in their concerns or the pressure from within their own countries will force every oil state to nationalize the properties.

Pachachi, the OPEC official, scoffs at the idea that national governments cannot run a cartel. "We are not stupid enough" to break the price of oil by flooding the world with it. We want to utilize this asset. We are as interested (as the companies) in maintaining the price level. It is a wasting asset, not replaceable. So we must make the maximum use of it."

He concedes that heavy investment will be needed to expand supply and satisfy the growing demand. He concedes, too, that only Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Kuwait will have idle resources for this task and that inevitably Western capital will be required. But Pachachi argues that Westerners need not be scared off by a participation arrangement, that the companies will still be shareowners, that both countries and companies have a joint interest in rational and profitable operations.

COMPANIES DIVIDED

In fact, the companies are far from single-minded about the principle of cutting the governments in. According to insiders, Shell, CFP and Gulf have virtually accepted the notion. Gulf has traditionally been a hard-line company but the Mellon family, its dominant owner, is said to have shaken up the management. Last year, I. G. Davis, Gulf's executive vice president, told the New York Society of Security Analysts: "One can understand the desire of the producing country to have a more effective voice in the planning, producing and disposal of crude oil produced in their country. This is particularly so where petroleum is the principal and sometimes only natural resource and finite and depletable resources at that. One can even foresee a beneficial mutual understanding resulting from joint consultation. . . ."

The big eight's undecided members are said to be Jersey Standard, British Petroleum and Mobil. Only Texaco and California Standard are reported to be insisting that a deal is a deal, a concession is a concession until it expires, and no rewriting shall take place.

UNITED ON TACTIC

Whatever their differences on the principle, the companies are united on their tactic: let us not hurry any changes. They argue that last year's big bargain at Tehran, where the companies agreed to a stiff increase in the royalties they pay the host nations (in foreign oil, royalties are called taxes so that the American firms can offset them against taxes that they would otherwise pay to Washington) was supposed to assure five years of "stability."

Even the most outgoing concerns insist that participation should not begin until the Tehran deal runs out at the end of 1975.

The companies have just reluctantly agreed to enlarge the Tehran deal, increasing their payments by 8.5 per cent or about another $700 million a year to the Persian Gulf states alone. But that settlement was made to compensate for the devaluation of the dollar, the unit of account in which oil royalty-taxes are figured, and thus is not seen as a violation of the "stability" principle.

OPEC ARITHMETIC

On the other side, Yamani regards delay over the participation question as politically impossible. He will not spell out the OPEC demands in detail. But he hints that a start on participation, the granting of a minority share, must be made soon and that OPEC expects its 51 per cent share within a decade.

Apart from the time scale, the other great issue in these crucial talks is how much the producer governments will pay for their shares. Yamani says that OPEC has determined to give no more than the net book value of concessionaires' assets above the ground.

Assume, for example, that Aramco has $800 million worth of rigs and the like but, after depreciation, now values these installations at $300 million. Then Saudi Arabia would pay only one-fifth of this total or $60 million for its initial, 20 per cent share.

That kind of arithmetic horrifies the companies. They insist they are entitled to be paid for the loss of their future profits on oil in the ground, profits they expected to reap during the lifetime of their concessions. Since many of the concessions do not run out until the next century—one in Kuwait expires in 2026—the companies are asking a lot of money.

How much is their secret since they do not reveal mestic companies have suction, although this is understood to be the most profitable part of their global operations. In any event, it is likely that the difference between the country proposals and the company position is several billion dollars.

However the lengthy negotiations beginning at Jeddah this week turn out, it is also clear that consumers in the West can only shudder at what is happening. Even if the two cartels—companies and nations—reach an amicable agreement that assures the supply of oil, both have a vested interest in pushing prices higher and the means to do so.

Some help will come from the growing discoveries of oil in the Western-controlled North Sea. Some may come from Alaska if the ecological worries can be laid to rest. Additionally, exploration off Indonesia's shores is likely to yield more oil.

EXPANDING DEMAND

But all these sources together, it is estimated, can not possibly replace over the next 20 years the Middle East and African oil needed to satisfy the expanding demand.

Moreover, the bulk of these concessions, too, will almost certainly be held by the big eight's cartel. At best, these new sources then will provide some safety margin for supplies but their exploitation will be controlled to prevent any fall in price.

It is clear then, from both the point of view of supply and price, that new energy sources must be tapped as long as wealthy nations demand rising material standards. These sources exist—oil from shale and tar sands, nuclear energy, possibly energy from the sun.

Typically, however, their exploitation has been held back, often at the insistence of oil companies that do not want rival fuels developed. Shale oil is the classic case; there both the major international concerns and domestic companies have successfully prevailed on the U.S. Interior Department to lease the shale lands only recently and then on the smallest scale.

Elsewhere in the world, rich nations like Japan are making a determined effort to free themselves from both OPEC oil and from the big eight companies. By 1980, Japan is expected to cut its dependence on oil as an energy source from 80 per cent to 68 per cent. And a smaller share of that oil will be coming from OPEC members.

For American consumers, the major policy question posed by the new round of cartel-to-cartel talks is this: how to find new sources of energy and how to exploit them outside the existing corporate structure.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United State withdrew an additional 7,200 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today there are 136,500 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday February 2, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I beseech you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called, eager to maintain the unity of spirit in the bond of peace.—Ephesians 4: 1, 3.

O God, Thou everlasting sustainer of our spirits, we come to Thee seeking peace, strength, and wisdom as we endeavor to lead our Nation through these demanding and difficult days. We are weak, but Thou art mighty; we are impatient, but Thou are so very patient. Do Thou hold us with Thy powerful hand and all our lives through be Thou our strength, our shield, and our support.

For our families and friends, for our colleges and universities, for the city about us, for our Nation, and for the whole human race we pray and our prayer is that all of us may be led from ill will to good will, from fear to faith, and from things seen to things eternal, and to an ever-increasing experience of Thy presence in the hearts of men. In the spirit of Christ we offer our morning prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

VIOLENCE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the slaughter of 13 civilians by British troops in Northern Ireland Sunday followed the pattern of the mindless slayings of students at Kent State in 1970 and of unarmed prisoners at Attica Prison last September.

When will armies and police and gov-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ernments learn that violence begets only violence? That the use of arms is more often the catalyst of violence than a deterrent. That an army of occupation serves only to stiffen the resolve of a citizenry.

Time and again we are told that troops had to open fire to protect their own lives. And time and again—at Kent State, at Attica, and last Sunday in Northern Ireland—it turns out that the threat was more imagined than real and that only civilian lives were lost.

It is long past time for British troops to withdraw once and for all, from Northern Ireland. I support Senator KENNEDY's proposal that the United States offer the services of an impartial mediator—such as President Johnson did with Cyrus Vance during the Cyprus dispute—and that a humanitarian aid program for the ravaged country of Northern Ireland be authorized without delay.

At the same time, I would urge President Nixon to ask through the United Nations or any other international mechanism, a worldwide conference aimed at developing humane means and policies for dealing with civil disturbances. This problem is no longer a local issue. It plagues virtually every nation and every community. It must be resolved.

This is the very least we can offer.

OPERATIONS OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, either the General Services Administration expects me to stay in the Congress for a long, long time, or I have just experienced one of the most hilarious, or ridiculous, things I have ever seen happen.

Mr. Speaker, I have set up a small office back in my district and we have been trying for a year now to get furnishings for that office from the General Services Administration. Some furnishings have been supplied; however, I am still waiting for certain furnishings which were ordered months ago.

Yesterday I talked to the district office and Miss Judy said, "Congressman, you will never believe what has happened. First, you should know that we did not get our furniture, however, the freight office informs me that you have there for delivery the following items: 315 pounds of floor sweeping compound, 155 pounds of cleaning compound, 1,625 pounds of paper toilet seat covers and 1,950 pounds of toilet tissue."

Mr. Speaker, I do not need all of these items.

GROUNDHOG SEES HIS SHADOW ON GOBBLER'S KNOB

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that at 7:18 this morning on Gobbler's Knob outside Punxsutawney, Pa., a distinguished group of citizens not only from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but from other States and foreign countries as well, traveled to Pennsylvania to look in at the doings of the seers of seers. At 7:18 a.m. that seer came forward, the sun came out, he saw his shadow, and you will have 6 more weeks of winter.

Now, we have a distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. HALEY) who from time to time has made the capricious statement that the groundhog is a poor prognosticator of spring and that the people should pay more attention to the advertisements of the Ringling Bros. & Barnum & Bailey Circus as to when they are going to appear in Madison Square Garden in the city of New York. The people from Ringling Bros. & Barnum & Bailey Circus have finally decided that they had better pay some attention to the seer of Punxsutawney. From Sarasota, Fla., the winter headquarters of that world-famous circus, two representatives were in Pennsylvania this morning in order to determine when they should open their show in New York City.

PERMANENT MECHANISMS FOR HANDLING EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES IN ENTIRE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, January 27, I introduced H.R. 12702, a bill to create permanent mechanisms for the handling of emergency labor disputes in the entire transportation industry. Today, with the bipartisan support of 58 colleagues, I am reintroducing H.R. 12702. It is our firm belief that this bill provides the Congress with the best vehicle for action on this very important subject.

The need for permanent strike legislation is growing by the minute. Yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz testified that the dock strike—both on the east and gulf coasts and on the west coast—has reduced farm exports by almost three quarters of a billion dollars below comparable periods in the preceding year. Certainly, the resumption of the west coast strike is, as the Secretary pointed out yesterday, "an emergency for agriculture."

Yet, permanent legislation languishes in the Congress. It has been almost 9 months since my cosponsors and I first introduced our emergency strike legislation. Even with the present dock strike emergency in full force, the Education and Labor Committee continues to postpone decisive action. Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot let this situation continue any longer. We must end the present dock strike, and we must enact permanent legislation for dealing with emergency transportation labor disputes. Anything short of these goals would be a shirking of our responsibilities to the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

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

Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 31, 1972, I was necessarily absent from the House Chamber and missed the rollcall No. 12 on the bill H.R. 10086, national park appropriations ceilings and boundaries. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on the measure, which passed by a vote of 303 yeas, 2 nays.

TAKE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES OUT OF WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a great deal of concern about the west coast strike and the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor is now holding hearings on legislation to deal with that matter. I hope we will be able to deal with these problems very shortly and perhaps the legislation would not be necessary.

But there is growing evidence that the administration is holding the Nation's farmers as hostages, trying to bring about a package settlement of the west coast dispute.

Yesterday when Secretary Butz testified before our committee and the day before yesterday when Secretary Hodgson testified before the committee, I asked both of them if it was not true that the unions have agreed to move agricultural commodities; to take them out of the work stoppage and move agricultural commodities. Both of them had to agree that this was true—that the unions have agreed and have made that offer. I have been in touch with the unions and have tried to persuade them to take agriculture commodities out of the strike.

But the shippers have not agreed—the Pacific Marine Association has not agreed. When I asked the two Cabinet members whether or not the administration has taken any action to put some pressure on the shippers to accept the union agreement to move agricultural commodities, Mr. Hodgson said they had not, because he feels that would break up the package deal that they are seeking.

So it seems to me, when they talk about the great losses caused to the farmers, and the losses are great, the administration has failed to get the shippers to move these agricultural commodities.

WEST COAST STRIKE

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) protesteth too much. He is on the committee that could report out the legislation that would solve this strike, and so far as I can understand the committee has been impotent, with no affirmative action.

We want the strike settled so that the economy as a whole, including agriculture, can get the benefit of our export-import business. The gentleman from Illinois could take the leadership if he wanted to and be helpful to get that legislation out of the committee. I am surprised that he does not take that leadership in this crisis.

THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Labor, I should like to report on the efforts being made by us—and by "us" I mean both the majority and the minority sides—to consider the President's urgent request, in the form of legislation, to resolve the west coast dock strike.

We have heard from Secretary Hodgson, and on yesterday from Secretary Volpe, Secretary Butz, and the Under Secretary of Commerce.

Unfortunately, under section 210 of the Taft-Hartley Act, following an 80-day injunction there is a mandatory requirement in that section that the President report to the Congress the full findings of the Board of Inquiry which he appointed, the issues involved, and the results of the National Labor Relations Board election.

Obviously, with the press of other business, the President has not yet been able to prepare and send that report to the Congress. In the interim we have learned much from the respective Secretaries. We have found them not only cooperative but very informative. By their own admission, in specific instances we do not have at hand in the subcommittee some vital information which we need. There was hand-delivered a request for specific information by me to Secretary Hodgson, and he promised me on the phone yesterday that he would respond at the earliest possible time. He has some data which is essential. There are some questions which we have asked of him in writing which he has promised to answer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank my colleague.

On Friday, which is the earliest possible date available, the principals in this unhappy strike from the west coast will appear before the Subcommittee on Education and Labor. They will be Mr. Harry Bridges of the longshoremen, the west coast counsel of the Teamster's Union, and the representative of the Pacific Maritime Association. I have been in touch with them virtually constantly during the last several days, even before the legislation was referred to my subcommittee. They are very, very close to a settlement, and I know that all of us hope that there will be a settlement before such time as we would have to enact a piece of legislation.

I think that the minority members of the subcommittee will say that everyone has been treated fairly and that I have acted as expeditiously as possible under the circumstances. I shall continue to do so. I am making every possible effort, as are my colleagues, to resolve this situation and we intend to do it in one way or another at the earliest possible time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

THE ADVERSE EFFECT OF THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE ON OUR NATIONAL WELL-BEING

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve in Congress for many years. I have always been proud to be a Member of Congress. When a critical situation arises endangering our national safety or national welfare the Congress has been responsive to the public needs. The public interest has taken precedence over selfish special interests.

It distresses me, Mr. Speaker, to have to say that this Congress is rapidly becoming known as the "public-be-damned" Congress. I say this because of the failure of this Congress to act expeditiously on the President's recommendation for ending the dock strike which is undermining all our efforts to stabilize our national economy and reduce unemployment.

Several members of the Committee on Education and Labor have publicly indicated that their committee has no intention of reporting the pending bill to quickly halt the west coast strike. And I might add we would not have this critical situation had this Congress, and the previous Congress, taken action to repair the long acknowledged deficiencies in our labor law for the settlement of national emergency strikes.

In a special message we will receive from the President he pleads with us to recognize the plight of the farmers, the exporters and the adverse effect of this strike on our national well-being.

I would simply say to the members of that committee, with all respect, that time is of the essence. We ought to be about our business and report out a bill so we Members of Congress would have the opportunity to vote it up or down as we decide.

DOCK STRIKES ON EAST AND WEST COASTS

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would make a brief additional comment to that already made by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of our subcommittee.

It is true the subcommittee has had hearings. In connection with the allusion or the reference to section 210 of the Taft-Hartley Act, however, the question was expressly put to Mr. Hodgson when he was before us, and he made clear that their interpretation of the section to which allusion was made was that a report could either be made after the west coast's 80-day cooling-off period had expired or after both the west and east coasts' 80-day periods had expired. He made it very clear that it was the interpretation of their Department that they should wait until the second period had expired. They are going to wait until the expiration of the second period and then file their report.

So far as Mr. Hodgson is concerned, I intend to contact him as quickly as possible after this. I was aware of the fact that there had been discussions between him and the chairman of our subcommittee. If we are awaiting a reply from him I will do my best to get that reply immediately.

As far as particular action by our subcommittee is concerned, yesterday when the Secretaries of Transportation and Agriculture and the Under Secretary of Commerce were before us, they made it very clear that there is present damage, that there is extreme or severe damage, and that in their opinion immediate action is called for. I hope that the immediate action will be taken just as quickly as possible.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 790 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 790

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7987) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy under this rule, and there appeared to

be no controversy over the matter it makes in order.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

A STRONGER FEED GRAIN PROGRAM ANNOUNCED TODAY

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the terms of the new 1972 feed grain program, which have just been announced this morning, which should greatly increase participation and strengthen the program this year.

When it became clear from the crop-planning intention survey released last week that there were not going to be sufficient acres set aside in response to the payments previously announced, Secretary of Agriculture Butz moved promptly to use the flexible provisions of the 1970 Agriculture Act, to remedy the situation. He has this morning announced that farmers who sign up for the program during the sign-up period which starts tomorrow will have the option of setting aside an additional 10 or 15 percent of their base acres in addition to the mandatory 25 percent. They will receive a direct payment of 80 cents per bushel for this voluntary set aside. To qualify for this payment they must also withhold another 10 or 15 percent of base acres from corn or sorghum production. This new option should go a long way toward reaching the goal of retiring 38 million acres from feed grain production this year.

The combined mandatory and voluntary aspects of the revised program will strengthen farm income while keeping feed grain production within reasonable limits and facilitating the orderly disposition of last year's surplus. By today's action the Nixon administration has demonstrated that it is capable of using the Agriculture Act of 1970 boldly and decisively in the national interest. The act is being given a chance to work in the way that Congress intended.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION TO SETTLE THE DOCK STRIKE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time from the gentleman from Ohio so that I might ask the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) a question.

The impression has been created, inadvertently or otherwise, that in order for the Congress to act on the President's emergency legislation to settle the dock strike this report under the Taft-Hartley Act was a prerequisite. Would the gentleman from Oregon answer that question?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes; I shall be glad to respond to the question asked by the minority leader.

The report to which the chairman of the subcommittee alluded earlier is called for by the act involved, but not as a preliminary to any such action as we are here contemplating in the subcommittee. We discussed the question of the report itself, but there should be no misunderstanding in the mind of any Member of the House that that is a prerequisite before the subcommittee can act on the legislation before us. There is no such prerequisite.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

(By unanimous consent Mr. HUNT was allowed to speak out of order.)

BUREAUCRAT QUESTIONS WISDOM OF VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a meeting was held at Vice President AGNEW'S office in Washington, D.C., at which I was privileged to attend, where officials from the city of Camden, N.J., and members of the Legal Services, OEO, were present.

The Vice President, presiding over the meeting, was trying to act as a mediator between the two adverse groups, so that we might get off the ground with some low-income housing in the city of Camden, N.J., that has been stymied by legal action for 3½ or 4 years.

During the meeting, the Director of the Legal Services, OEO, Mr. Fred Speaker, had the audacity to question the wisdom of the Vice President in attempting to get something done for poor people by getting rid of this ridiculous situation by recommending a meeting between the litigants. No attempt was made by the Vice President to circumvent the courts, and he made it quite clear he was having this meeting so that all parties concerned might meet on common ground.

I am appalled that a bureaucrat like Fred Speaker would have the audacity to question the right of the Vice President of the United States on this matter.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my colleague and wish to state that I support this bill and the rule. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour's debate.

The purpose of H.R. 7987 is to authorize the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to utilize the facilities of the Bureau of the Mint on a fully reimbursable basis to strike a series of commemorative national medals.

The medals are to be made widely available to the American people at reasonable prices to insure the broadest public participation in this phase of the bicentennial commemoration.

The medals are to be furnished to the Commission by the Secretary of the Treasury at prices equal to the cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses. Since all production expenses must be paid by the Commission, there will be no cost to the Treasury. The Commission in turn expects to make substantial profit from the public sale of the medals. These profits are to be used in the furtherance of the bicentennial celebration. No medals may be produced under authority of this legislation after December 31, 1983.

This is an administration bill which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. PATMAN, on behalf of himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, which has jurisdiction over the Bureau of the Mint, and Mr. WIDNALL, ranking minority member of the committee.

The committee report includes one letter from the Department of the Treasury approving the bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 7987) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution.

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. 7987, with Mr. MADDEN 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 Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7987 is a nonpartisan, administration bill proposed by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to carry out recommendations of a distinguished panel of Americans in the numismatics field, and was approved unanimously in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The bill authorizes the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which is an independent Federal agency created by Public Law 89–491, to utilize the facilities of the Bureau of the Mint, on a fully reimbursable basis, to strike a series of commemorative national medals as part of the national observance of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the United States of America.

Enactment of the legislation will provide a means by which the general public can begin to participate directly in the observance of the 200th anniversary of the events which culminated in the founding of our Nation—events which changed the course of civilization.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) is chairwoman of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee. She conducted the hearings on this bill and did a very fine job in getting all of the material testimony that could be obtained. She is very familiar with the bill, and I would like to yield to her at this time such time as she may use.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, we

have expedited this bill in the Committee on Banking and Currency, at the urgent request of the Director of the Bureau of the Mint, so that the Mint can begin promptly to program its work for the production by July 4, 1972, of the first of a series of commemorative national medals authorized in the legislation. I mention that fact, because otherwise, there might be some question as to why we are asking the House to act today on a measure which presumably deals with an anniversary which is still more than 4 years away.

