers are employed in aerospace or related industries. From production lines to research laboratories, Dallas is deeply involved in the development of ideas and equipment that are pushing back the frontiers of man's knowledge.

Those frontiers will be pushed back by those who have the will. It only remains for us to decide whether we will take part and reap the benefits or allow others to take over the innovative lead while our economy stagnates.

THE LATE HONORABLE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of this House, I was genuinely saddened by the death of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., my colleague on the Committee on Education and Labor for two decades, and my predecessor as its chairman.

No one who knew him over that period, as I did, can be unmoved by the travail and the tragedy that marked his last years.

Here was a man of great brilliance, great dedication, and with which to give to his fellow Americans, black as well as white.

From the onset of my acquaintance with him in 1949, I was struck by the man's passion to see justice done for all of his fellow citizens. He hated discrimination in all its forms—not only for what it did to his own people, but because it cheapened and degraded his country.

I have always suspected that his flamboyance and his showmanship were

really screens around a sensitive man, baffles to turn aside the stones that always fly at the head of a man bent on destroying unearned privilege, easy custom, and injustice sanctioned by usage and time.

I well remember his first big effort in Congress for the enactment of fair employment practices legislation. I remember his work in its behalf, and was pleased to help him get his first FEPC bill out of subcommittee. That was in 1949.

When he became chairman of the committee in 1960, he presided over the initiation of an impressive list of new laws and programs that have wrought great changes in American life. Just to name a few of them: The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Economic

Opportunity Act, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, the Vocational Education Act, and those landmark measures, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act.

If others reaped more fame and glory from the great civil rights movement of the 1960's, their success was due in no small measure to the foundations he helped lay in the 1930's and 1940's and 1950's.

In essence, those civil rights leaders of the 1960's were simply saying the same things Adam Powell had been saying all through the years. The difference was that the time had come for the Nation to listen.

In this little statement of recollection of Adam Powell, I can only say that my

long association with him was a pleasant one. I worked with him to the best of my ability to help him to be a successful chairman—and that he was. For all of his flamboyance he was not a jealous man, and never begrudged another member of the committee a share of the credit when credit was due.

He is gone from this House now. The controversies of the past have lost their urgency and their passion.

Those who had differences with him here and elsewhere may now join with his friends in bearing honest witness of his life as each of us knew it, and let history be the judge.

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., would not care two hoots about that verdict. But, in the judgment of history, I believe he will not come off badly at all.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 25, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, grant to Thy servants here strength of character, vigor of mind, and soundness of judgment to match the high demands of our day. In the competition of programs at home and the collision of forces abroad, keep us united in dedication to freedom for all men everywhere. Give to each the courage of his convictions without arrogance and the will to fight for them without ill will for any man.

Guide us, O Father, through the work of this day. Give us grace to find our highest satisfaction in a steadfast purpose to do Thy will.

In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1972, the following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 11417. An act to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the purpose of purchasing railroad equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-756).

By Mr. CRANSTON (for Mr. HARTKE), from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2219. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide certain assistance in the establishment of new public nonprofit medical, health professions, and allied health schools and the expansion and improvement of health manpower training programs in Veterans' Administration facilities and in existing educational institutions affiliated with the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 92-757).

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 20, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 20, 1972, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3153) to amend the act of January 8, 1971 (Public Law 91-660; 84 Stat. 1967), an act to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Florida and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate

the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Title I, Section 102, of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1752a(e)), enclosed is the Annual Report of the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration for the calendar year 1971.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1972.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 218) to extend the authority conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1969.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12931) to provide for improving the economy and living conditions in rural America; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. POAGE, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. KYL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13361) to amend section 316(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as