CELEBRATION OF OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE

The bicentennial of the American Revolution, will be one of the most significant anniversaries in our history, and in the history of freedom in the world. But it is not just the formal act of national independence in 1776, which we are celebrating; it is the series of events which preceded and led up to the War of Independence, the developments during that war—which did not end, as you know, until 1783—and the establishment of our governmental structure which evolved painfully, and culminated in the drafting and adoption of the Constitution. It is our heritage we are celebrating in the bicentennial, not just the anniversary of 1 day in 1776.

So the Commission, which was established by Congress several years ago to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the American Revolution, and which consists of a wide cross section of distinguished Americans, including four of our colleagues in the House and four Senators, appointed an advisory panel of outstanding leaders in the field of numismatics, to recommend appropriate use of coins, currency, commemorative medals or similar means, for dramatizing the birth not only of a nation, but of a new political concept of freedom. In addition to a bicentennial theme medal, commemorating the year 1776, the panel recommended a series of 13 separate medals, marking specific historical events, proposing that they be issued at a rate of one each year on July 4, through 1983, along with a companion commemorative stamp in a philatelic-numismatic combination.

DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY TO STRIKE MEDALS

Now, this bill does not require that 13 annual medals be issued; it just authorizes that number as a maximum. If the project meets only limited success, or the public response just is not there, why of course they can then make their own judgment as to how many medals will be struck.

The same thing is true as regards the materials used in the medals. We had some testimony urging that we require the use of silver in certain of the medals. The bill leaves that decision up to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and to the Secretary of the Treasury—they can use silver, or not, as they see fit. I do not feel it is the proper role of the Committee on Banking and Currency to force a Government agency to use silver for souvenir purposes, or any other particular alloy, if it wishes to use something else instead.

There was one other area of controversy in the hearing. One of the private manufacturers of commemorative medals felt that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission should be permitted to issue only one commemorative medal—for the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. He felt that if the Federal commission issued more than the one medal, it would cut into his business, because he was working out arrangements with a number of the State bicentennial commissions to issue a series of State commemorative medals.

RELATIONSHIP TO STATE COMMISSIONS

Representatives of several of the State commissions supported this view, because they said they had no funds at all for their work and the issuance of State medals would help them raise some funds. But it is the plan of the Federal commission to make grants to all of the State bicentennial commissions, of at least $90,000 each, and legislation to authorize such grants to the State commissions, S. 1857, has passed the Senate and has been approved and reported by the House Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Union Calendar and would certainly help meet this problem of helping to finance the State commissions. Incidentally, two private manufacturers of medals, who also hope to get business from the State commissions, supported H.R. 7987 and do not consider it improper competition by the Federal Government.

There is nothing in H.R. 7987 to prohibit the States from issuing any medals they want to. I am sure a lot of people will want to buy copies of all of the Federal medals, and also copies of any medals issued by their own States. But, this is a nationwide celebration, and I think the Federal commission's medals, will be of much broader appeal to collectors throughout the country, and to the general public than a series of medals issued by a State other than one's own State.

There is, of course, a money-raising aspect to these Federal medals; the National Commission hopes to take in anywhere from $400,000 to $2 million a year in gross receipts—not profits, because no one knows what the profits would be as yet—in the sale of national medals or medal-and-stamp combinations, and of course any profits they realize would reduce the need for appropriations for the Federal commission. But as we brought out in the hearings, it is not just a case of raising money—these medals are intended to have patriotic significance to the American people, and particularly to children, to bring home to them what we mean by liberty, and justice, and representative democracy, and how we got these unalienable rights Jefferson wrote about, and what those rights entail, and who we are as a people, and what America is supposed to be all about.

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

In summary, then, let me say that—

First. This is permissive legislation; it permits the use of Bureau of the Mint facilities to strike as many as 14 different national medals marking our 200th birthday and the events which surrounded the formation of our Nation;

Second. The medals would be produced without cost to the Treasury and are intended to make a profit for the Federal agency;

Third. The decisions on what the medals will contain and what they will be made of and how they will be distributed and how much they will cost will be made by a distinguished commission to which eight Members of Congress, 12 Cabinet members and heads of agencies, and a group of outstanding private citizens have been appointed under an act of Congress;

Fourth. The numismatics hobby supports this legislation, and all but one of the private manufacturers of medals who testified also supported it and felt this was a proper use for the Bureau of the Mint facilities;

Fifth. The bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency after a full hearing by a subcommittee.

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION

The list of members of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission who would make the necessary determinations about the medals to be issued under this legislation is as follows:

MEMBERSHIP LIST

CONGRESSIONAL MEMBERS

Representative Harold D. Donohue of Massachusetts.
Representative Julia Butler Hansen of Washington.
Representative G. William Whitehurst of Virginia.
Representative Lawrence G. Williams of Pennsylvania.
Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts.
Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia.
Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire.
Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

Hon. William P. Rogers, Secretary of State.
Hon. Melvin R. Laird, Secretary of Defense.
Hon. John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States.
Hon. Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior.
Hon. Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce.
Hon. George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
Hon. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation.
Hon. Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Hon. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress.
Hon. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.
Dr. James B. Rhoads, Archivist of the United States.
Dr. William D. McElroy, Chairman Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities.

PUBLIC MEMBERS

Chairman

Hon. David J. Mahoney of New York, N.Y., chairman of the board, Norton Simon Industries.

Chairman emeritus

Dr. J. E. Wallace Sterling, Office of the Chancellor, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Vice chairman: Hobart Lewis, president and executive editor, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y.

James Biddle, president, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 748 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

James S. Copley, chairman of the corporation, Copley Newspapers, La Jolla, Calif.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

Mrs. Ann Hawkes Hutton, Bristol, Pa.

George Irwin, Quincy, Ill.

Hon. Erik Jonsson, Dallas, Tex.

George E. Lang, the George Lang Corp., New York, N.Y.

Prof. Richard P. McCormack, Department of History, Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Thomas W. Moore, president, Tomorrow Entertainment, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Clarke T. Reed, Greenville, Miss.

Frederick A. Seaton, Hastings, Nebr.

Dr. Paul S. Smith, Whittier, Calif.

Miss Nancy Porter, National Representative of Girl Scouts, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.

Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr., Washington, D.C.

Under terms of S. 1857, a Senate-passed bill which has been approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary, the membership of the Commission would be expanded to include also the Secretary of the Treasury as an ex officio member, four representatives of the judiciary branch, and 25 instead of 17 public members. (S. 1857 also authorizes grants by the ARBC to all of the State bicentennial commissions.)

ADVISORY PANEL ON COINS AND MEDALS

The proposed series of commemorative medals envisioned by H.R. 7987 was recommended by the following advisory panel established by the Commission:

George E. Lang, ARBC Commisioner, Chairman.

Mrs. Margo Russell, editor, Coin World, Vice Chairman.

Herbert M. Bergen, president, American Numismatic, Association.

Mrs. Elvira Clain-Stefanelli, curator, the National Museum of History and Technology.

Dr. Vladimir Clain-Stefanelli, curator, the National Museum of History and Technology.

Henry Grunthal, curator of European and modern coins, the American Numismatic Society.

Clifford Mishler, editor, Numismatic News.

Don Taxay, Flushing, N.Y., numismatic author.

Ralph J. Menconi, distinguished sculptor and creator of the Nixon Medal.

Eric Newman, distinguished collector.

From Federal agencies

Hon. James Conlon, Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Hon. Mary Brooks, Director of the Bureau of the Mint.

Hon. Charls Walker, Under of the Treasury.

Douglas MacAgy, National Endowment for the Arts.

(Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon, Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa, and John J. Pittman of Rochester, N.Y., new president of the American Numismatic Association, have subsequently been added to this panel.)

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

H.R. 7987 was referred to the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, which held a hearing on the measure on June 29, 1971. Witnesses favoring the bill included:

From the administration: Hon. Mary T. Brooks, Director of the Bureau of the Mint; Hon. William L. Dickey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and George E. Lang of New York, a member of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and chairman of its advisory panel on coins and medals;

From the numismatic field: Chester L. Krause of Iola, Wis., publisher of Numismatic News; and Mrs. Margo Russell of Sidney, Ohio, editor of Coin World and vice chairman of the ARBC advisory panel on coins and medals; and

From private industry in the medallic field: Michael C. Cerullo, Jr., of Attleboro, Mass., director of commemorative issues for the Robbins Co.; and William T. Louth of New York, president of Medallic Art Co.

Hon. JAMES A. MCCLURE, a Member of Congress from Idaho, testified in favor of the provisions of the bill, but urged its expansion to specify the use of silver in certain of the medals and to authorize issuance of a silver commemorative coin, as proposed in his bill H.R. 9408.

Testimony urging limitation of the bill to a national commemorative medal marking the year 1776, or otherwise reducing the variety of medals authorized in the legislation, was given by Hon. John H. Ware, a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania; Richard F. Gibbs, executive secretary of the North Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and Chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States; Hon. George F. McDonald, a representative in the Rhode Island Legislature, serving also as chairman of the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission and formerly as Chairman of the Bicentennial Council of the Original Thirteen States; and Joseph M. Segel of Philadelphia, president of Franklin Mint.

The bill was considered in the full committee on Tuesday, January 24, 1972, and approved by voice vote without amendment.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

There will be no cost to the Treasury in the production of the medals authorized by this legislation, since all production and related expenses must be paid by the ARBC. The ARBC, in turn, expects to make substantial profits from the sale of the medals to numismatists and other collectors. Annual gross revenues from sale of medals and companion commemorative stamps, in a proposed philatelic-numismatic combination suggested by the advisory panel, are estimated by Commission spokesmen at from $400,000 to $2 million, "based on an increasing yearly acceptance over a 5-year period" (p. 49 of the hearings). The Commission however, as yet has "no valid estimates" as to the potential profits from such sales.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill be approved.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. This legislation, which has been the result of the hearings held in your subcommittee, which were extensive and afforded full opportunity for all parties to be heard, does not make any provision for the incorporation of the State series into the national series, does it?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No. It has nothing to do with the State medals.

Mr. McCLURE. They are free to do what they wish, but there is no requirement that they be coordinated with the national series?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCLURE. And the legislation authorizes the Treasury Department to use whatever materials they desire to use?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct. The Treasury and the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. McCLURE. I believe there was testimony that they intend to use bronze, German silver, and platinum in their series. Has there been any change in their thinking so far as the gentlewoman's committee knows?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. At the moment I do not believe the Commission has made up its mind. If any of the Commission members are here—and I believe several of them are—they might answer that question for the gentleman.

Mr. McCLURE. But as far as your committee is concerned, no information different from that which was given in the hearings has been forthcoming?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding. Will any of these medals or whatever they are contain any of that anachronistic, barbaric gold as the Committee on Banking and Currency labeled it not so long ago when they had some legislation on the floor of the House?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I do not think I can answer that question of the gentleman. It is going to be up to the Commission and the Treasury as to what materials are used.

Mr. GROSS. I see the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) listening intently. I am sure he knows that that anachronistic, barbaric gold went to more than $48 an ounce yesterday on the world market, some $13 an ounce more than that barbaric metal was worth in the United States until last November when the administration saw fit to arbitrarily increase the price by $3 an ounce. I do not know whether the gentleman has any comment to make regarding that barbaric metal, but I will be glad to hear the gentleman if the gentlewoman will yield to him.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. First, I cannot agree with the definition of gold the gentleman uses. I do not recall our committee ever describing gold with the language the gentleman just used.

I assume from the way the gentleman started out on his question that he meant the cupro-nickel clad metal.

Mr. GROSS. Containing no gold whatsoever. I am sure we would not want to engage in an evil action of that kind. I just want to be sure that none of that

barbaric gold is going to be used in any of these metals.

Mr. PATMAN. Gold is generally used now in every country of the world, but not as you know as a medium of exchange.

Mr. GROSS. Not in the United States; is it not being used as a medium of exchange. It is used and highly valued everywhere else in the world as a medium of exchange.

Mr. PATMAN. For rings, jewelry and the like. It is used all the time, for filling of teeth and things like that.

Mr. GROSS. But your committee has labeled it as being so barbaric and so evil and so anachronistic that it must not be used as a medium of exchange in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman, I am sure, is incorrect in that statement. No one used that language.

Mr. GROSS. I will cite you chapter and verse in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. No one has used that language except the gentleman from Iowa, to my knowledge.

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in further answer to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, I would like to quote the language of the bill.

The bill states:

> The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to strike medals of suitable sizes and metals, each with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission") subject to the approval of the Secretary).

At no time has the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission mentioned the use of any gold in any of the medals to be struck.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7987 provides for the production of a series of commemorative national medals under the auspices of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The commission was set up in 1966 to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the second century since the American Revolution. As well as being a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I also serve as a member of the ARBC.

One of the means of bringing to the American people a tangible symbol of this celebration is the provision of medals for the general public. I have joined in supporting this bill to authorize the commission to make such medals available for all those who will purchase and treasure them. I would like to mention at the outset that these medals will be produced and sold on a fully reimbursable basis—that is, at no cost to the Government.

Specifically, H.R. 7987 authorizes the production of a number of medals commemorative of the American Revolution to be struck at the request of the ARBC, a national medal commemorating the year 1776, and up to 13 additional medals each of a different design to commemorate specific historical events of great significance.

These medals will be made of .925 fine silver, a combination of .925 fine silver and some other metals, and bronze.

The medals themselves will be designed by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in consultation with its advisory panel on coins and medals, and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Decisions as to the sizes of medals, their material composition, and the artistic designs will be based on studies and reports of the advisory panel, which has already undertaken to determine the factors, including necessary price to cover costs, which will assure the broadest dispersal of such medals.

Approval by the Secretary of the Treasury is required because the facilities of the Bureau of the Mint will be used to produce the medals, and costs of production and administration should be supervised to protect the Treasury. As printed in the committee's report on the bill, the Acting General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury has stated that there is no objection from that quarter, given the approval power. Additional measures of protection are provided by the minimum number of medals per series being set at 2,000, and a termination date for production of December 31, 1983. With these prerogatives vested in the Secretary, the Department of the Treasury has expressed its approval of the production of medals as provided by the bill.

The costs to the Treasury are to be fully reimbursed, on a basis which includes cost of manufacture, including labor, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses. The medals will be priced accordingly, including an allowance for a profit to the ARBC, to be devoted to carrying out its other functions.

The bill was reported out favorably by the committee by a unanimous voice vote and without amendment. Based on the hearings and information available to the committee, this bill has gained wide acceptance as a desirable program for the celebration and commemoration of the 200th anniversary of our Nation. I commend it to your favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) such time as he may consume.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill before the House and to make a few comments in regard to it.

First, I have a great and continuing interest in commemorating significant events in our history. Recently we commemorated the 100th anniversary of the War Between the States. In that commemoration we produced some literature and a better understanding of the history of the time, the problems involved, and the solutions that came from those problems when they were resolved.

A great American addressing this House said at one time—

> Whenever a people forget its early hard beginnings, it is beginning to decay.

I am quoting Carl Sandburg, who is the only private citizen not serving in public office who has addressed a joint session of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are evidences of decay in America today. We need to be reminded of those early struggles and sacrifices.

The Commission's program commemorating the bicentennial of the Revolution is focusing on those struggles and early hard beginnings. Those were not easy times for people. The series of medals proposed will be a fine series calling attention to significant dates that we need to know and remember. We need to ponder them as we prepare today to handle the problems of today and as we look to the future.

I wish to commend the committee for responding to the recommendations of the Medals Subcommittee, of which I am a member, which has spent much time evaluating this program and considering what contribution we can make with and through the medals program. We most surely will help to finance the cost of this commemoration. There is nothing wrong with that. It is something we did during the Civil War centennial celebration and it worked out very well.

I am glad to know also and emphasize and underscore what both the principal sponsors have said here, and that is those in the private business of medals are cooperating and endorsing the committee bill with one exception. That also indicates that this is a proper approach to take full benefit of the potential here.

So I commend the committee and the Congress for responding to this kind of proposal, and hope that as we carry on with the total program we can do justice to this most meritorious project. No nation has ever had the opportunity we now have to commemorate the rich heritage which is ours. We know the sacrifices of our early pioneers that gave us this thing we call America, where we have some of the basic freedoms and take advantage of those freedoms, though we do not have them in the finest sense yet.

We are still struggling with the full implementation of those basic freedoms, but we have them here, and we are embarking on a great program to call attention to this magnificent time, the 200th anniversary of the freedom on this continent.

I commend and thank the committee for this legislation. I am glad they are acting with dispatch in giving the Commission an opportunity to get going.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment now briefly on the opportunities that are presented to the Commission. First, I want to say that the Commission has not been unaware of States responsibilities. I think they are keenly aware of the challenge. I only add my comments because I feel the urgency of getting early and effective programs underway so that we can benefit to the fullest from the opportunity that this 200th anniversary of our birth brings to us.

Mr. Chairman, no country, I believe, has in its brief history produced as much good literature on basic philosophies as we have, and no country has produced a finer group of historians than we

Someone has researched this question on historians worldwide and has brought up the interesting conclusion that there are possibly 35,000 recognized and reliable historians in the world and that over 15,000 of them are Americans. So, it behooves us to have a program that will harness all the talents available here and especially the talents of those who have an interest in the Revolutionary period.

We also have great authors of drama and related literature who would be very willing to help. These must be approached and given an opportunity.

We have a communication arrangement in television, in radio, and the press which surpasses anything in the world. These facilities can be, and should be, appealed to and used as we promote this commemoration.

Also, because there are so many first and second generation Americans here, we want to use the potential of their family ties within the foreign countries to encourage them to bring visitors here.

We have great builders and we have great needs for many institutions that can be helpful. Magnificent park systems—city, State, and National—should be coordinated and orchestrated into this total program.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to know that members of the Commission are helping. Recently, they have contacted every historical association that has a statewide or national tie and invited them to not only participate, but to make suggestions. From this can come many ideas and I hope and believe that they will be used.

Already, the Commission has called in men of great talent who have and are making a study of what can and should be done. One man in particular who is highly respected in the historical field is Carl Haverlin, former president of Broadcast Music, Inc., and now retired. He is a man who, throughout his life, has been interested in American history, associated with historians, and in various ways made great contributions toward a better understanding of American history. He can, and I am sure will, be very helpful.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great opportunity we have—recalling our history, evaluating it, and using it as we make plans today to resolve problems of tomorrow.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa for his appointment recently to the Advisory Committee of the Commission. I know he will do a good job on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I also would like to say to my distinguished colleague from Iowa that the one exception which opposed this program I believe is no longer opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I take this time only to underscore what I tried to tell the Banking and Currency Committee at the hearing which was held, which was indeed a full and open hearing into the full aspects of this proposed legislation. I do not mean by my disagreement with the results in any way to say that the committee did not deliberate and make a judgment concerning what should be done. However, I will offer some amendments at the appropriate time to do what I think the committee should have done in respect to directing the activities of the Bicentennial Commission and our U.S. Treasury as to what kinds of medals should be issued.

I think it would be a very sad commentary on the commemoration of the forming of this country if we should indeed use medals of less than acceptable quality. We should at least do as well with respect to these medals as the founders of this Nation did in their coinage at the time the Nation came into being. We should also, I believe, follow the example of the private mints which have produced and are selling medals in the private markets that are composed of bronze and of silver.

I offered such legislation to the Congress and testified before the committee in support of that legislation. I am very thankful for the comments made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) just a few minutes ago with respect to the probable course that will be followed by the Bicentennial Commission in fixing the content of these medals, because I feel very strongly if these are to be an apt commemoration, they should then contain silver in their major series, and the lesser series or duplicate series could be of lesser value, could be struck in bronze for the larger markets where these medals would be less expensive.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for the statement he is making and say that I hope these medals are of better material and better put together than an Eisenhower sandwich dollar I saw not too long ago that a gentleman dropped on the floor. Whatever it was made of, it came apart in two pieces. The scrap metal was not bound properly, and he had two pieces of a dollar.

Mr. McCLURE. I know the gentleman is very well aware of the way the dollar is coming apart all around the world.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that is more of the handiwork of the Banking and Currency Committee as well as its counterpart in the Senate that we have scrap metal money in this country.

Mr. McCLURE. I think the gentlemen is well aware of the efforts I made at the time the Eisenhower dollar was authorized to make certain it was going to be a quality coin. While my original legislation called for a quality silver coin, I do not intend to go into that today, because it is another battle for another time and place.

The proposal I made would allow the Treasury to use gold if they saw fit in the presentation of medals which they have suggested will be made as awards to people who are particularly diligent in their efforts in the bicentennial observance.

I believe these kinds of materials would underscore their dedication to the fundamentals upon which this Nation was founded and which were cherished by the men and women who were the founders of this country and set the course of this great Republic of ours.

I will at the proper time offer a substitute for the committee measure, to substitute the terms of my bill for the committee-passed measure. It will do only two things in addition to what the committee measure will do.

First, it specifies the content of the medals. Second, which I believe is equally important, it will give recognition to the State series of medals so that they can be integrated with the bicentennial observance and not independent expressions of this observance. This would put the State medals in concert with the Bicentennial Commission observance, rather than outside.

I can see no reason to object to this particular form of legislation, and I believe it is something which would also enhance the sale and prestige of the State medal series.

I will also offer as an amendment to the committee measure which is before us today the single purpose of specifying the metalic content of the medals.

Without taking any further time at this time, I wanted to call attention to that.

I also wish it were possible now to confront the issue the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) just mentioned; that is, with respect to the position of gold in this country. I believe it would be appropriate if we at this time debated again the right of citizens of this country to own and hold gold of all kinds.

At this point I include the body of the statement I made before the committee, which explain in greater detail what my amendment will do:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES A. McCLURE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

I join you in saluting the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. Its recommendations for a series of medallions are entirely appropriate and in keeping with the spirit of the occasion. The bill that I have introduced, H.R. 9408, takes the Commission's suggestions, enlarges upon them and carries them, I think, to a more logical end.

Like the other measures before you, my bill provides for a National Medal and it authorizes a maximum of thirteen medals commemorating a significant milestone out of the American past.

The Commission originated the concept of an Awards Medal to be given to those individuals whose contributions to the success of the Bicentennial are considered outstanding. I like that idea very much and have provided for it in my bill.

We know that the States plan to issue medallions of their own, and as an inducement, H.R. 9408 would recognize those medals as part of the official Bicentennial program. I think it is important to remember that collectors prefer to buy a complete series. Indeed, sales of all medallions issued by the Government will be enhanced if we give official recognition to those produced by the States.

There is another consideration which bears upon the desirability of these medals and that is their composition. It is told to me by people at the Treasury Department that

some will be minted in bronze, some will be of German silver and some will be platinum. Bronze is a traditional metal for such purposes, and I have no quarrel with its inclusion. German silver on the other hand, is pot metal. If it were salable, private mints would have been using it long ago. And if private mints cannot justify its use, how can we expect the Federal Government to do so?

Platinum is equally ridiculous. It is in short supply, and its cost enormous. So, I made a few inquiries about its use in medals from respected and knowledgeable sources. The Franklin Mint in Philadelphia, for example, has tried using platinum from time to time, and never have they been able to charge less than a thousand dollars for the finished product. Numismatic News figures that a 3-inch platinum bicentennial medallion would cost somewhere between two thousand and two thousand five hundred dollars apiece.

Throughout history silver and gold have been the medals of art. Other metals offered durability; others were merely inexpensive. But only silver and gold could combine the best of all worlds—beauty as well as durability and reasonable cost.

I know of no other way to supply a prestige medal at a price acceptable to the average American than through the use of silver. We know that the Bicentennial Commission originally wanted the medallions to contain silver because the founding fathers placed great value in silver and gold coins at the time of the Nation's founding. Trade publications also have editorialized in behalf of silver bicentennial medallions, and we have proof of the metal's continued acceptance by the average American because of the unprecedented demand for the Eisenhower dollar.

Most Americans want a series of prestige bicentennial medallions, but they want them to be within reach of their pocketbooks. That is why my bill authorizes that each medal, except the Awards Medal, is to be minted in two medals, one silver and one bronze. Each would come in two sizes—a larger, prestigious medal and a smaller, more inexpensive facsimile. The Secretary of the Treasury would have the option of producing a third series in gold, if he deires to do so.

The Awards medal would be struck in .925 fine silver only. It and the state medals would be produced by private mints.

As a matter of fact, I would have no objection to farming out all of these medals to private mints if they can handle it and it meets with the Committee's approval. After all, we are commemorating 200 years in which free enterprise built this country into the most powerful nation in history. The role of private industry should be equally as important as the Government's in celebrating the occasion.

Back in the days when the Eisenhower silver dollar legislation was before the Congress, I was privileged to have as an ally in that struggle the remarkable Senator from Colorado, Mr. Dominick. It was therefore a source of deep personal pride to learn that Mr. Dominick had introduced in the Senate yesterday a bill similar to my own. I'm sure that if he were appearing before this panel today he would join me in urging that the Committee honor America's past through the use of those metals which helped make that past worth remembering. The Founding Fathers, in carving a nation out of a wilderness, did so much with so little. What a shame it would be to find that affluent America would now do so little with so much.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa made the statement he knew of one of these cupro-clad coins falling on the floor and separating. I had never heard that. I certainly do not doubt the word of the gentleman from Iowa. If he saw that happen, of course it happened.

One thing I am sure about. A coin, whether it is a cupro-clad coin, gold or silver or anything else, or paper money, issued by the Federal Government, is good. We could put it on copper or put it on anything, and the law is that any money issued by the U.S. Government—and all money is issued by the U.S. Government, if it is in circulation—is good money. It is the type of money one can pay debts or bills with. It is legal tender.

Regardless of what is presented, if a person tenders this cupro-clad money or paper money or any other type of money in payment of a bill or of a debt or of taxes, and the person who is legally permitted to accept it in payment of the debt refuses it, the debt is automatically paid, because it is legal tender.

So the gentleman has nothing to fear from this type of money, even the cupro-clad coins put out now.

Take the Eisenhower dollars. Some of them are cupro-clad. Some of the half-dollars are cupro-clad.

Take all of the nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars that are cupro-clad. They are good money. There is no risk to be run, and certainly no one has perpetrated a wrong on society or individuals who receive the money, by causing it to be put into circulation.

We must have a medium of exchange, and that is the medium of exchange. It is legal tender money, and nobody could question it.

We have in our Nation today domestically about $1.75 trillion in debts, that is, all debts, public and private. We have that much in debts. Now, if our money—and it is ours—is legal tender for the payment of those debts and taxes, it will be a long time before the money should ever be offered for sale at one cent less than a dollar in value. There would be no occasion for it, because it can always be used for the payment of debts and taxes, and we will have enough of each to the point where the money we have and which will be available to us can always be used for 100 cents on the dollar. That is the reason why I am impressed that this devaluation will not be effective for any meaningful purpose in our domestic economy.

Of course, in dealing with foreign countries it may require negotiations to determine the value of the country's money in relation to ours.

But insofar as the material that is used in it, whether it is gold or silver or copper-clad money or anything else, it is still money that is issued by the U.S. Government which is worth 100 cents on the dollar. There is no reason why any person in the United States of America should ever be required to take less.

When we have the devaluation bill up all of these questions will come up and will be material for discussion. Amendments can then be offered. But it is not material, obviously, on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. That may well be, but I cannot think of a better time to toss this issue around a little bit.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman made his contribution to debasing the intrinsic value of the currency of this country, the metal currency of this country, when he brought the bill in to debase it by taking the silver out of the coins that we had in this country. The gentleman is well aware of that. He made his contribution to debasing it, and the inflation that has come upon us has played its part in further debauching it.

Mr. PATMAN. Not by reason of that.

Mr. GROSS. I said that inflation has debauched it.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: If anything is acceptable, as currency why were zinc pennies taken out of circulation and I happen to have one of those zinc pennies in my hand. There were millions of them coined in World War II. Why were they ever taken out of circulation? They represented a penny just as much as this scrap metal being used today.

Mr. PATMAN. They do.

Mr. GROSS. They represented your version of currency just as much as the present pennies do. Why were they taken out of circulation and the taxpayers put to the expense of reproducing millions upon millions of pennies? Do you have any idea as to why that happened?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I do. During the war, you see, we needed copper. It became scarce. Therefore they accumulated all of the copper scrap from any source that they could to use in the war machinery. It was wartime, and copper was employed in winning the war. After the war was over it was again more plentiful.

Mr. GROSS. But, why go back? to copper after the war? Zinc is durable.

Mr. PATMAN. Now just a moment. I remember in the first World War I was on the Pacific Coast, in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and other places, where gold was mined and they would bring it in and they would have pieces of gold that were not put out by the Government. They had a block there in every store where merchandise was handled or anything was traded, and the person in charge would throw a piece up in the air and let it fall on that block and see if it would ring true. That was the phrase. See if it would ring true. If it rang true, they would take it, although it was not put out by the U.S. Government.

This copper-clad money will not ring true. There is no question about that. But with the seal of the United States on it and with the law saying that it is legal tender money and that everyone must accept it in payment of debts or taxes, you could not have better money than that.

Mr. GROSS. They used to say "When I was single my money would jingle; oh, Lord, how I wish I was single again." We used to have silver money that would jingle and would ring where dropped, as the gentleman just said. The stuff we have now lands with a dull thud.

Yes, the gentleman and his committee have made a contribution to denying the generations to come some of the good things of life that we enjoyed.

Mr. PATMAN. If that is what they like, just for jingling purposes——

Mr. GROSS. What is a better feeling than to have money in your pocket that will jingle? Money that you know has intrinsic value.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right, if the gentleman wants it but it is not necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no, it is not necessary neither was it necessary for the committee to bring in legislation debasing our currency by taking all of the silver out when, at the same time, millions of ounces of U.S. silver was being sold to foreign countries.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the discussion which we have had today on monetary policy. However, it does not directly relate to this bill.

What we are trying to do is to get out some medals to commemorate the bicentennial celebration of this country's 200th birthday.

As far as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), is concerned in his comments about the use of gold and silver, I believe since I have been in this Congress I have voted consistently against deficit spending and I regret some of the steps we have been forced to take.

But, let me make several things clear. First, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission is charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that the 200th birthday of this country is properly celebrated in every State. To that end the ARBC has been making an effort to have every State set up a bicentennial commission for that State. We have been successful to the extent that something like 30-odd State bicentennial commissions have been set up.

Now, there is a very close cooperation between the State bicentennial commissions and the ARBC.

However, one thing we cannot do, if we do not want to alienate the State bicentennial commissions, is to start telling them that they can do nothing without Federal approval, because as State representatives, many of them want to celebrate the bicentennial in their own way, and they have a right to do this.

So, there is a plan and there is some legislation which would provide $90,000 to each State for planning purposes, and then these plans of the State would be presented to the ARBC for comment. So, it is hoped that the Federal Government may help to underwrite some part of the celebration.

For the first time, incidentally, definite progress is being made in the city of Philadelphia toward selecting a proper international exposition site for 1976. They will have their report ready in the very near future.

As far as getting down to actually saying what kind of metal is going to be used in making the medals that will be placed on sale to the general public, we have to keep in mind the one primary consideration has got to be cost. Sure, we can have special awards medals made in gold, but as you know we still have a distressing shortage of gold in this country.

We know that they can be made of .925 fine silver, and it would be rather expensive. On the other hand we could also use silver with the combination of some other metal to make a medal that is cheaper and place it within the price range so that more people can afford them, or we can use bronze. All three types of medals can be minted and sold.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is making a very good point when he talks about the cost that is involved. And that is one of the things that was particularly distressing to me when I learned that there was some mention of some thought of making the special award medal out of platinum. If it is made in that way the cost would be extremely high, as the gentleman well knows. And I might point out that a prominent manufacturer of medals has tried to use platinum, and I think the gentleman should know that platinum cannot be utilized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There has never been any proposal by the ARBC to sponsor medals in which platinum will be used as the metal. There are a series of nine recommendations made by the advisory committee, and none of them include that which you have referred to. Possibly what you are referring to is some medal that a State has arranged to buy from a private manufacturer of medals.

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to conclude by saying that I think this legislation has been thought out. I think it accomplishes that which we want to accomplish and at the same time it provides the ARBC with enough flexibility to provide these medals at a cost that anyone can afford.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, during the first session of this Congress—indeed, since its initial organization—the American Bicentennial Commission has frequently been subjected to criticism. Without offering for consideration the problems with which this organization must contend—and there are many—there are those who have complained of the operation of the ARBC, particularly the manner in which it has been using the nominal funding that it has received.

In an effort to offer some reassurances regarding ARBC expenditures, and in order to give credit where credit is due, I would like to offer the following correspondence from David J. Mahoney, chairman of the American Bicentennial Revolution:

Hon. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: One of the first actions I took after my appointment as Chairman of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was to seek a meeting with the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Elmer Staats.

Mr. Staats graciously spent several hours with me on September 23, 1970. I emphasized my interest in having the Government Accounting Office assist us in conducting an independent audit of the Commission's activities to date as well as in giving us any suggestions they might have. Mr. Staats brought into the meeting Mr. J. Edward Welch, General Counsel of the Government Accounting Office. Also in attendance was Mr. Mel Spector, Executive Director of the ARBC.

Mr. Staats and Mr. Welch thoroughly endorsed our request but did not seem inclined to believe that an audit was needed at the time. Mr. Staats stated that he agreed with me but that we could not get anyone for this job less than a GS–17 or GS–18. He stated he would seek supergrades from the Civil Service Commission to help us with our problem.

Both these gentlemen were more than cooperative and said that it was one of the first times in their memory that a Chairman had gone before them to ask for such assistance in advance.

We have in every way attempted to comply with the directive of the Government Accounting Office. I am very cognizant of the great responsibilities of this Commission to the people of America in the upcoming Bicentennial. I am constantly aware that, much like Caesar's wife, we must not only be above reproach, but appear to be above it.

There can always be errors of judgment, of course, but it was and is my intention that the accountability of the Commission should be an open matter. This was so indicated by my voluntary visit with Mr. Staats fifteen months ago.

I certainly appreciate your interest in our behalf, and am pleased to supply you with this information.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. MAHONEY.

Mr. Chairman, I might add that it is the good fortune of Congress to have a man of Mr. Mahoney's caliber to be responsible for ARBC expenditures and it is the good fortune of the citizens of the United States to have a man of his dedication serving their interests. Asking nothing more than the opportunity to provide the American people with a celebration commensurate with our pride of 200 years of liberty under democracy, David Mahoney has given to the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission imaginative and selfless leadership.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time and I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of the United States and the historic events preceding and associated with the American Revolution, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to strike medals of suitable sizes and metals, each with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission") subject to the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 2. A national medal shall be struck commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence. In addition to the national medal, a maximum of thirteen medals each of a different design may be struck to commemorate specific historical events of great importance, recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall strike and furnish to the Commission such quantities of medals as may be necessary, with a minimum order of two thousand medals of each design or size. They shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission, but no medals may be made after December 31, 1983.

SEC. 4. The medals authorized under this Act are national medals within the meaning of section 3851 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 5. The medals shall be furnished by the Secretary at a price equal to the cost of the manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'CLURE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLURE: Page 1, strike out lines 3 and all that follows thereafter through page 2, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of the United States and the historic events preceding and associated with the American Revolution, there is hereby authorized to be struck medals of suitable sizes, each with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary"), which shall be known as the United States Bicentennial medal series (hereafter referred to as the "series").

SEC. 2. (a) A national medal shall be struck commemorating the year 1776 and its significance to American independence.

(b) An awards medal may be struck as a Commission presentation piece in recognition of outstanding service, leadership, or support of bicentennial programs.

(c) A maximum of thirteen medals each of a different design may be struck to commemorate specific historical events of great importance, recognized nationally as milestones in the continuing progress of the United States of America toward life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

(d) Each State may cause to be struck and issued a medal subject to the approval of the Commission and the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Each medal with the exception of the awards medal shall be of four or more varieties: One shall be struck in .925 fine silver, one shall be struck in bronze, and two shall be struck in .925 fine silver and bronze, respectively, and be of such size so as to be an inexpensive facsimile of the more costly medals authorized under this Act. The awards medal shall be struck in .925 fine silver and be of only one size which shall be determined by the Commission. In addition, the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary may direct that any of the medals authorized in section 2 be struck in gold.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized and directed to strike the national medal authorized in section 2(a) and the commemorative medals authorized in section 2(c) of this Act. The awards medal authorized in section 2(b) and the State medals authorized in section 2(d) of this Act shall be struck by private mints.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall strike and furnish to the Commission such quantities of national medals and commemorative medals as may be necessary, with a minimum order of two thousand medals of each design and size. They shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the Commission, but no medals may be made after December 31, 1983. The medals shall be furnished by the Secretary at a price equal to the cost of the manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 6. The medals authorized under section 2(a) and (c) of this Act are national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 368).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the third sentence of section 3510 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 276) and in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the United States, the Secretary shall cause to be minted and issued, in such limited quantity as he determines appropriate, $1 pieces which shall have—

(1) a diameter of 1.500 inches;

(2) a cladding of an alloy of eight hundred parts of silver and two hundred parts of copper; and

(3) a core of an alloy of silver and copper such that the whole coin weighs 24.592 grams and contains 9.837 grams of silver and 14.755 grams of copper.

The coins authorized under this section shall be of such design as the Secretary determines to be appropriate after consultation with the Commission.

Mr. McCLURE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, 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 Idaho?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen a copy of the amendment.

Mr. McCLURE. It is at the gentleman's desk.

Mr. PATMAN. We have two or three amendments. I think it would be better to have the amendment read in full and I hope the gentleman will not insist on his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw by unanimous-consent request for the moment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

Mr. Chairman, the Commission very carefully considered this, and the proposals that are in this amendment were turned down.

They want to make the medal at the lowest possible price so as to have wide distribution to commemorate this great event of the 200th anniversary. So in doing that, they wanted to keep the materials at a low price. This amendment would require the use of silver and gold—and permit the use of gold, whether it required it or not.

Mr. Chairman, it was not intended in this legislation that either gold or silver be used. The Commission, of course, under the original bill could not go outside and use silver and gold. But if this amendment were adopted, it would permit that to be done. It goes clearly outside the language of the bill and, therefore, the amendment is not germane.

Furthermore, if a State desires to have a Bicentennial Commission of its own, as was the case with the Sesquicentennial Commission of 1936, under the amendment the State would be required to obtain permission. In that case the State then did not have to get the permission of the Federal Government to put out its medals, advertising, and valuable souvenirs. Under this proposal the States would have to come to the Federal Commission to get power to do so. Therefore, the amendment is clearly outside the scope of the original bill that is presented. Not only does Mary Brooks, the very fine Director of the Mint, oppose it, but the Commission opposes it. It has been thoroughly considered at every point. Proposals of this type have been considered, and at no point have they ever been approved.

I do not see why we should pick out a certain section of the country and say that because it produces silver, if we could encourage the use of more silver, it would help that section. The same would be true with respect to the gold. Here is a place where gold is produced. If we could make them put gold in the proposed coins, there would be a better market for gold. It would increase the price of gold and help that area.

I can see where there is a strong appeal that can be made, but considering the fact——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not arguing the germaneness of the amendment. He is bringing in a lot of extraneous matter. It does not make any difference what some bureaucrat or official downtown thinks of putting silver into medals. It is a question of the germaneness of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas may continue to discuss his point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would affect section 7 of the Coinage Act relative to the distribution, the production and distribution of $1 pieces. It would change the basic law in a number of substantial respects. Therefore, it is clearly subject to a point of order and I insist, Mr. Chairman, that it be declared as not germane and the point of order sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho wish to be heard?

Mr. McCLURE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McCLURE. First, I attempted to ask that I be heard on a unanimous-consent request, because the copy which was given to the gentleman from Texas and the copy sent to the desk inadvertently contain section 7, which I had not intended to be in the amendment, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that section 7 be stricken.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman would yield, I think it would be very unusual to change the amendment right now. It was offered to the Chairman of the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. It has been read. If the gentleman desires to withdraw it and there is no objection—and, of course, I would not object—but it would be very unusual to start all over again.

Mr. McCLURE. I can proceed in either of two ways. I can withdraw the amendment and offer another without section 7. Or I can ask unanimous consent that reference to section 7 be deleted from the proffered substitute. I have asked the House for unanimous consent to strike section 7.

Mr. PATMAN. Time is of the essence in relation to this bill. On July 4, we are supposed to have out these souvenirs and coins. They would be produced under a time schedule, and the Director of the Mint is trying to meet that time schedule. It is going to upset the whole Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. McCLURE. If the gentleman is sincere about saving time, then I suggest that he not raise any objection to my unanimous-consent request. We could then consider the point of order, and then consider the amendment on its merits, and we would save a lot of time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, without waiving the point of order, and reserving the point of order—however, I would like to have this amendment ruled on with section 7 in it first, and then if it is held subject to a point of order, you can offer another amendment. That would be the regular way of doing it. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. McCLURE. Does the gentleman object to the striking of section 7?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is not the right way to do it. I made the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho? Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to modify the amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Without jeopardizing the point of order, I would not object to that.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. That is with the understanding it would not jeopardize the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MADDEN). The Chair is ready to rule. This bill clearly deals with national medals, and they must be struck by the Secretary of the Treasury. The amendment itself brings in the subject of State medals and provides that they are to be struck by private mints, which is clearly not in the bill and not germane.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I was not heard on the point of order, and I do not wish to quarrel with the Chair, but may I be heard on the point of order for the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled, but the Chair will hear the gentleman if he wishes to speak.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Chair will permit me even belatedly to make the point I wish to make in regard to this particular amendment, and that is the fact that the bill provides for the striking of medals for the commemoration of the bicentennial, and that is all this amendment does. To say this is not germane to the subject matter of this bill seems to be straining at gnats and avoiding the issue presented by the amendment, which is simply the content and the form and the manner in which the medals will be issued, which is precisely what the major bill does.

I would ask the Chair to rule upon the point of order. I had not understood the Chair had, although he indicated he thought perhaps it was not germane. I will, of course, abide by the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Without reiterating his reasons, the Chair still holds the amendment is not germane and sustains the point of order.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho have a further amendment?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'CLURE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLURE: Page 2, immediately after line 21, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Each medal shall be of four or more varieties: One shall be struck in .925 fine silver, one shall be struck in bronze, and two shall be struck in .925 fine silver and bronze respectively and be of such size so as to be an inexpensive facsimile of the more costly medals authorized under this Act. In addition, the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary, may direct that any of the medals authorized in section 2 be struck in gold."

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not go as far as the last one which I had offered, which did go into the question of the State medals. This simply addresses itself to the content of the medals, and I think it is a perfectly legitimate, perfectly logical area for the Congress to exercise its discretion and to exercise its direction to the Bicentennial Commission, because I think again, as I said in the general debate, that to strike medals which are not in the same vein as the coinage issued by those who founded this country is certainly no proper recognition of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution.

It is said that the legislation before us gives the Treasury authority, in consultation with the Bicentennial Commission, to define the metal content in these medals.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) indicated it is his understanding that they are tending in this direction and certainly not in the direction some other people have indicated might be taken.

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

Mr. McCLURE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in this amendment where the gentleman says that two medals shall be struck in 0.925 fine silver and bronze respectively, does the gentleman mean a combination of those two metals?

Mr. McCLURE. No; I will say to the gentleman I do not. It is intended that there will be two sizes of medals and two materials. There will be a regular size in bronze and one of a silver alloy which is commonly known in the trade as sterling silver.

Then would be a smaller one of similar metal content.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What does the gentleman mean by the words:

Each medal shall be of four or more varieties:

Mr. McCLURE. The bill provides for as many as 14 medals, and the varieties I am speaking of would be a regular-sized bronze medal, a regular-sized silver medal, and a smaller bronze medal, and a smaller silver medal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For each of these?

Mr. McCLURE. For however many they decide to issue, 13 or 14 authorized under the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why would the gentleman say, in this amendment:

One shall be struck in 0.925 fine silver, one shall be struck in bronze, and two shall be struck in 0.925 fine silver and bronze respectively.

Why does the gentleman not say, "And two smaller medals shall be struck"?

Mr. McCLURE. It seemed to me this language was clear. Certainly I do not object to what the gentleman is trying to state. I believe the legislative history made by the questions here will make certain that is exactly what is intended by the legislation.

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have followed the debate here very closely. As I indicated earlier, I am on the committee which deals with this question.

This matter of having two different sizes has been before us before. For obvious reasons, I believe—and this is a matter of great interest to collectors—we do not do this. At this point I believe it would be inadvisable for us to accept the amendment on that ground.

The point I am interested in now is the cost of the silver medal under the amendment as compared to the cost of the medal under terms of the committee bill.

Mr. McCLURE. I do not believe a comparison can be made, because the committee bill does not say what the substance will be. If indeed the Bicentennial Commission says that these are the substances which will be used there will be no difference in cost. All this is a congressional expression of what metals should be used in the medal.

I would say to the gentleman, with regard to the two different sizes, this is a very usual practice in the medallion field, of having two different sizes at a different cost, one a standard medal and one less expensive, which more of our citizens across the land could own and possibly would buy.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have been somewhat interested in this as a collector of medals. I know something about collections. I have seen the display, which is the largest in the world, at the Smithsonian. This is not exactly characteristic of medals. Generally they are of one size. This was specially so for the Civil War Centennial, which had one size medal.

Mr. McCLURE. There is a great market now in the private field, and several private mints have developed a means of merchandizing their own privately produced, privately authorized medals. They

are very successful with two sizes and in these materials.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes a national Commission, on which eight Members of Congress serve, along with 12 Cabinet officers or heads of departments, and a group of 37 distinguished Americans appointed by the President, to use the facilities of the Bureau of the Mint to produce a series of commemorative medals for sale to the public.

What those medals will be made of—whether of silver or bronze or brass or other materials—will depend upon the Commission's own judgment. They want to make these medals available as broadly as possible to as many Americans as they can interest in buying them as a reminder of our national origins and national heritage.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of the committee, it would be highly improper for the committee to require the Commission to use any particular material in the production of the medals. This is not a relief bill for the silver industry, and it should not be made into one.

If the silver industry wants to promote the use of silver in these medals, it should go to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and try to sell that Commission on the virtues or advantages of using silver.

One of the witnesses who testified before us suggested it would be a good idea to use recycled materials in some or all of the medals. But this, again, is up to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

I oppose any attempt to write into this bill any requirement that one type of mineral be favored over another in the production of these medals. All the bill does, I repeat, is to authorize the use of mint facilities on a fully reimbursable basis. We no longer have vast stores of Government-owned silver available for use in coinage or medals—all of the remaining silver is in the defense stockpile. So if the Commision decides to use any silver in its medals—as it well might—it would have to go out and buy the silver on the open market. There is no Government-owned silver they could use and the medals would become too costly for large quantities to be sold.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I want to say this: excepting myself on the committee we have men and women of great ability and experience, and I think this Congress can trust the committee to be a wise counsel and adviser to the Bicentennial Commission. I think it is in good hands. I think it would be unwise for us to take this amendment. I have the feeling why this has not been taken up by the committee, and I feel that almost everyone, although not all, oppose it. Therefore, I oppose it on that ground.

Also, I think this kind of approach has not had sufficient discussion, and for that reason we ought to defeat it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, the last sentence of the amendment says:

> In addition, the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary, may direct that any of the medals authorized in section 2 be struck in gold.

That applies directly to 13 medals the sale of which may run into the hundreds of thousands. We all know the gold situation in this country. We are short of gold right now.

Another thing also is I object to the section which says:

> Each medal shall be of four or more varieties: One shall be struck in .925 fine silver, one shall be struck in bronze—

Obviously this is an attempt to have a fairly expensive medal and then a cheaper medal. Then we go on to say in the amendment—

> and two shall be struck in .925 fine silver and bronze respectively and be of such size so as to be an inexpensive facsimile of the more costly medals authorized under this Act.

Actually, the cost of the bronze in making the full-size medal as compared to the smaller facsimile would amount to a cost of only a few pennies.

Therefore I do not see the need for this amendment and, in fact, I think it would be harmful.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could vote on the amendment. I do not know if anybody else desires to speak on it, but we have discussed it fully.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could we have some indication as to the number that would wish to speak under the suggestion of the chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes two Members on their feet.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Since becoming a Member of this body, Mr. Chairman, I have heard on the floor of the House condemnation of the executive branch and specifically the OMB on not—and I specify on not—complying with the intent of Congress. So I would ask the chairman of this committee and perhaps the entire committee why they have not chosen to be very specific on the type of medals that they wish and also their content.

I think, perhaps, that question has been answered specifically a short time ago. However, it would seem to me that the answer says this in the language of the country from where I come—that we seem to be more concerned with cheapness rather than less expensive medals to be made available to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the concept of two sizes, and contrary to the statement of my colleague, I am sure he will find that the smaller medals will be considerably less expensive. The price of the medal itself would be considerably less and will be within the means of the younger citizens of this country, as the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) just specified.

Mr. Chairman, I would reject the argument of the chairman of the committee that it is only because of certain sections of the country that we are attempting to include within the medal, within the bill, specific metals.

I think that it has been the work of this Congress over and over again within the scope of welfare itself to enact laws which specifically support or aid different areas of this great country, and I can assure anyone——

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

Mr. SHOUP. One moment, sir, and I shall yield to the gentleman.

I can assure the gentleman that if the Congress will recognize the strong forces of supply and demand of silver and gold alone that the State of Montana will reduce its share of welfare requests because it will allow a great industry to get back on its feet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I assume that the great industry that the gentleman has referred to is the silver industry getting back on its feet. However, I do not think we should use a bill like this which is supposed to be in the public interest—and it is in the public interest—for the purpose of promoting any section of the United States or promoting any product, whether it is gold or silver or bronze or anything else.

This Commission, I am sure the gentleman realizes, was appointed by the President of the United States to do something that would be fair to all citizens in the United States and not to pick out any section to favorably consider or any product to favorably consider, but to treat everyone fairly and equally, at least equitably for the purpose of one thing—not the question of the medal or how it is made, but this is a bicentennial celebration, something of which we are very proud. It is the 200th anniversary of the founding of our country. I think we are all proud of it. Why should we lose sight of that and turn down what this 37-member Commission has selected as the right kind of authority they need in order to put on the right kind of celebration for our 200th anniversary?

In consideration of this, does the gentleman not think we can well afford to leave it up to the Commission?

Mr. SHOUP. I would revert to my original statement on the intent of Congress and leaving this to the Commission's discretion. It is strictly with the pride I have of this country and of the celebration that is coming up that I think this Congress should take the responsibility to insure that there is no cheapness in any of our legal observances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 32, noes, 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. MADDEN, 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. 7987) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the American Revolution, pursuant to House Resolution 790, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—388

Abbitt	Cabell	Edwards, Calif.
Abernethy	Caffery	Eilberg
Abourezk	Camp	Erlenborn
Abzug	Carey, N.Y.	Esch
Adams	Carney	Eshleman
Addabbo	Carter	Evans, Colo.
Anderson, Calif.	Casey, Tex.	Fascell
	Cederberg	Findley
Anderson, Ill.	Celler	Fish
Anderson, Tenn.	Chamberlain	Fisher
	Chappell	Flood
Andrews	Clancy	Flowers
Annunzio	Clark	Flynt
Archer	Clausen, Don H.	Foley
Arends		Ford, Gerald R.
Ashbrook	Clawson, Del	Ford, William D.
Ashley	Cleveland	
Aspin	Collier	Forsythe
Aspinall	Collins, Ill.	Fountain
Badillo	Collins, Tex.	Fraser
Baker	Conable	Frelinghuysen
Barrett	Conte	Frenzel
Begich	Conyers	Fulton
Belcher	Cotter	Fuqua
Bennett	Coughlin	Gallagher
Bergland	Crane	Garmatz
Betts	Culver	Gaydos
Bevill	Curlin	Gettys
Biaggi	Daniel, Va.	Giaimo
Biester	Daniels, N.J.	Gibbons
Bingham	Danielson	Goldwater
Blanton	Davis, S.C.	Gonzalez
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Goodling
Boland	de la Garza	Grasso
Bolling	Delaney	Gray
Bow	Dellenback	Green, Oreg.
Brademas	Dellums	Green, Pa.
Brasco	Denholm	Griffin
Bray	Dennis	Griffiths
Brinkley	Dent	Gross
Brooks	Derwinski	Grover
Broomfield	Devine	Gubser
Brotzman	Dickinson	Hagan
Brown, Mich.	Diggs	Haley
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Hall
Broyhill, N.C.	Donohue	Halpern
Broyhill, Va.	Dow	Hamilton
Buchanan	Dowdy	Hammer-schmidt
Burke, Fla.	Drinan	
Burke, Mass.	Dulski	Hanley
Burleson, Tex.	Duncan	Hanna
Burlison, Mo.	du Pont	Harsha
Burton	Eckhardt	Harvey
Byrne, Pa.	Edmondson	Hastings
Byron	Edwards, Ala.	Hathaway
Hawkins	Miller, Ohio	Schmitz
Hays	Mills, Md.	Schneebeli
Heckler, Mass.	Minish	Schwengel
Heinz	Mink	Scott
Helstoski	Minshall	Sebelius
Henderson	Mizell	Seiberling
Hicks, Mass.	Mollohan	Shipley
Hicks, Wash.	Monagan	Shoup
Hillis	Montgomery	Shriver
Hogan	Morgan	Sikes
Hosmer	Morse	Sisk
Howard	Mosher	Skubitz
Hull	Moss	Slack
Hungate	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Hunt	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Hutchinson	Myers	Snyder
Ichord	Natcher	Spence
Jacobs	Nedzi	Springer
Jarman	Nelsen	Staggers
Johnson, Pa.	Nichols	Stanton, J. William
Jonas	Nix	
Jones, Ala.	Obey	Steele
Jones, N.C.	O'Hara	Steiger, Ariz.
Jones, Tenn.	O'Neill	Steiger, Wis.
Kastenmeier	Patman	Stephens
Kazen	Patten	Stokes
Keating	Pelly	Stratton
Kee	Pepper	Stubblefield
Keith	Perkins	Stuckey
Kemp	Pettis	Sullivan
King	Peyser	Symington
Kluczynski	Pickle	Talcott
Koch	Pike	Taylor
Kuykendall	Pirnie	Teague, Calif.
Kyl	Poage	Teague, Tex.
Kyros	Podell	Terry
Landgrebe	Poff	Thompson, Ga.
Landrum	Powell	Thompson, N.J.
Latta	Preyer, N.C.	Thomson, Wis.
Lent	Price, Ill.	Thone
Link	Price, Tex.	Tiernan
Lloyd	Pucinski	Udall
Long, La.	Purcell	Ullman
Long, Md.	Quie	Van Deerlin
Lujan	Quillen	Vander Jagt
McClory	Railsback	Vanik
McCloskey	Randall	Veysey
McClure	Rangel	Vigorito
McCollister	Rarick	Waggonner
McCulloch	Rees	Waldie
McDade	Reid	Wampler
McDonald, Mich.	Reuss	Ware
	Rhodes	Whalen
McEwen	Roberts	Whalley
McFall	Robinson, Va.	White
McKay	Robison, N.Y.	Whitehurst
McKevitt	Rodino	Whitten
McKinney	Roe	Widnall
McMillan	Rogers	Wiggins
Macdonald, Mass.	Roncalio	Williams
	Rooney, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Madden	Rooney, Pa.	Wilson, Charles H.
Mahon	Rosenthal	
Mailliard	Rostenkowski	Winn
Mallary	Roush	Wright
Mann	Rousselot	Wyatt
Martin	Roy	Wydler
Mathias, Calif.	Roybal	Wylie
Mathis, Ga.	Runnels	Wyman
Matsunaga	Ruppe	Yates
Mayne	Ruth	Yatron
Mazzoli	Ryan	Young, Fla.
Meeds	St Germain	Young, Tex.
Melcher	Sandman	Zablocki
Metcalfe	Satterfield	Zion
Michel	Saylor	Zwach
Mikva	Scherle	
Miller, Calif.	Scheuer	

NAYS—1

Hechler, W. Va.

NOT VOTING—42

Alexander	Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.
Baring	Frey	Mitchell
Bell	Galifianakis	Moorhead
Blackburn	Gude	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	Passman
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Harrington	Riegle
Clay	Hébert	Sarbanes
Colmer	Holifield	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Horton	Stanton, James V.
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Calif.	
Dorn	Karth	Steed
Downing	Leggett	Wolff
Dwyer	Lennon	
Edwards, La.	McCormack	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Holifield with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Steed.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Gude.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Harrington with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Galifianakis.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Downing with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Sarbanes.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

CREATING A NEW JUDICIAL DISTRICT AND PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 783 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 783

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11394) to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, to provide for the appointment of additional district judgeships, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a 1-hour open

rule for a bill providing for the appointment of certain additional district judges. The one in Louisiana which is included in this bill, according to my understanding, has already been allowed in other legislation. The bill before us actually will provide for one additional district judge for the Southern District of Florida, one additional district judge for the Northern District of Indiana, one additional judge for the Western District of Missouri, and one additional judge for the Northern District of Texas.

The cost estimate for the four new permanent district judgeships is $1,099,000 for the first year, and $967,000 for subsequent years.

I detail the content of the bill that will be made in order, because the rule does not make clear what the content of the bill made in order is. It refers to the title which deals with the Louisiana judgeship which has already become law in another fashion, and that is my only reason for detailing the content of the bill.

I know of no controversy on the rule. There is some controversy on the bill.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has already given us an adequate description and discussion of the subject matter of the bill which this rule would make in order which, as the gentleman has indicated, despite the title, is really concerned with the creation of four additional U.S. Federal District judgeships rather than a new judicial district.

I just want to take this opportunity, since I have the floor, to express my appreciation publicly at this time to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) for the words that he had for me when the bill was before the Committee on Rules the other day.

I had explained to him that in view of the fact that the bill, at least originally, had provided for the creation of an additional judicial district that I would like very much to propose on the floor of the House legislation creating an additional judicial district in my own State of Illinois which would serve what is now the Western Division of the Northern District, where we are receiving, according to the bar of that area, inadequate judicial service. And the distinguished chairman pressed upon me the temporary expediency or solution of perhaps getting the Chief Justice of the United States to cooperate in assigning a judge otherwise on the retired list to assist in that particular area, because we have been told by the presiding chief judge of northern Illinois, Judge Robson, that he does not have the judicial talent to send out to sit in and service the Western Division of the Northern District of Illinois.

So I take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman for that offer which I will certainly discuss with him further, and privately, in an effort to work out some solution for my own section of the country, my own State.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) has filed some individual views, only a page in length, but there is, I think, a very excellent history of this legislation. Quite some controversy has developed with respect to the additional judge that this bill provides for the northern district of Indiana.

Rather than discuss at this time the amendment which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) has informed me he will offer to the bill when we consider it under the 5-minute rule, I would yield him some time to discuss his own amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would merely conclude my remarks by saying that this is an open rule with 1 hour of debate. I know of no opposition to the rule as such and join in urging its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to advise and alert such of my colleagues as are on the floor as to the only point in this bill so far as I know which would be at all controversial. That deals with the matter of Federal judges, or judge, in the State of Indiana.

In order to bring us up to date, a little history is in order on that subject. We had here in the last session, as Members will remember, an omnibus judges' bill which created new and additional Federal judges in a great many States of the Union. That bill in its original form and as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States whose business is to make such recommendations, included two judges in the State of Indiana. One in the northern district and one in the southern district—the two districts in my State.

It passed the Senate with the two judges and without any controversy.

Unfortunately, when it got into the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) for reasons which are more comprehensible to him than to me, struck out the two judges for his State and mine. At that time, yielding to the advice of senior Members, I did not contest that matter on the floor, hoping something would be worked out in the parliamentary process. But nothing was worked out and Indiana got no judges, in spite of the fact that they had been recommended by the Judicial Conference.

When this bill came along this year, I wanted to be very reasonable. Instead of offering two Indiana judges, which we had been entitled to in the previous bill, and in the hope of compromising and agreeing with my good friend from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) I provided simply in this bill that we have one roving judge additional in the State of Indiana to serve both districts.

That was designed to meet his argument, with which I did not agree; but to meet his argument that there was not a sufficient case load for two judges—and the Judicial Conference thought that there was—my friend claimed that there was not—I decided to take half a loaf and have one judge to serve the two districts.

I hoped my colleague Mr. JACOBS would agree to that and that there would not be any controversy to take up the time of the House, but unfortunately he could not see it that way. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary wrote in the one roving judge in the State of Indiana, but on Mr. JACOBS' motion, the full committee, by a margin of three votes, struck out the roving judge and made one judge for the Northern District of Indiana only.

Now my friend had said that we did not need any judge at all 2 years ago, but he now concedes we should have one in the northern district. My district and his is the southern district.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am not asking to add a judge. All I am trying to do is to see to it that that one judge serves both districts, as provided in the original bill approved by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Therefore, at the appropriate time, when the Judiciary Committee amendment which strikes out the roving judge and creates a judgeship in the northern district only is read, I will oppose that committee amendment. I will ask for a "no" vote on that committee amendment, the effect of which will be to restore the roving judge and to make this one Indiana judge serve both of the two districts in the State of Indiana.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and H.R. 11394, the bill from the Committee on the Judiciary that provides for the appointment of additional permanent judgeships.

I wish to commend members of that committe for their foresight and wisdom in expanding the means by which the administration of justice will be enhanced. Congressional approval of this measure will enable the President to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, one additional judgeship for the citizens of the State of Missouri.

The addition of this permanent judgeship will raise to four the number of Federal judges presently sitting and presiding in the western district cities of Kansas City, Jefferson City, Joplin, St. Joseph, and Springfield. The 2,135,315 citizens residing within this district will be provided with the additional means by which their legal rights will have prompt, adequate, and efficient consideration.

It was in September of 1968 when this additional judgeship was originally proposed and recommended to the Congress by the Judicial Conference of the United States as part of its quadrennial survey of the needs of the district courts. While the 1970 omnibus district judgeship bill reported by the Judiciary Committee deleted this additional judgeship, the necessity for expansion of the judgeships in the western district of Missouri was reiterated by the judicial conference at its October 1970 meeting. The conclusions

of that conference were that the need for an additional judgeship in the western district of Missouri constituted an emergency situation that could be abated only by congressional authorization at the earliest possible date.

A cursory examination of the statistical case load, including the weighted case load per judgeship, the time interval from issue to trial, the numbers and types of civil and criminal cases commenced in preceding years and the numbers and the types of civil and criminal cases pending in the western district of Missouri clearly resolves any doubt of the necessity of this additional permanent position.

This proposed addition lends assurance of reasonably prompt consideration of the cases filed, helps to relieve the congestion of the crowded dockets and diffuses the frustration of delay.

The previously low number of caseload backlogs in this district, as well as the fact only three civil cases were pending more than 3 years as of June 30, 1971, is a credit to both the bench and the bar of the western district of Missouri. However, the caseload growth from 1969 through 1971, revealing a dramatic filings increase of 60 percent on the civil side and 36 percent on the criminal side is proof that retaining the concerted efforts of this district's bench and bar deserves the expansion offered by H.R. 11394.

In 1970, there was a startling increase of 501 more civil actions than had been filed in the year 1969; three-fourths of this increase was the result of prisoner petitions. Criminal filings also sharply climbed from 162 in 1970, to 435 in 1971.

For many years I have been clearly convinced that the backlog of civil and criminal cases has unnecessarily debilitated the effective and just consideration of private and public controversies. Speedy and public determination of legal rights, one of the touchstones of the American common law tradition, requires the threat of an additional backlog be given our immediate attention.

The effects of this district's case backlog is immediately perceived by the increase of the median time interval from issue to trial of civil cases which rose from 5 months in 1968, to 9 months in 1971.

Not only has the change in the business of the district courts been quantitative, it also has been qualitative. The increased number of cases, accompanied by a proliferation of motions and hearings, raise more complex issues that place heavier demands on the time of each trial judge. Since 1970, the weighted caseload per judgeship in the western district of Missouri has substantially increased the workload per judgeship from a national rank order of 57th to ninth position. In 1971, the weighted caseload per judgeship moved up from 367 to 398.

The creation of an additional permanent judgeship in the western district of Missouri, I believe, will materially contribute the means by which this district can more efficiently and expeditiously handle the business brought before it.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to echo the sentiments stated by the previous speaker in the well (Mr. DENNIS). We are indeed close personal friends, as he is with my father, and our difference, I am sure, is an honest difference of opinion.

Let me simply say now, because this matter will be discussed when the amendment is offered, it is true that the other body provided a more generous expansion of the judiciary than this body provided 2 years ago. I hope that that will not be the first time nor the last that this body has seen fit to be more frugal than the other body.

Second, let me say for the record that the southern district of Indiana in 1971 ranked 35th out of 86 districts in the United States in weighted caseload. The northern district ranked 32d. In my judgment, those figures would justify the expenditure of none of my Hoosier taxpayers' money for additional judgeships in either district.

The reason I see fit at this time to support an additional Federal judgeship for the northern district of Indiana is the malapportionment of the caseload within that district itself, namely, the unusual heavy caseload of the court which sits in the Chicago area of Indiana. I have become convinced in the last 2 years that that is becoming more onerous as a burden.

On the other hand, 2 years ago the southern district of Indiana ranked 17th in weighted caseload, but now it ranks 35th, and I might add that within that caseload are the Allegheny air crash cases, 180 in number—a substantial part of the overall caseload—none of which are expected to be tried in the southern district.

With that I think I should say no more, except that the northern district does need, in my judgment, a new judgeship. It needs the judge to work in the northern district, in the Chicago area, not to rove over the northern district, and certainly not to rove in the southern district, where there is a conspicuous lack of need.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. 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. 11394), to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, to provide for the appointment of additional district judgeships, and for other purposes.

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

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. 11394, with Mr. PUCINSKI 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 New York (Mr. CELLER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge support for H.R. 11394.

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the members of the committee that certain provisions of H.R. 11394 have already been enacted into law. These provisions create a new judicial district in the State of Louisiana—sections 1–5 of the bill. They were added by the Senate to a private bill and were enacted into law in the closing days of the first session. The President approved the legislation on December 18, 1971—Public Law 92–208. In the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I shall propose an amendment to the instant bill the effect of which will be to delete those provisions creating a new district in Louisiana and retain only those provisions of H.R. 11394 that authorize four additional district judgeships.

I shall also offer an amendment to conform the title of H.R. 11394 to the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this measure, as amended, is to provide for an additional district judgeship in each of the following Federal districts: Southern district of Florida; northern district of Indiana; western district of Missouri, and the northern district of Texas. These new judgeships were originally recommended to the Congress in September 1968 by the Judicial Conference of the United States as a result of a quadrennial survey in that year of the needs of the district courts. The House Committee on the Judiciary, in its consideration of the omnibus judgeship bill in 1970, endeavored to limit the creation of new positions to those courts whose needs appeared to warrant additional manpower most urgently. The four positions contained in H.R. 11394, along with a number of other proposed permanent positions, were not recommended by the Judiciary Committee.

Subsequent to the enactment of the omnibus district judgeship bill in June 1970—Public Law 91–272—the Judicial Conference of the United States reiterated its recommendations. The Conference stated that the need for an additional judgeship in five districts constituted an emergency situation and urged the Congress to authorize five additional positions at the earliest possible date.

The Department of Justice indicated its support for the creation of these additional positions in the course of the consideration of the 1970 legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary has painstakingly reviewed the statistical caseload for each of the five districts in question. It has examined the time interval from issue to trial, the numbers and types of civil and criminal filings and the weighted caseload per judgeship. On the basis of its most recent review, the committee recommends the creation of four of the five additional

judgeships recommended by the Judicial Conference. I believe the committee has been frugal in expanding the list of Federal judicial positions. At the same time, I believe it has not been deaf to the pleas for increased manpower to deal with the heavier demands now being placed on the Federal courts.

The committee report delineates the statistical caseload profile of the four districts involved. It illustrates, for example, that these districts for which one additional judge is proposed to be authorized rank high in the Nation with respect to the weighted caseload per judgeship.

The committee has concluded that authorization of these four permanent positions will enable prompt consideration of cases filed in the district courts in question and will contribute toward reducing existing backlog.

COST

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts advises that the cost of the judiciary of establishing a new district judgeship is $138,000 in the initial year and $123,000 annually thereafter. The General Services Administration budgets approximately $18,000 to supply the office of each district judge with the necessary furniture and furnishings.

The Department of Justice advises that the cost of supporting four new permanent judgeships created by H.R. 11394, as amended, is approximately $475,000.

Based on these data, the estimated total cost for four new permanent district judgeships would be $1,099,000 for the first year and $967,000 in subsequent years.

Over the years, particularly since I have been chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, there have been created many Federal judgeships—circuit judges and district judges. I have participated in all the debates over these years on the creation of those judgeships. They have been needed from time to time because of the increased population and the increased numbers of cases developed in those courts because of the vast amount of legislation which has poured forth from this Congress, which legislation touches upon the lives of so many thousands and thousands of people each day, each week, each month, each year.

I do hope, however, that partisanship will not be the criterion for the appointment of these judges.

I do not like to appear as if I were, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a Democratic hen that hatches Republican eggs. In other words, I do hope that all these judges will not be merely Republicans. I have made that assertion on other occasions during Democratic administrations, and it has had some effect, because during some of the previous Democratic administrations there were quite a number of Republican judges appointed.

The real test of one who is to be a judge is found in the First Book of Kings, where we read the following:

> Give thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad.

An understanding heart. If judges have understanding hearts they will make, indeed, good judges. They will be able to separate fact from fiction. They will interpret the law and not legislate. They will never divorce themselves from the dedication to their tasks. They will work and not shirk. And they will judge by the dry light of reason.

We must all recognize, indeed, that without just judges the Nation is in jeopardy. No nation can long survive if the judges are not just.

I do hope that those in power will see to it that the judges who are to be appointed will all have what we find in Kings—an understanding heart.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 11394 as a practical and effective means of improving the machinery of the Federal courts.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has so ably stated, this bill when it is put in form for final passage will provide for the creation of four new Federal district judges, one in Missouri, one in Florida, one in Texas, and one in Indiana.

The history of these judgeships has been explained in detail to the committee both by the chairman of the committee on the Judiciary and during debate under the rule. I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat it.

For the record, I think it would be well to point out that in these particular four districts, all of them by the measures of the judiciary are presently overworked. Against an average weighted caseload per judge countrywide of 307, the caseload in the southern district of Florida is 382, in western Missouri, 398, in northern Texas, 376, in northern Indiana, 336, and in southern Indiana 331.

Mr. Chairman, the volume of the cases flowing through the Federal judicial system has very largely increased in recent years. The Congress has enacted a multitude of new laws and new Federal programs, and out of those programs and those Federal laws Federal questions arise. Whenever you get a Federal question involved in a lawsuit you have the basis for Federal jurisdiction.

The judicial branch of the Federal Government has occasionally in some areas found itself swamped in litigation. I think that this situation has been brought about also by a change in attitude of people toward the courts generally. I believe most of us can recall the day when people did not resort to the courts first. They resorted to them last. They tried to resolve their differences out of court. However, in recent years quite the contrary seems to be in vogue. Courts are forums to which people go first instead of last. Consequently, the volume of the cases has skyrocketed.

Then in these times, also, legal issues have become more complex, and this complexity is apparent on the criminal side as well as on the civil side. These difficult and involved matters of necessity require more time to resolve.

Courts cannot operate without judges, so the Congress has in recent years authorized the creation of a large number of additional district judges. The case made by the Judicial Conference for the critical need of these four additional judges which are to be provided in this present bill has persuaded the Committee on the Judiciary that they should be authorized.

Mr. Chairman, court delay and backlog cloud the public confidence in our judiciary. It is no wonder that the American people are concerned about our system of justice. According to a recent poll, only 23 percent of the American people think that the American justice system is working well today.

Parties to litigation become increasingly frustrated over their inability to secure prompt judicial disposition of their rights and liabilities. It is not enough that our system provides justice eventually. Innocent persons should not have to wait many painful months to clear their names. On the other hand, the general public should not be subject to the risk of repeated criminal offenses committed by guilty persons free on bail simply because the courts are too busy to try them speedily.

We must be increasingly concerned about this time lag in bringing persons accused of crime to trial.

Mr. Chairman, the Bill of Rights specifically guarantees to persons accused the right to a speedy trial. Justice delayed is justice denied. When cases are not brought to trial because of a clogged judicial system, memory fails and witnesses disappear.

While a suitable number of judges is not the whole solution to our problem, it is elemental that there can be no trial without a judge. We have the constitutional obligation to provide the judges requisite to meet the caseload in the Federal courts.

The time for a Federal-criminal proceeding has roughly doubled in the past 10 years. I am fearful that the U.S. Supreme Court will rule one of these days that these delays are inordinate and violative of the sixth amendment. It is our duty to see to it that such a decision is not necessary. In my opinion a partial solution to the problems of court congestion is an adequately staffed judiciary. This will quicken the pace of justice without impairing its quality.

Therefore, because the judicial conference has made an urgent case for these particular judges in those districts, we should enact the bill before us, H.R. 11394.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, none of us will question the accuracy of the old axiom, "Justice delayed is justice denied."

Unfortunately, when court dockets get overloaded, there is often no alternative but to delay justice. In recent years, the caseload in our Federal courts has increased rather steadily and it has been necessary from time to time to create additional judgeships to relieve the situation, and to insure that litigants in Federal district courts are given their "day in court" within a reasonable length of time.

The bill now before the House would create four additional Federal district judgeships, one in the southern district

of Florida, one in the northern district of Indiana, one in the western district of Missouri, and one in the northern district of Texas.

As a Representative from the State of Texas, I am particularly concerned about the situation there. In the northern district of Texas, the caseload rose to 376 in 1971. The national weighted caseload average is 307. This makes the northern district of Texas the 15th busiest Federal court in the Nation.

This court presently has six judgeships. This legislation would raise it to seven. This additional judge would greatly improve the service that this court can render the 3,678,996 people residing in that district. The court for the northern district of Texas sits in Dallas, Fort Worth, Abilene, Amarillo, San Angelo, and Wichita Falls.

I strongly urge the House to approve this legislation and I commend the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. CELLER), for his able and convincing presentation of the need for this legislation.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would like to join my distinguished chairman of the full Judiciary Committee in his expression of sentiment as to the type of person who should be made a Federal judge. And, I may say that I have spent a lot more time in the courtrooms of the Nation than I have in political activities. I regard myself, basically, as a member of the bar.

If I have anything to do with the man who is appointed—and I think I might have if I succeed in securing a judge who will serve the southern district of Indiana as well as the northern—in that event I have some qualifications in mind. I expect and hope to have something to say about the type of individual who might be appointed to that position to serve those two districts in my State.

Now, of course, I am for the bill, even with the miserable allotment of one judge to the other district only, because there ought to be additional judges in Indiana. The figures and the facts actually support a judge in each district. I do not need to belabor that too much because the judicial conference of the United States, which is appointed for that purpose, so found and so recommended.

But as has already been pointed out, the average weighted caseload per judge in this country is 307 cases. In the southern district of Indiana it is 331 cases. In the northern district of Indiana, which my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) says is so much more busy, it is 336 cases—a five-case difference in the two districts. They are both entitled to extra judicial help; there is no question about it.

In the southern district of Indiana the percentage has increased in civil cases filed, and in 1970 over 1969 the increase was almost 21 percent; cases terminated increased over 23 percent; cases pending increased 22 percent.

When you take the second half of 1970 over the first half the increase in civil cases filed in the southern district was nearly 25 percent and the increase in cases terminated was nearly 30 percent. And when you go to the criminal cases, partly because there was a changeover in district attorneys, the increase is even more impressive, a 99-percent increase in criminal cases commenced in the second half of 1970 over the first half, and a 73½-percent increase in cases terminated.

Anybody can argue figures. My good friend from Indiana who does not want to do anything for the southern district, who does not even want the one judge we are talking about to serve the southern district, will no doubt quote figures. But those I have given you are the figures. That is what the Judicial Conference worked on. If you want to take the figure of an abnormally high year arbitrarily somewhere back and then take an arbitrarily low year somewhere else you can prove anything. But those are the facts. And I cannot believe that my good friend and colleague really feels that the figures do not illustrate that both of these districts need a judge.

As I said a moment ago, at this point I am not advocating that, although I approve of it, because all I am asking is that we go back to the original bill, defeat the committee amendment which assigns a judge only to the northern end of the State, and have this one judge that we are going to have in this bill, assigned to and required to serve both districts of the State. And the figures indicate that that certainly ought to be done.

I am not interested in this thing from a political point of view. I regret that the senior chief judge in the southern district, a member of my friend's party, and my friend are in disagreement about a number of matters. It is not a matter of my party, but I do not think those considerations are relevant here. What we need is adequate help to take care of the caseload. The judges are going to be Republicans sometimes, Democrats sometimes, and always, I hope, good judges.

Just among other things——

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. The Judiciary Committee and the Congress a few years ago did adopt a measure which said that the Indianapolis division of the southern district should sit in my own hometown at Richmond, Ind. Although this was an act of Congress, the court has never implemented it and the judges will not implement it because they have not got the manpower. Now we ought to give them enough judges to go around, enough to take care of these things which the Congress has already enacted. That is a small point, but it is a valid one.

So I say again to the members of this committee that it is a very little thing I am asking, merely that this one judge—and the Judicial Conference gave us one in each district—but at this moment I am just asking that this one judge that we are going to create in any event, be required to service both districts in the State, where the caseloads are practically identical and where there is no good reason why that should not be done.

My good friend's—and he is my good friend—personal problems ought not to prevail over the needs of the bench and bar within the State, and over the needs of the people of the State, and the desires of the judiciary of the State, and in disregard of the caseload which is there to be taken care of.

So when we come to the time when we are voting on this committee amendment which removes the roving judge to serve both districts, I will ask you to vote "no" on the committee amendment; and I will ask you to restore the original bill which provides this judge to serve both districts in my State of Indiana.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUSH).

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, my chief concern, of course, is that we be able to dispose of the cases pending in our Federal courts. My district lies in the northern district of Indiana where a most pressing need exists.

As most of you know, I just recently returned from an involuntary sabbatical, during that time I tried various matters in the Federal court for the northern district of Indiana. This experience made me very aware of that court's needs. During that time and since, I have had several conversations with one of the judges of that court, Judge Jesse E. Eschbach, whose home station is Fort Wayne. He has impressed me not only with the large caseload that is pending in that court, but also with the fact that there is so much time wasted in travel.

As late as last Monday I had a telephone conversation with Judge Eschbach and asked him if he could by chance document this for me. I have received the following letter from Judge Eschbach.

This letter is addressed to me and is as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1972.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Member of Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: Pursuant to our telephone conversation this morning, I am supplying you with some additional statistics. I am sure that the Committee has all of the district-wide statistics, and these I am able to furnish relate to calendar year 1971 and concern only my own time and the time of my staff.

During calendar year 1971, we spent 318 hours per person in travel. This includes a staff of four plus myself. This means that we traveled well in excess of 10,000 miles and conducted trials in Fort Wayne, Lafayette, and Hammond. To illustrate that we have given Hammond as much time as humanly posisble, let me point out that in addition to pre-trial conferences and hearing on motions, I actually tried one more case in Hammond than I did in Fort Wayne.

The lost time in travel and the expense thereof is a tremendous cost to the taxpayer, and even with this moving around, we are completely unable to reduce the ever-mounting backlog. If we had one additional judge for the Northern District and he was located in Hammond, this in itself would eliminate

at least seventy-five per cent of the travel time and cost.

We will sincerely appreciate anything which you can do to provide a judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE E. ESCHBACH.

Mr. Chairman, I read this letter only to point out what I believe would be the folly of having a judge appointed as a roving judge. A roving judge would greatly detract from the ability to adequately deal with the caseload confronting our northern district judges if it means canceling out the proposed additional judge for northern Indiana. We need another judge for the northern district of Indiana, and I urge my colleagues to support the committee on this matter and to reject the proposal for a roving judge for all of Indiana.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I sat on the subcommittee that considered this legislation 2 years ago when the controversy arose regarding these judges for the State of Indiana. I recall distinctly that the subcommittee gave special attention to the recommendation of the judicial conference. There was one specific recommendation to provide one additional judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district of Indiana. In every instance, except with regard to the additional judges for Indiana, the subcommittee and the full House Judiciary Committee followed the recommendations of the Judicial Conference.

That was the way the bill came to Congress. That was the way the bill came to the subcommittee.

In eliminating these two judgeships from the bill at the last session we departed from the recommendations of the Judicial Conference. I might say that if we had followed those recommendations, we would have no problem insofar as travel or travel expense, because we would have one judge for northern Indiana and one judge for southern Indiana.

It seems to me that what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) has recommended or acquiesced in is a compromise which would enable Indiana to secure additional judicial service without the additional two judges that the Judicial Conference recommended and which, I am sure, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) would support if that were in the bill or if it were possible to secure passage of an amendment and put that in the bill at this stage. However, I note that in addition to the statistics which the Judicial Conference has sent to us, Indiana itself is projected to increase in population by 16 percent by 1975. This would seem to mean additional delays in the trial of cases which the records show have occurred in recent years over the period that it took to get a trial prior to that time. I notice, too, that the Indiana State Bar Association—and I do not believe they have reversed their resolution which they delivered to the last Congress—recommends that Indiana should have additional judgeships.

So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should endeavor to put aside the political controversy which appears to have arisen here and try to reconcile our views and come to a happy meeting ground which can provide the additional judicial service. I do not think there is any other way in which we can get speedier trials for litigants than in that way, and consider the interests of litigants and the lawyers and the public that is being served by this legislation.

So I am hopeful that we can support the bill as it came to the committee without the committee amendment which I understand is going to be offered, which would eliminate the proposed roving judge and provide instead for a single judgeship in the northern district of Indiana. I concur in the position which has been presented here so ably by my colleague (Mr. DENNIS).

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to my personal problem in Indiana. Let me just tell you what my personal problem is. My personal problem is that I have found in the House of Representatives that when you stand for economy on some things, it is fine, but when you stand for economy on other things, it is not so good.

When I supported the committee action in the subcommittee of which I was not a member in the other Congress judgeship in the southern district and northern district of Indiana, I did so because I am opposed to unnecessary Federal spending. In case somebody wants to leap up and ask me about my record on that subject, I will be happy to tally my votes on appropriations and amendments to appropriations to substantiate what I have been stating.

I must say for the record that I would be less than human if I did not resent any implication that I have a political axe to grind in my opposition to what I consider unnecessary Federal spending in this case. A comment was made that I do not want to do anything for the southern district of Indiana. But I do. I represent taxpayers in southern Indiana. One of these Federal judgeships runs $2.5 million a copy total to the taxpayers over a 10-year period among the GSA, the Justice Department, and the Federal judiciary. I try to do Federal economy for my district.

My personal problem is that I quite innocently opposed the expenditure which the figures showed me was clearly unnecessary for a new Federal judge in the southern district of Indiana. Now, was that a political decision? I hardly think so, because the Federal judge in Indianapolis who said on the front page of the paper that he had lost all faith in my integrity, and attacked me politically while he was a sitting judge, was a Democrat.

Let me read to the Members what the Republican circuit court judge of Marion County said, and he is the highest State court judge in our jurisdiction. This is from a letter to the editor of the Indianapolis News, Saturday, January 22, 1972. It says:

To the Editor of the News:

I see by the papers there may be a new Federal judge requested for Indianapolis and that attorney John Ryan has been selected to fill the place, and that Congress may authorize it. Of course, Congress has not done so yet.

I would respectfully suggest to all concerned, including Congress, that we have plenty of Federal judges now, maybe more than we really need. If they would stick to their Federal cases and let the state courts handle their legitimate business, we would not need so many United States courts.

For instance, in August 1970, the Circuit Court had a half-day hearing in which it was determined by competent evidence the $20 million pension fund of the Barber's Union was being victimized by the president of the union, and the court appointed a receiver, to wit, the Merchants National Bank, which would serve without bond.

The president of the union, Mr. DePaola, by his attorney one Mr. Carmen from Chicago, went over the same day to Federal judge William Steckler and had the case transferred to the United States District Court. Judge Steckler took jurisdiction and after seven months and 10 days of hearings, he finally arrived at the same conclusion that this Circuit Court had made and appointed a receiver. Not being a bank and trust company . . . had to spend $100,000 of the union's assets to provide a bond. The case took up a lot of Judge Steckler's time, many hours which could have been devoted to trying other cases.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I include the letter to which I referred:

OPPOSES NEW FEDERAL COURT

To the Editor of the News:

I see by the papers there may be a new Federal judge requested for Indianapolis and that attorney John Ryan has been selected to fill the place, and that Congress may authorize it. Of course, Congress has not done so yet.

I would respectfully suggest to all concerned, including Congress, that we have plenty of Federal judges now, maybe more than we really need. If they would stick to their Federal cases and let the state courts handle their legitimate business, we would not need so many United States courts.

For instance, in August 1970, the Circuit Court had a half-day hearing in which it was determined by competent evidence the $20 million pension fund of the Barber's Union was being victimized by the president of the union, and the court appointed a receiver, to wit, the Merchants National Bank, which would serve without bond.

The president of the union, Mr. DePaola, by his attorney one Mr. Carmen from Chicago, went over the same day to Federal judge William Steckler and had the case transferred to the United States District Court. Judge Steckler took jurisdiction and after seven months and 10 days of hearings, he finally arrived at the same conclusion that this Circuit Court had made and appointed a receiver, this time the Hon. Homer Capehart. Not being a bank and trust company, Capehart had to spend $10,000 of the union's assets to provide a bond. The case took up a lot of Judge Steckler's time, many hours which could have been devoted to trying other cases.

Likewise, Judge S. Hugh Dillin has spent at least a thousand hours of judicial time fooling around with the Indianapolis school integration case, finally deciding in his infinite wisdom that our schools have been segregated by law, "de jure," which was the only

handle by which his court could take hold of the case, as Congress in the 1964 Civil Rights Law has forbidden any Federal Court to draw school lines so as to correct racial imbalance.

On top of which, Judge Dillin on his own motion reached out and took in about nine townships in this county, seven other school corporations outside the city of Indianapolis, and four or five surrounding corporations, all working under Indiana law by and through people elected by voters, and ordered them into the lawsuit—on what theory I do not know. I guess they were guilty of racial segregation by just being there and not doing anything about sending for people of other races to come out and go to schools in their district. Likewise, he ordered the Indiana Legislature into the lawsuit, although it had in 1949 abolished all manner of racial discrimination in the state, including schools.

Then there was the famous case of the long-hair from North Central High School whom the authorities told to shear his locks and look like a human being again, and the meddlesome Civil Liberties Union, at its own expense, took up the time of our local Federal court and the 7th District Court of Appeals to prove to the local school authorities they had no business trying to maintain discipline in schools. As the result of this hair decision, North Central is now a shambles as far as discipline and looks are concerned, according to my best information from parents, with students going dirty and unkept, and wallowing around halls kissing and hugging.

I am going to invite the Senate Judiciary Committee to come out here and hold an investigation as to the needs of another Federal Court and ask to be invited as a witness to the fact that the Federal courts here are taking over a lot of the state courts' business, and furthermore, are accepting cases which under the Federal Constitution they have no right to bother with.

I am sure Congressmen William Bray and Andy Jacobs, both representatives from this city, will agree with me as they have already expressed their sentiments along similar lines.

If the Federal courts will get off our backs, we will get along a lot better around this county and state.

JOHN L. NIBLACK,
Judge, Marion Circuit Court.

INDIANAPOLIS.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, let me simply reiterate the southern district of Indiana 2 years ago, when this body denied an additional judge, stood 17th in the Nation in the caseloads. In 1971, it stood 35th in the Nation.

The only thing political about my position in this situation is that I have been politically attacked for doing what I try to do always—vote against unnecessary Federal spending.

My dad told me a long time ago that it is not according to whose ox is being gored, it is according to whose hogs are being slopped.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BURKE).

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

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote to provide additional judgeships in these districts which are so clearly overloaded with criminal and civil cases.

The Judicial Conference of the United States considers this an emergency situation calling for immediate action by Congress. I agree. Strengthening our system of justice in this way is of pressing importance.

Later this year the Judicial Conference of the United States will meet for its quadrennial review of the needs of the Federal district courts. At that time I am sure the Conference will become aware of an equally pressing need for one additional judgeship to be added to the four authorized judgeships in the district of Minnesota. I hope that a year from now—if not before—Congress will act to relieve the severe overloading in the Federal courts of Minnesota.

I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in a brief comparison between the overloading now plaguing the Federal courts of Minnesota with the figures in the committee Report 92–677 accompanying H.R. 11394, the bill now on the floor. Minnesota has a heavier caseload per judgeship than three of the five districts we vote on today.

Here is a list of each of the districts in this bill and the district of Minnesota, comparing "weighted caseload per judgeship" and national ranking of the severity of overloading:

District	Weighted caseload per judgeship, 1971	Rank, 1971
Louisiana, eastern	372	17
Florida, southern	382	13
Indiana, northern	336	32
Missouri, western	398	10
Texas, northern	376	15
Minnesota	381	14

Note: The Minnesota figures are from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, located in the Supreme Court Building.

Thus it is clear, Mr. Chairman, that Minnesota presents precisely the same overloading problem as the States and districts we are voting on today. Early action to relieve the situation in Minnesota is necessary.

Let me present a more detailed comparison of statistics for the Western District of Missouri—which is the only district we are considering today that now has the same number of judgeships as the Minnesota district; namely four. Minnesota and Missouri are seen to have the same problem of heavy overloading of the Federal courts:

District population—1970

Missouri, western	2,135,315
Minnesota	3,805,069

Total civil cases pending—1971

Missouri, western	672
Minnesota	865

Total criminal cases pending—1971

Missouri, western	211
Minnesota	262

Time interval from issue to trial of civil cases—1971

Missouri, western, 59 trials, 9 months.

Minnesota, 116 trials, 7 months.

Age of civil cases—1971

Missouri, western

Over 3 years	3
2 to 3 years	22
1 to 2 years	111

Minnesota

Over 3 years	24
2 to 3 years	32
1 to 2 years	138

Action is needed, Mr. Chairman, to reduce the backlog of cases clogging the Federal courts in Minnesota. An additional judgeship must be authorized soon.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11394 which, if passed, will authorize an additional Federal judge, not only for the Southern District of Florida, but also elsewhere. I am a cosponsor of the legislation, having introduced H.R. 10760 last year. Earlier in the 90th Congress, I introduced a similar bill asking for additional judges for the southern district of Florida.

I would like now to commend the chairman and the members of the House Judiciary Committee for bringing this legislation to the House floor for a vote. In our system of checks and balances where the powers are divided among the three branches of the Government, the legislative and the executive and the judicial, we, as legislators, have a due responsibility to enact laws and to provide the necessary courts to enforce these laws.

Since my time is limited, I shall speak today mainly on the need for the additional Federal judge to serve in the southern district of Florida. but I do, as a lawyer, recognize the need for additional Federal judges in the other parts of the country called for in the bill sent to the House floor by the Judiciary Committee.

Under the provisions of the omnibus bill which was passed by the 91st Congress and which is now law, 58 additional, permanent Federal judgeships were created across the country. At that time two additional Federal judges were given to the State of Florida, even though the bill at that time had requested three.

Actually, the State of Florida, and the area which I represent and wherein the southern district of Florida is located, is probably the fastest growing area in the United States.

When the bill was passed last year, the omnibus bill, the principal arguments made then in support of the need for additional judges were the heavy population growth in many of the areas in the country plus the backlog of court cases existing in some areas of our country.

South Florida is one such area. Twelve of the most rapidly growing counties in the country comprise the southern district of Florida. These include Broward and Dade Counties, parts of which I represent, as well as Collier, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Indian River, Martin, Monroe, Palm Beach, Okeechobee. and St. Lucie Counties.

According to the 1970 census, these counties have a total combined population just under 2.5 million people, which is an increase of 48.6 percent above the 1960 figure as shown by the census, or an increase of 1,680,000 people.

The population figures, if taken today, would be even greater.

This rapid growth in population has more than absorbed, then, the two additional judges authorized by the 1970 act. Hence there is still a very serious need for additional judges to be appointed to hear cases in the southern district of Florida.

In fact, the Judicial Council, follow-

ing their conference held in Washington, D.C., in October of 1970 referred to the need for additional judges in each of the districts named in the bill being considered today and reasoned that this constituted an emergency situation, and they therefore voted to recommend authorization of these judges and the creation thereof as soon as possible.

A study of the statistics contained in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary will bear out the need for these judges.

Furthermore, I believe all of us know that the caseload, because of increased Federal legislation, requires additional judges to hear these cases.

We all know that the sixth amendment to our Constitution guarantees the accused in all criminal cases shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, but many of those accused of crimes have good reason today to deny this statement. An accused person should have a speedy trial to determine guilt or innocence. Unless we increase the speed with which defendants can get trials, dissatisfaction with the present system will continue to be voiced.

Basically, our system of law is sound, but it cannot function if we as a Congress undermine it and fail to give proper judicial representation in areas where it is needed. If we fail we will drive the courts and our judicial system to the point of chaos.

The accused should have a speedy trial to determine guilt or innocence and unless we increase the speed with which defendants can get to trial, dissatisfaction with the present system will continue to be voiced. Basically our system of law is sound, but it cannot function if it is undermanned to the point of chaos.

I would like to commend the judges of our Federal courts on the job they are doing, in view of the vast amount of cases thrust upon them in present undermanned courts. As a lawyer from Florida, I know the problems that the judges of the southern district of Florida have had. I am sure those in the other districts continually face the same problems.

I sincerely hope that you, my colleagues, will give consideration, not only to my request for an additional judgeship in the southern district of Florida, but to all the facets of H.R. 11394, in toto. I support my fellow cosponsors in their requests, under provisions of this bill, for a new Federal judicial district in Louisiana, and additional judgeships in the northern district of Indiana, the western district of Missouri, and the northern district of Texas.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inform the Committee of the Whole that at the appropriate time, when the bill is open to amendment, I shall offer an amendment to include an additional judge for the western district of Wisconsin, a judgeship which is most urgently needed. Rather than make the argument and discuss the need at this time, however, and again repeat the same arguments during debate, I shall defer discussion of that until the appropriate time.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it is with some temerity that, not being a lawyer, I arise and express appreciation for the time yielded in this matter pertaining to the Federal judiciary.

I would presume that it is easily understandable why I was not aware until this bill was available to Members, that the western district of Missouri, in which I live, was included in the additional Federal judgeships at this time and under this proposal. That presumption would be predicated upon my opposition in the past and I presume some of the sparks that I barefootedly knock out of not only the limestone of the Capitol, but the flint of the Ozark hills, from time to time.

I would confess that I am still in a quandary as to whether or not we're addressing the total problem, and if we would correct the balance of the highest tribunal and give it time to work and maybe have some more erstwhile system of appointment, tenure, and termination of all of the highest Federal judges; and if indeed the legislative branch maintained as exact a control over legislative matters as we are required to do by the Constitution rather than let them legislate by fiat and decree, we would indeed no longer need to add continually to personnel and moneys for the judicial branch.

I am not aware of all of the problems and I have not heard a word from my bar associations, but I have studied this Committee's report in detail, and I appreciate the report. I think it is a good one. I think with the least knowledge of the so-called Warren court decisions, it is not hard to determine why almost three-fourths of the increase in the caseload has been prisoner petitions in recent years. I say this as a gentleman who often visits the Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents located in my hometown for the entire Federal prison system. I say it also as the only member of my party elected to national office in the State of Missouri.

There are many gives and takes in this area, and I am not at all sure of the cure for the problem, but I do know this, Mr. Chairman: Having opposed the increase in the Federal judgeships before, that we have now had time to study the problem and, as nearly as I can tell from this report and from conversations with members on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Judicial Council, a study has been made that Missouri in its western district still has a weighted caseload of 398, greater than any of the others under consideration at this time. I find that there is the problem of the Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents of the U.S. prison system at Springfield, which brings on additional workload and that there is also the problem of circuit riding. Indeed, one of the judges of the western district—a classmate of mine—is a roving judge and tries cases in the eastern district of Missouri, as well. I also find the U.S. attorney appointed in the western district—with my consent to say the least—has advised me that additional judges are truly needed in order to get the caseload down, and to no longer delay the application of justice, and to properly expedite justice so that we will not have too many people out on bail with felonious intent, to say naught of balancing the courts ideology in part.

I further find that with these studies, and the recommendations of the U.S. marshal who "rides herd" on this as to actual need; and also because of the problems of land condemnation under the Federal right of eminent domain alone—for which I have submitted additional suggested legislation—since within a radius of 75 miles of my hometown in the western district of Missouri there are 17 Federal or private impoundments all of which are involved in land acquisition or disposition.

And inasmuch as all these increase the Federal problems of our country and the judiciary, I believe that, perhaps, now the time has come when after careful analysis, after due time has lapsed, to make a judicious decision on the recommendation that we need this additional judge. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in spite of my previous questions about this, I shall vote today in favor of this bill.

I thank the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing it forward so this body may exert its will.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I fear the comments that I make at this point may seem anticlimactic. The reason is that our good colleague from southwest Missouri, Dr. HALL, has just completed the most eloquent statement in favor of this bill so far as the new Missouri judgeship is concerned.

Our good friend, who represents the Seventh Missouri District, quite frankly recalled that he had been against an additional judgeship in the past but that present caseloads now justify the additional judge.

As a matter of fact, we have all been up the hill and down the hill more than once during the last two or three Congresses on this point. We have just listened to the need for the judgeship in Florida. We have heard the discussion of the situation in Indiana and also in Texas.

Returning to the judgeship for Missouri, the true facts are that the caseload in the western district has shown a surprising increase in the number of criminal cases—or prisoner petitions as they are called.

One of these days, Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court across the street over there is going to get around to handing down a decision to the point that the Constitution means exactly what it says, meaning a speedy trial is guaranteed to everyone. They are going to issue an order to dismiss all of those cases that have been denied trial within a reasonable time after the commission of a crime.

Our good colleague from southwest Missouri mentioned a moment ago a discussion with the U.S. district attorney for the western district of Missouri. It was pointed out that those on bail for a long period of time sometimes commit another offense while on bail. This is an additional reason why another judge is

needed in this area—to assure a speedy trial of criminal cases.

Well, with all those things considered, the statistics on page 20 of the committee report leave no doubt about the need for another judge in the western district of Missouri.

For the 2 years 1969–71, criminal cases were up 36 percent. In terms of total numbers there was an increase of 360 in 1 year from 1969 to 1970.

My support of H.R. 11394 is not without adequate foundation. The Judicial Conference ranked western Missouri as one of the first to be considered for an additional judge based on the weighted caseload system.

Missouri has waited patiently through three different Congresses for this legislation. Today there is complete unanimity on the part of every member of the delegation from our State, on both sides of the political aisle, unlike the situation may I add in other States included in this bill today.

I am proud to have introduced a bill for relief from the casework overload in two or three of the last few years. Today we have a good, valid, and most substantial reason for the passage of H.R. 11394. Let us do the job now without any further delay.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, a judge died. He went to St. Peter's gate and was admitted. St. Peter called him in and said:

> Well, Court opens at 9 a.m. goes to 12:00 with one ten minute recess, then you get an hour for lunch and then run from 1:00 to 5:00 with another ten minute recess. We sit five full days a week and until noon on Saturdays. You will get a two weeks vacation in summer.

Well, after a month of this, this judge asked to be redistricted. They control that you know. He was then allowed to visit hell. He found court opening at 10:30 a.m. running until noon, then 2 hours for lunch, from 2 until 4:30 with a half hour recess in the afternoon. They did not sit at all on Saturday and had 3 months vacation each summer. This judge was irate. He said: "Well, I don't think this makes sense, that in heaven, Judges work all the time. Here in Hell, they hardly work at all. Why is that?

The devil replied: "Ah yes, but we get lots more Judges down here."

Judges face a difficult task.

If they are too conservative, as the poet says:

> They baffle endeavor and halt reform
> In the sacred name of the Law
> And over the droning voice of Hem,
> Comes the quavering voice of Haw.

If they are too liberal, they are like the boy in Brooks Hays' story. There was an earthquake in California. A father and his son were at home together enduring it. The walls were shaking and cracking, and chimes were ringing. The boy's father said, "Son, do you want to pray for God to help us?"

"No," said the boy. "I want him to cut it out."

The Federal courts have ordered redistricting six times in seven elections in Missouri. In private life, this might constitute harassment. We have decrees on school busing, school taxes, school district lines—nearly everything except announcing the school lunch menu for next week. Many in Congress, and out, if they could, would "cut it out."

But as the Irish priest remarked:

> The Courts face a difficult job. They must walk the narrow line between right and wrong.

Recall the admonition that life is for all of us a matter of trial and error. As Bill Macauley, a great Milwaukee district attorney once said:

> We understand trial and error, but let's have more trial and less error.

I support this bill to create four district judges. One judge each in the Western District of Missouri, Northern District of Texas, Southern District of Florida, and one for Indiana.

The U.S. Judicial Conference recommends each of these. In fact, they recommend eight and the Judicial Conference reduced the number to four—each of which four I believe are fully justified for these reasons:

Increase in population.

Increase in crime.

Increase in prisoner petitions.

Increase in caseloads all require more time for disposing of litigation and means we need additional judges to carry out the work.

I first principally address myself to the Western District of the State of Missouri. This district ranks first among the four mentioned in the need for additional judicial personnel according to the weighted caseload system used by the Judicial Conference. In particular, because of the rate of crime nationally, there has been an increase in bank robberies and narcotics cases to be handled in this court and a doubling in 1970 of the number of habeas corpus and prisoner petitions the judges are required to consider. The population growth in the western district of Missouri has been slightly faster than that of the entire State and the district's population is now 2,135,315.

As an example of the volume of work increasing in the western district of Missouri, I might cite the following figures: There has been an increase in motions to vacate sentence from 20 in 1969 to 42 in 1970; and habeaus corpus petitions in 1969, were 196 and in 1970, there were 313: and prisoner petitions in 1969, were 102, while in 1970, there were 304.

I am joined in support of this legislation concerning the western district of Missouri by my colleagues from that area, Mr. BOLLING, Dr. HALL, Mr. HULL, Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. ICHORD. The judges of the western district primarily serve their congressional districts. I believe the entire Missouri delegation supports this bill.

The growth in the volume of work in that area has increased so that recently it was announced in September 1971, that the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, in which the western district lies, has established a third panel to hear more than 800 cases during the current fiscal year compared to 717 considered during the preceding year ending June 30. To give an example of the growth of the court's caseload, in 1958 only 215 cases were being heard annually, whereas now the figures are regularly running around 700.

I would urge support of this legislation for all of the four judges contained in the bill and particularly that in the western district of Missouri with which I am more closely acquainted. I stress the bipartisan, and perhaps, the nonpartisan nature of this legislation by pointing out that many of these judges, and the one for the western district of Missouri, were in legislation passed by the Senate in the last Congress. In that Congress, the House Judiciary Committee eliminated those judges from the bill, because the need at that point had not been satisfactorially established. At that time, in the last Congress, the Judicial Conference had not recommended an additional judge for the western district of Missouri. The figures on the current and most recently completed fiscal year of the courts were not available at the time that conference acted. When the conference did not recommend such a judge, I opposed such a judge. The conference now recommends such a judge and I think they have made a case for the need for additional judicial personnel.

I strongly urge passage of this bill.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, the phenomenal growth of southern Florida in the past decade has placed an intolerable burden on the Federal district court in the southern district of Florida. H.R. 11394, which we consider today, will by creating an additional judgeship substantially alleviate this burden.

The district ranked 13th in 1971 on the weighted caseload comparison of all U.S. districts. The median interval from "issue to trial" for the district has been below the national average for 8 of the last 10 years. Civil filings last year rose 17 percent and exceeded the combined increases of the previous 3 years. The criminal caseload rose 50 percent in the last year.

Most alarming however, is the fact that in 1971 there were 47 civil cases which had been pending 3 years or more.

I strongly urge my colleagues to give their approval to this needed legislation which will result in providing speedier justice to the citizens of the southern district of Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11394, the bill now under consideration to create a new judicial district and to provide additional district judgeships. In reporting this proposal, the Judiciary Committee and its able chairman (Mr. CELLER) have again demonstrated their dedication to the efficient administration of our judicial system.

The pending proposal authorizes an additional judgeship for the southern district of Florida, raising the number of judgeships in that district to eight. This position was originally recommended to

the Congress by the Judicial Conference in September of 1968 as part of the Conference's quadrennial survey of the needs of the district courts. The Conference recommended at that time an increase of three judgeships for the southern district, and the House committee, in an attempt to provide those most urgently required, approved two new positions in legislation enacted in 1970.

At its October 1970 meeting, the Judicial Conference reiterated its earlier recommendation, noting that the need constituted an emergency situation, and recommending favorable action by the Congress at the earliest possible date.

Evidence clearly points to the need for the additional judgeship. Florida's southern district ranked 13th in weighted caseload in both 1969 and 1971. Last year the weighted caseload was 382, as compared with a national figure of 307. The number of civil filings rose about 17 percent last year, and the criminal caseload increased nearly 50 percent, from 536 cases in 1970 to 780 cases in fiscal 1971.

In spite of the heavy and increasing caseload, however, the judges of Florida's southern district have done an admirable job of insuring prompt consideration and disposition of cases brought before it. The median time interval from filing to disposition in civil cases in 1970 was 7 months for the southern district, compared with the national figure of 10 months. We cannot, however, rest with this good record; especially with the predicted additional increase in caseload.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of H.R. 11394.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 19]

Alexander	Edwards, La.	Mitchell
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Fish	O'Konski
Bell	Fountain	Passman
Blackburn	Fraser	Patman
Blatnik	Galifianakis	Pepper
Brademas	Gude	Pike
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Clausen, Don H.	Harrington	Reid
Clay	Hébert	Riegle
Colmer	Heinz	Scheuer
Conyers	Holifield	Smith, Iowa
Corman	Horton	Stanton, James V.
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Steed
Diggs	Keith	Wolff
Downing	Lennon	
Dwyer	McCormack	
	Mills, Ark.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS) having assumed the Chair, Mr. PUCINSKI, 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. 11394, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 378 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, all time had expired and the Clerk was about to commence reading the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 98 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 98. Louisiana

"Louisiana is divided into three judicial districts to be known as the Eastern, Middle, and Western Districts of Louisiana.

"Eastern District

"(a) The Eastern District comprises the parishes of Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, Saint Bernard, Saint Charles, Saint James, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Tammany, Tangipahoa, Terrebonne, and Washington.

"Court for the Eastern District shall be held at New Orleans.

"Middle District

"(b) The Middle District comprises the parishes of Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, Saint Helena, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana.

"Court for the Middle District shall be held at Baton Rouge.

"Western District

"(c) The Western District comprises six divisions.

"(1) The Opelousas Division comprises the parishes of Evangeline and Saint Landry.

"Court for the Opelousas Division shall be held at Opelousas.

"(2) The Alexandria Division comprises the parishes of Avoyelles, Catahoula, Grant, La Salle, Rapides, and Winn.

"Court for the Alexandria Division shall be held at Alexandria.

"(3) The Shreveport Division comprises the parishes of Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, De Soto, Natchitoches, Red River, Sabine, and Webster.

"Court for the Shreveport Division shall be held at Shreveport.

"(4) The Monroe Division comprises the parishes of Caldwell, Concordia, East Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Tensas, Union, and West Carroll.

"Court for the Monroe District shall be held at Monroe.

"(5) The Lake Charles Division comprises the parishes of Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson Davis, and Vernon.

"Court for the Lake Charles Division shall be held at Lake Charles.

"(6) The Lafayette Division comprises the parishes of Acadia, Iberia, Lafayette, Saint Martin, Saint Mary, and Vermilion.

"Court for the Lafayette Division shall be held at Lafayette.

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of section 1 of the bill be dispensed with, that it be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That" through page 3, line 20, strike section 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The district judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana holding office on the day immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, and whose official station on such date is Baton Rouge, shall, on and after such date, be the district judge for the Middle District of Louisiana. All other district judges for the Eastern District of Louisiana holding office on the day immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall be district judges for the Eastern District of Louisiana as constituted by this Act.

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of section 2 be dispensed with, that it be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to speak out of order.)

WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I will only take just a moment of the Committee's time, and I simply want to use this opportunity to announce to the Members of the House that, along with my colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. H. ALLEN SMITH, we have just introduced a resolution to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from further consideration of the dock strike legislation and to bring the matter before the Committee on Rules. We do not expect to ask for a hearing this week before the Committee on Rules because of the time schedule and the times under which we operate, however the seriousness of the situation in our State of California and as we know it to be increasingly so in other areas, simply makes it imperative that we take action moving in the direction of attempting to solve the dock strike. I would hope that within the next 2 or 3 days a settlement is reached. We understand there is some possibility of that. Either that or that the Committee on Education and Labor would see fit to bring out legislation to the floor of the House, otherwise we simply feel that it is necessary for us to do whatever we can to try to bring this legislation to the floor.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I concur in every statement the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) has made. It seems to me that Congress must provide an immediate solution to this very serious work stoppage on the west coast. I know that this is a procedure that is rarely used and we hesitate to use it, and we hope it will be settled between now and the first part of the week. However, it is the only procedure we can use, and we certainly ask the cooperation of the Members of the

House to get this strike settled on the west coast because it could spread to the east coast once the 80 days have expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I would like to talk a little bit about the situation that the gentleman from California has brought up.

The Committee on Education and Labor have worked diligently. We have been in direct contact with all parties involved. Many of the things that are taking place in this discussion would be best left untold on this floor. We are in the midst of a very delicate balance at this moment with high hopes of having the whole decision made by the negotiating parties where it properly belongs.

It is not a question of any jurisdictional dispute between two labor groups. That has already been taken care of and an agreement has been reached.

It is not a question of the dollar a ton charged against containerized freight. That has been resolved.

The only thing holding an agreement up is something that this Congress cannot do anything about. It is not a question of economics. It is not a question of work rules. It is not a question of one side or the other being stubborn. It is a question that must be resolved in good faith. It is a matter of faith more than anything else. This Congress cannot legislate on faith.

We are doing more than we have ever done before in a dispute to get the parties together in a peaceful and agreeable solution. Any action by this House or the Committee on Rules in discharging the Committee on Education and Labor from their duties, their obligation and their jurisdiction in this matter will only create a situation much worse than it will be if left in the proper hands.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There have been many times over the year when I have been in agreement with my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I could not agree with the thrust of his argument.

I hope that the gentleman would not leave the impression with the Members of this body that the main interest of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor at this point is negotiating and we are becoming involved in a contract. I think we still recognize that our basic duty is legislation. I think the gentleman has left the impression that as members of the committee we are becoming involved in negotiations. I hope the gentleman will straighten that out because we are having hearings on the bill before us. As part of our oversight function we are also looking into the need for remedial legislation in this field.

Mr. DENT. That is what the fights all about. The committee is interested in remedial legislation, within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I hope the gentleman will straighten that point out.

Mr. DENT. We are getting the facts by having experts, union leaders as well as members who are in daily communication with both sides and business people also.

However, when you suggest that it would be improper for our committee to get into actual negotiations between the two sides on the question of an agreement; is that not exactly what the Committee on Rules intends to do by discharging the committee and taking a piece of legislation which is a direct negotiating instrument and one in which there is no appeal to either side no matter what decision is made by a commission named by the President of the United States? You cannot appeal it on either side and it will last for the duration of time, for 18 to 24 months regardless of the findings on the equity or lack of equity in the settlement. They say they can set aside any consideration of a negotiating team the rights and consideration of negotiating teams of either the union or employer.

Any action taken by the House must give the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., who is chairing the committee with the jurisdiction on this matter, a full opportunity to hear all sides and report the recommendations to the full committee and then follow the rules on the House in proper order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will have to ask permission to speak out of order.

Mr. DENT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that when one side has been heard and no objection was made, it comes with sad grace from the gentleman to object.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 3, line 21, through page 4, line 4, strike section 2.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, these provisions were already adopted in the previous bill which was offered by the Senate to another bill and was accepted by this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Nothing in this Act shall in any manner affect the tenure of office of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana who are in office on the effective date of this Act, and who shall be during the remainder of their present terms of office the United States attorney and marshal for the Eastern District of Louisiana as constituted by this Act.

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney and marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana.

SEC. 4. The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows with respect to the State of Louisiana:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Louisiana:	
"Eastern	9
"Middle	1
"Western	4."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 4, lines 5 through 14, strike section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows with respect to the State of Louisiana:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
"Louisiana:	
"Eastern	9
"Middle	1
"Western	4."

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of section 4 be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 4, lines 15 through 17, strike section 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 134(c) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by deleting the first sentence.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 4, lines 18 and 19, strike section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of Indiana, one additional district judge for the western district of Missouri, and one additional district judge for the northern district of Texas.

(b) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this subsection in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table

is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"Districts	Judges
* * * * *	
Florida:	
* * * * *	
Southern	8
* * * * *	
Indiana:	
* * * * *	
Northern and Southern	1
* * * * *	
Missouri:	
* * * * *	
Western	4
* * * * *	
Texas:	
* * * * *	
Northern	7
* * * * *	".

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of section 6 be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments:

Committee amendments:

On page 4, line 21, strike "northern and southern districts" and insert in lieu thereof "northern district".

In the table on page 5, strike out the matter relating to Indiana and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Indiana:

Northern	4
* * * * *	"

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendments which we are considering en bloc.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENNIS was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this is the only part of the bill, I think, which is controversial, and, therefore, I would like the Committee to understand what is before us. The bill as originally proposed, insofar as my State of Indiana is concerned, provided one additional U.S. district judge who should be a roving judge between the two Indiana districts, the northern and southern districts, in order to serve them both. The bill so came out of the subcommittee.

In the full Judiciary Committee, by a vote of 20 to 17, I believe it was—three votes—an amendment was adopted by the committee, on the motion of Mr. JACOBS, of Indiana, which struck out the roving judge to serve the two Indiana districts, and provided that that judge would be for the northern district only.

I am opposing that committee amendment. I ask for a "no" vote on the committee amendments, which must now be adopted or rejected by this body. If the committee amendments are voted down, of course, the effect will be that the original bill will be restored, and the one judge, which judgeship is created in any case by the bill, will be expected to serve both districts of the State.

Now, there is not any logic or reason in the world—none—why this judge should not serve both districts of the State.

The Judicial Conference of the United States recommended an additional judge for each district. The weighted caseloads in the two districts are practically identical—331 in the southern district and 336 in the northern district—and both of them are well above the national average. The civil caseload and the criminal caseload in both districts have been regularly increasing. The increase in the southern district over the two halves of the year 1970 is particularly dramatic, and the business is there.

I do not really know why my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, wants to have this judge work in the northern district only and not in the district he and I both represent, when the caseloads are practically identical, when the bench and the bar of Indiana are unanimous in wanting, actually, a judge in each district, and when there is nothing partisan about the approach, because one of the main proponents of additional judicial help is the chief judge of the southern district who is a distinguished jurist and a distinguished member of the Democratic Party.

I regret that my colleague should have differed with me on this matter. I went along with the idea of half a judge, one might say, one judge to serve both districts rather than trying to insist, in the first instance, on a judge in each district, in the hope that the gentleman would cooperate with me and that we could get this matter established without conflict. That unfortunately has not proved to be the case.

But I say to the Members that when both districts are well in excess of the national average load per judge, and when there is practically no difference between them, and when the civil business in the southern district, on the latest figures, in 6 months, had increased practically 25 percent, and in criminal business about 99 percent, there is absolutely no logical, reasonable, or if I may say so, respectable reason for treating these two districts differently.

Therefore, I ask for a no vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the relevant statistics to this issue are that the northern district of Indiana in 1970 stood 32d in the whole country in weighted caseload and in 1971 stood 31st—virtually no change. The southern district of Indiana, however, stood 17th in the Nation, and in 1971 stood 35th, and improved its position that much.

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

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, as long as the number of cases which each judge has to consider are going up—and they are—and as long as the percentages of cases to be considered are increasing—and they are—what difference does it make what the relative status is, as between the 30th and 20th, in the country? The judges still have more work, and about the same amount more work in each district.

Mr. JACOBS. My answer to the gentleman is priorities. Other districts are not asking for more judges, districts who stand much higher in caseload than Indiana.

Now if I may point out, the new filings were 1,047 civil cases more and in the 1971 calendar year—not the fiscal year, but the calendar year—the new filings were 987, and they actually went down in raw figures. In criminal cases in 1970, as the gentleman from Indiana has indicated, in fiscal 1970, they went up, because of the change in the political administration of new political cases being filed, but in 1971 the criminal caseload, new cases filed in the southern district went from 536, down in 1971 to 415.

Those figures I secured from the clerk of the southern district this morning.

If it is true that the main supporter of an additional judge is a democratic Federal judge in Indianapolis, it is equally true that the main opponent of an additional judgeship, or of the assignment of any more Federal judges to Indianapolis, is the top-ranking Republican circuit trial judge in Indianapolis, as I said a few minutes ago.

Let me read just about four sentences from his letter to the local newspaper. This is from the Honorable John L. Niblack, Republican judge of the circuit court in that county.

I see by the papers there may be a new Federal judge requested for Indianapolis and that attorney John Ryan has been selected to fill the place, and that Congress may authorize it. Of course, Congress has not done so yet.

I would respectfully suggest to all concerned, including Congress, that we have plenty of Federal judges now, maybe more than we really need. If they would stick to their Federal cases and let the state courts handle their legitimate business, we would not need so many United States courts.

For instance, in August 1970, the Circuit Court—

That is the State court of which this man is a judge—

had a half-day hearing in which it was determined by competent evidence the $20 million pension fund of the Barber's Union was being victimized by the president of the union, and the court appointed a receiver, to wit, the Merchants National Bank, which would serve without bond.

The president of the union, Mr. DePaola, by his attorney one Mr. Carmen from Chicago, went over the same day to Federal judge William Steckler—

That is the Democratic judge my colleague was talking about—

and had the case transferred to the United States District Court—

Now, listen to this—

Judge Steckler took jurisdiction and after seven months and 10 days of hearings—

This was the same case that the State court took care of in an afternoon—

he finally arrived at the same conclusion that this Circuit Court had made and appointed a receiver,

Not being a bank and trust company—

I am not mentioning the name of the receiver—

the receiver had to spend $100,000 of the union's assets to provide a bond. The case took up a lot of Judge Steckler's time, many hours which could have been devoted to trying other cases.

Let me further say that there are now sitting in the southern district of Indiana four Federal judges, and in the northern district there are three Federal judges.

The southern district, as I said, stands 35th in the Nation. The northern district stands 32d. Neither, in my opinion, by those statistics, merits the expenditure of $2.5 million over the next 10 years, which is the cost of Federal judges per copy to the taxpayers.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JACOBS was allowed to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.)

Mr. JACOBS. But in the northern district there is a malapportionment of the caseload, so that the court which sits in the Chicago region has an unusually heavy caseload, and that is the reason why I do support the addition of that Federal judge in that district.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is becoming apparent here that there are some political differences in Indiana, and the rather interesting part has just come to light; it is an intraparty political difference in Indiana within the Democratic Party. We understand that in Indiana. We have a lot of political fights.

But this intrapolitical fight should not be allowed to prevent the establishment of the badly needed court in Indiana.

I am well acquainted with the senior judge, to whom the gentleman just referred, Judge Steckler, a great and estimable judge. I certainly would not join in the tirade against Judge Steckler which the Members of this body just heard.

Also, I am well acquainted with the State circuit judge mentioned, in Indianapolis, Judge Niblack, a friend of mine of many years.

There is no question, but that there is some dispute between courts.

However, we cannot do away with Federal courts because we sometimes disagree with them. Indiana badly needs two new Federal courts, one in the north and one in the south. The Judicial Conference of the United States a year ago recommended two Federal judges, one in the northern and one in the southern district. I assure you I had nothing to do with that, and I assure you no Member of the Indiana delegation had anything to do with it. These two courts were recommended because they were necessary. The need of these two courts is greater than it was a year ago. There was one criminal conspiracy case which was very important which was recently tried in the southern district in Indianapolis which consumed 7 weeks.

One of the greatest deterrents to crime is to be able to bring cases quickly and judiciously to court. We cannot do that in Indiana. I deeply regret that an intraparty fight in Indiana is the cause of a great deal of this opposition to an extra court. There is no one here from Indiana who is not well aware of this fact.

I have the highest respect for the judiciary in Indiana, both State and Federal. Since Judge Steckler has been mentioned, I want to say he is the senior judge in Indiana and a man of unquestioned integrity. I have discussed this matter of the needed judge with Judge Steckler, and I want to assure the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the aisle that this is not a political fight between Republicans and Democrats in Indiana. We are well aware in Indiana that this court is badly needed.

Remember that last year the Judicial Conference asked for two Federal judges in Indiana, one in the north and one in the south. It was defeated for the same reason that the effort to defeat an additional court is being made today. I simply do not want the Indiana judicial system to suffer because of a political fight in Indiana. We have had those fights in the past and we will have them in the future, but let us not allow this to damage justice in Indiana.

Mr. McCLORY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It seems to me that the attempt to retry a case on the floor of the House as an argument against the additional judges for the southern district of Indiana would be most unwise. Yet, this is what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) has attempted to do.

Mr. BRAY. I certainly agree and I feel it is one thing we should not try to do. We should not try this disagreement in Indiana on the floor of Congress as is being attempted. I have the utmost respect for the circuit judge before whom this litigation was originally filed and I have the same respect for the Federal judge in the State of Indiana before whom the case is now pending. Let us not allow bitter intraparty legal feuding to become a football on the floor of this House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the committee gave long and careful consideration to this controversy that has arisen between two Members from the State of Indiana and came to the conclusion that there should be one additional judge for the northern district of Indiana and not a roving judge. The northern district of Indiana contains a number of industrial areas such as South Bend, Hammond, Fort Wayne, and Lafayette, and the need for an additional judgeship was great in the northern district. There has been a vast increase in population there. Since 1960 there has been almost a 10-percent increase in the population. There is a definite need for an additional judicial position in that northern district. We feel that is sufficient, and the committee amendment provides for the northern district and not for a roving judgeship.

I do hope the committee will accept the committee amendment.

Mr. DENNIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The chairman will agree with me, I am sure, that in either version of this bill as we consider it in regard to the present amendment, we are only creating one judge.

The only issue here is whether that judge should serve both districts or only one. Therefore, only one judge is involved in this particular committee amendment; is that not correct?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct, but the committee by a majority, although it may not have been an overwhelming majority, felt there was no need for a roving judge, but that one judge in the northern district would be sufficient.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may respond to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY)?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I am not suggesting that we should retry the case here. However, I would suggest that a case that was fully tried in a State court in half a day was retried in a Federal court over a period of 7 months and 10 days, and I am talking about the time taken for the trial of that case in the Federal court in order to reach a decision, the same decision, at a cost of $100,000 plus the cost for travel pay and plus the fact that in the north they need a judge and they do not need a roving judge.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, an "aye" vote would be a vote for the committee amendment and a "no" vote would be against the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this with respect to the case which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) argued.

I think if we had a $20 million pension fund which was adjudicated in 10 minutes or an hour, we might criticize summary action such as that, and we would suggest that more protracted and deliberative consideration should be

given in such a case. But, aside from that point which I do not think is a valid basis for denying judges for Indiana, I want to remind my colleagues that 2 years ago when this bill came to the committee there was a recommendation by the Judicial Conference for two additional judges, one for the northern district of Indiana, and one for the southern district.

What we will be doing here today if we adopt the recommendation of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) is to acquiesce in the fact that Indiana requires additional judgeships. One additional judge for all of Indiana seems to me to be a valid compromise. With respect to the rest of this bill, we are respecting the recommendations of the Judicial Conference as we have done generally for other judges throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we should reject the committee amendment and accept the position of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DENNIS. Am I correct that the vote now is on the committee amendments and, therefore, those who oppose the amendments, as I do, should vote "no?"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has stated the case correctly.

The question is on the committee amendments.

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

TELLER VOTE WITH CLERKS

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers with clerks.

Tellers with clerks were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. DENNIS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 217, noes 168, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

[Recorded Teller Vote]

AYES—217

Abbitt	Bennett	Byron
Abernethy	Bergland	Cabell
Abourezk	Bevill	Caffery
Abzug	Biaggi	Carey, N.Y.
Adams	Bingham	Carney
Addabbo	Blanton	Casey, Tex.
Albert	Boggs	Celler
Anderson, Calif.	Boland	Chappell
	Bolling	Chisholm
Anderson, Tenn.	Brademas	Collins, Ill.
	Brasco	Conyers
Annunzio	Brinkley	Cotter
Ashley	Brooks	Culver
Aspin	Burke, Mass.	Curlin
Aspinall	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Badillo	Burlison, Mo.	Daniels, N.J.
Barrett	Burton	Danielson
Begich	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, S.C.
de la Garza	Howard	Poage
Delaney	Hull	Preyer, N.C.
Dellums	Hungate	Price, Ill.
Denholm	Ichord	Pucinski
Dent	Jacobs	Randall
Diggs	Jarman	Rangel
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Rarick
Donohue	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Dorn	Jones, Tenn.	Reuss
Dow	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Drinan	Kazen	Roe
Dulski	Kee	Rogers
Eckhardt	Kluczynski	Roncalio
Edmondson	Koch	Rooney, N.Y.
Edwards, Calif.	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Eilberg	Landrum	Rosenthal
Evans, Colo.	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Fascell	Link	Roush
Fisher	Long, La.	Roy
Flood	Long, Md.	Roybal
Flowers	McCulloch	Ryan
Flynt	McFall	St Germain
Foley	McKay	Satterfield
Ford, William D.	McMillan	Scheuer
	Macdonald, Mass.	Seiberling
Fountain		Shipley
Fraser	Madden	Sikes
Fulton	Mahon	Sisk
Fuqua	Matsunaga	Staggers
Gallagher	Mazzoli	Steed
Garmatz	Meeds	Stephens
Gaydos	Melcher	Stokes
Gettys	Metcalfe	Stratton
Giaimo	Mikva	Stubblefield
Gibbons	Miller, Calif.	Stuckey
Gonzalez	Minish	Sullivan
Grasso	Mink	Symington
Gray	Mollohan	Taylor
Green, Oreg.	Monagan	Teague, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Montgomery	Thompson, N.J.
Griffin	Moorhead	Tiernan
Griffiths	Morgan	Udall
Hagan	Moss	Van Deerlin
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Vanik
Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito
Hanley	Natcher	Waggonner
Hanna	Nedzi	Waldie
Harrington	Nichols	White
Hathaway	Nix	Whitten
Hays	Obey	Wilson, Charles H.
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara	
Helstoski	O'Neill	Wright
Henderson	Patten	Yates
Hicks, Mass.	Perkins	Yatron
Hicks, Wash.	Pickle	Young, Tex.
Holifield	Pike	Zablocki

NOES—168

Anderson, Ill.	du Pont	Lujan
Andrews	Edwards, Ala.	McClory
Archer	Erlenborn	McCloskey
Arends	Esch	McClure
Ashbrook	Eshleman	McCollister
Baker	Findley	McDade
Belcher	Fish	McEwen
Betts	Ford, Gerald R.	McKevitt
Biester	Forsythe	McKinney
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Mailliard
Bow	Frenzel	Mallary
Bray	Frey	Mann
Broomfield	Goldwater	Martin
Brotzman	Goodling	Mathias, Calif.
Brown, Mich.	Gross	Mayne
Brown, Ohio	Grover	Michel
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Miller, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.	Hall	Mills, Md.
Buchanan	Halpern	Minshall
Burke, Fla.	Hammer-schmidt	Mizell
Camp		Morse
Carter	Harsha	Mosher
Cederberg	Hastings	Myers
Chamberlain	Heckler, Mass.	Nelsen
Clancy	Hillis	Pelly
Clausen, Don H.	Hogan	Pettis
	Hosmer	Peyser
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Pirnie
Cleveland	Hutchinson	Poff
Collier	Johnson, Pa.	Powell
Collins, Tex.	Jonas	Price, Tex.
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Quie
Conte	Keating	Quillen
Coughlin	Keith	Railsback
Crane	Kemp	Reid
Davis, Wis.	King	Rhodes
Dellenback	Kuykendall	Roberts
Dennis	Kyl	Robinson, Va.
Derwinski	Landgrebe	Robison, N.Y.
Devine	Latta	Rousselot
Dickinson	Lent	Runnels
Duncan	Lloyd	Ruppe
Sandman	Spence	Ware
Saylor	Springer	Whalen
Scherle	Stanton, J. William	Whalley
Schmitz		Widnall
Schneebeli	Steiger, Ariz.	Wiggins
Schwengel	Steiger, Wis.	Williams
Scott	Talcott	Wilson, Bob
Sebelius	Teague, Calif.	Winn
Shoup	Terry	Wyatt
Shriver	Thompson, Ga.	Wydler
Skubitz	Thomson, Wis.	Wylie
Slack	Thone	Wyman
Smith, Calif.	Vander Jagt	Young, Fla.
Smith, N.Y.	Veysey	Zion
Snyder	Wampler	Zwach

NOT VOTING—47

Alexander	Hansen, Idaho	Patman
Baring	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Bell	Harvey	Podell
Blatnik	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hébert	Purcell
Clark	Heinz	Riegle
Clay	Horton	Ruth
Colmer	Karth	Sarbanes
Corman	Lennon	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Stanton, James V.
Dowdy	McDonald, Mich.	
Downing		Steele
Dwyer	Mathis, Ga.	Ullman
Edwards, La.	Mills, Ark.	Whitehurst
Evins, Tenn.	Mitchell	Wolff
Galifianakis	O'Konski	
Gude	Passman	

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania and Mr. BURLESON of Texas changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENNIS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNIS: Page 5, line 3, after "Indiana," insert "one additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana,"

In the table on page 5, Sec. 6(b) after the matter relating to the northern district of Indiana, insert the following:

"Southern ---------- 5."

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is to go back to the original recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States and to amend the bill so as to provide one additional judge in the southern district of Indiana, in addition to the one additional judge provided now by the bill in the northern district of Indiana. In this case there is no question of a roving judge. We are adding, as did the Judicial Conference, an additional judge, making one judge for each district.

I might point out again that the caseload in the two districts is practically identical, that it is increasing in both districts, that this is the recommendation of the Judicial Conference, and inasmuch as the House has adopted the committee amendment and has seen fit to put the judge in the northern district only, I submit it is only fair to add a judge in the southern district also.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, is that also the recommendation of the State bar association?

Mr. DENNIS. It is the recommendation of the Indiana State Bar Association and of the Indiana judges and of

everybody in Indiana, so far as I know, except my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. He is not alone.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear what the gentleman said, but this is a good amendment, and I hope the gentleman will support it. This time I would like an aye vote.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, but I, of course, must do so. There are three sitting judges in the northern district of Indiana presently, and four in the south of Indiana. The additional judgeship which the committee has authorized for the northern district would create an equality; four in the northern district and four in the southern district. We took note in the Judiciary Committee of this situation and other situations referred to by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS). I do not like the idea of opposing the gentleman, but I want to stand by the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee's view was that it would be sufficient to create one additional judge for the northern district. I do hope, therefore, that the amendment will not prevail, but will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

The question was taken; and on a division—demanded by Mr. DENNIS—there were—ayes 72, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASTENMEIER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KASTENMEIER: On page 5, line 4, strike the word "and".

On page 5, line 5, delete the period and insert the following: ", and one additional district judge for the western district of Wisconsin."

In the table on page 5, after the matter relating to the northern district of Texas, insert the following:

"Wisconsin:

* * * * *

Western ---------- 2."

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Mr. PRICE of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11394 because it contains the provisions of H.R. 10568, a bill I introduced during the past session of this Congress, which calls for the addition of one district judgeship in the northern district of Texas, thus raising the number of judges in that district from six to seven.

This is a much-needed addition and one for which I have fought for a long time. It is absolutely imperative, if we are to restore some of the confidence of the people in our judiciary that has been lost and is continuing to be lost because of the great logjam of cases in our court system and the resultant delays involved, that we do everything we can to help the judges with their caseloads. Voting for passage of this bill is the most significant and meaningful thing we can do today to help alleviate that problem.

Justice delayed is justice denied; I urge adoption of this bill in order to speed up justice.

As an indication of the kind of workload I am talking about, I submit the following information:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The Northern District of Texas had three judgeships prior to 1961. Two additional positions were authorized by the 1961 legislation and one in 1970 and the district now has six authorized judgeships.

For most of the 1960 decade there has been no consistent pattern of steadily rising civil caseload in the Northern District of Texas. The volume of new civil cases went from 1,030 to 1,256, between 1962 and 1969. However, from 1970 to 1971 this district's civil filings jumped 23%. There were 1,450 cases in 1970 and 1,790 in fiscal '71. This is over three times the seven percent national growth rate in civil filings for 1971.

The median time interval from issue to trial in civil cases for 1971 is six months, well below the national median of 11 months. There were only 29 three-year old cases pending at the end of 1969.

There was no significant change in the incoming criminal caseload from 1959 to 1965, but filings grew 50 percent between 1965 and 1968—from 400 in 1965 to 603 in 1968. Since 1968 criminal filings have again fluctuated. There were 594 in 1971.

Between 1963 and 1966 the weighted caseload per judgeship in the Northern District of Texas was below the national average. In national standing the district ranged between 37th and 51st in the nation. With an increase in civil cases filed in 1967 the weighted caseload per judgeship climbed to 293, about 18 percent above the national average of 252, and the district ranked 19th in the nation in weighted caseload per judgeship. A further increase in weighted caseload per judgeship to 336 in 1969, brought the district up to 18th in weighted caseload. A further rise to 376 in 1971, against a national weighted caseload average of 307, means the district now ranks 15th in the nation on this score.

AUTHORIZED JUDGESHIPS, 6

Resident judges: Joe Ewing Estes, chief judge; Sarah T. Hughes, William M. Taylor, Jr., Robert M. Hill, Leo Brewster, and Halbert O. Woodward.

Places of holding court: Dallas, Fort Worth, Lubbock, Abilene, Amarillo, San Angelo, and Wichita Falls.

TABLE 1.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

	1960	1970	Percent change
District population	3,138,775	3,678,996	17.2
State population	9,579,677	11,196,730	16.9

Source: Census of Populati Bureau of theon, Census.

TABLE 2.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES COMMENCED, TERMINATED AND PENDING

Fiscal year	Total civil cases[1]			Total criminal cases		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending
1959	826	1,209	631	403	366	85
1960	701	764	568	340	362	63
1961	760	692	636	462	421	104
1962	1,030	922	744	473	410	167
1963	875	983	636	490	519	138
1964	981	992	625	443	432	149
1965	1,034	1,056	603	393	426	116
1966	968	1,011	560	559	470	205
1967	1,213	1,008	765	481	483	203
1968	1,102	975	892	603	504	302
1969	1,256	1,240	908	552	615	239
1970	1,450	1,289	1,069	622	573	288
1971	1,790	1,578	1,281	594	675	207

DISTRIBUTION OF CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Private civil			U.S. civil		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending
1959	430	790	405	396	419	226
1960	356	416	345	345	348	223
1961	399	365	379	361	327	257
1962	605	518	466	425	404	278
1963	474	523	417	401	460	219
1964	477	527	367	504	465	258
1965	462	474	355	572	582	248
1966	470	476	349	498	535	211
1967	738	556	531	475	452	234
1968	739	658	612	363	317	280
1969	769	757	624	487	483	284
1970	1,036	876	784	414	413	285
1971	1,284	1,120	948	506	458	333

[1] Private and U.S. civil cases shown below.

TABLE 3.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CIVIL CASES COMMENCED DURING THE FISCAL YEARS 1959 THROUGH 1969, AND CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1958, 1967, 1968, AND 1969, BY NATURE OF SUIT

Nature of suit	Civil cases pending June 30, 1958	Civil cases filed, by fiscal year									Civil cases pending June 30, 1967	Civil cases filed 1968	Civil cases pending June 30 1968	Civil cases filed 1969	Civil cases pending June 30, 1969
		1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967					
Total	1,104	826	701	760	1,030	875	981	1,034	968	1,213	765	1,102	892	1,256	908
U.S. plaintiff, total	179	312	255	272	311	284	364	435	355	326	116	228	127	321	136
Land condemnation	23	13	11	21	34	20	15	14	8	4	18	1	14	2	10
Note cases and overpayments	126	243	163	143	152	128	179	251	217	152	21	59	12	101	32
Antitrust					1	1		1							
Labor cases	8	17	14	19	20	17	16	17	25	23	21	23	18	31	22
Tax	1	3	4	4	3	4	6	6	6	6	7		5	4	7
Other	21	26	63	85	101	114	148	146	99	141	49	145	8	183	65
U.S. defendant, total	70	84	90	89	114	117	140	137	143	149	118	135	153	166	148
Tort Claims Act	20	11	8	12	10	20	20	17	15	14	16	14	15	17	14
Prisoner petitions	7	6	13	11	15	15	26	18	29	35	12	23	15	26	10
Tax refund	33	48	49	44	71	56	69	65	55	48	45	51	78	52	4
Social Security				8	5	12	14	17	17	25	14	26	23	28	23
Other	10	19	20	14	13	14	11	20	27	27	31	21	22	43	27
Federal question, total	61	78	82	115	124	141	128	129	132	316	193	343	242	341	257
Marine contracts										1					
Jones Act			1	2	1	1	2			4		2	1	2	
Federal Employer's Liability Act	12	10	6	5	10	9	6	10	4	6	4	9	6	12	11
Miller Act	4	6	13	23	11	11	12	9	11	11	5	3	6	4	4
State habeas corpus	1		3	2	3	2	9	10	15	169	69	133	72	165	63
Labor cases	4	9	11	18	19	24	18	24	34	34	36	35	29	33	20
Antitrust	8	6	4	7	6	3	2	6	6	11	11	37	41	18	46
Patent	12	13	10	8	11	8	10	12	6	15	17	14	19	12	22
Copyright and trademark	3	7	8	8	17	14	11	10	14	14	11	17	13	13	13
Civil rights	3	5	9	1	6	5	6	9	10	9	8	23	19	32	27
Other	14	22	17	41	40	64	52	39	32	42	32	70	36	50	51
Diversity of citizenship, total	704	352	274	284	481	333	349	333	338	422	338	396	370	428	367
Contract actions	545	197	106	110	230	122	155	125	158	183	166	172	189	165	161
Stockholders' suits				3		2			2		1	4	3	1	4
Real property	21	26	27	27	16	19	25	15	20	21	16	12	17	11	6
Personal injury, motor vehicle	74	76	52	68	70	72	81	89	64	85	61	81	72	90	70
Other personal injury	54	40	56	61	154	112	76	92	86	117	83	116	76	136	105
Other	10	13	33	15	11	6	12	12	8	16	11	11	13	25	21

TABLE 4.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS; CRIMINAL CASES[1] COMMENCED AND PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1967, 1968, AND 1969, BY NATURE OF OFFENSE

Offense	Criminal cases								
	Commenced				Pending June 30, 1967	Commenced 1968	Pending June 30, 1968	Commenced 1969	Pending June 1969
	1964	1965	1966	1967					
Criminal cases, total	408	360	522	452	203	567	302	498	239
General offenses:									
Homicide									
Robbery		5	5	11	2	5	2	4	
Assault	2		1	1		1	1	8	1
Burglary	5	8	2	1	1	6	4	4	
Larceny and theft	36	38	60	64	22	103	54	76	29
Embezzlement	25	25	25	26	4	34	4	28	10
Fraud	47	47	59	48	45	72	68	57	41
Auto theft	118	85	114	97	25	112	35	56	31
Forgery and counterfeiting	88	67	111	90	49	103	58	66	44
Sex offenses	1	1	2			1		1	1
Narcotic laws	5	9	8	8	5	6	5	27	11
Miscellaneous general offenses	19	25	46	42	27	67	43	62	37
Special offenses:									
Immigration laws	7	3	20	10		4		19	5
Liquor, Internal Revenue	2	2	4	3	2		1		1
Selective Service Act	5	3	9	5	3	16	10	40	23
Other Federal statutes	48	42	56	46	18	37	17	50	23

[1] Excludes transfers.

TABLE 5.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

TIME INTERVAL FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES[1] IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED

Fiscal year	Number of trials	Median time interval (in months)	National median time interval (in months)
1961	67	9	11
1962	117	4	10
1963	132	4	10
1964	71	4	11
1965	97	3	11
1966	89	4	11
1967	94	5	12
1968	88	4	12
1969	102	5	13
1970	137	5	12
1971	178	6	11

[1] For both tables 5 and 6 excludes land condemnation cases. For table 5 also excludes habeas corpus cases, deportation reviews, and motions to vacate sentence.

TABLE 6.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

AGE OF CIVIL CASES[1] PENDING AT THE END OF FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year	Total	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	Over 3 years	
					Number	Percent
1961	593	404	127	33	29	4.9
1962	680	546	96	25	13	1.9
1963	594	387	182	18	7	1.2
1964	625	480	82	52	11	1.8
1965	573	442	96	16	19	3.3
1966	538	404	105	17	12	2.2
1967	746	590	102	36	18	2.4
1968	876	603	194	47	32	3.7
1969	891	635	169	58	29	3.3
1970	1,065	810	158	66	31	2.9
1971	1,278	988	178	55	57	4.5

[1] For both tables 5 and 6 excludes land condemnation cases. For table 5 also excludes habeas corpus cases, deportation reviews, and motions to vacate sentence.

TABLE 7.—WEIGHTED CASELOAD PER JUDGESHIP FOR ALL U.S. DISTRICT COURTS AND FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS [1]

Fiscal year	Number of district courts in the United States	Number of judgeships		Weighted caseload per judgeship [1]						
				Civil		Criminal		Total		
		United States	Texas, northern	United States	Texas, northern	United States	Texas, northern	United States	Texas, northern	
									Number	Rank [2]
1962	87	289	5	185	241	57	51	242	292	17
1963	88	289	5	195	185	56	53	251	238	43
1964	88	289	5	207	197	57	47	264	244	50
1965	88	288	5	214	195	60	42	274	237	51
1966	87	318	5	200	186	55	67	255	253	37
1967	89	322	5	198	238	54	55	252	293	19
1968	89	323	5	207	249	58	76	265	325	14
1969	89	322	5	225	260	64	76	289	336	18
1970 [3]	89	382	6	196	174	80	88	276	262	54
1971 [3]	89	382	6	217	294	90	82	307	376	15

[1] Based on civil and original criminal cases filed. The weighted caseload reflects the amount of court time used for types of civil or criminal cases divided by the proportions of total terminations In computing the weighted caseload for the United States, the District of Columbia and territories are excluded.

[2] Refers to the rank of the district court compared to all of the district courts for the year indicated. The lower the ranking the higher the average weighted caseload.

[3] Weighted caseload figures for 1970 and 1971 are based on revised weights based on 1971 Federal judicial time study.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this particular amendment is as controversial. In any event, I can say that those of us in Wisconsin are of like mind in terms of the urgent need to create this particular judgeship.

Last year both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON) and I offered bills to create this additional judgeship. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON) cosponsors this amendment, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'KONSKI), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN), in whose district in whole or in part lies the western district of Wisconsin.

I should like to commend the committee as well, because I fully appreciate the caution and careful consideration it has given in reporting out four judgeships today. They did not include this particular judgeship. I believe the membership should wonder why.

In 1968 the single judge in the western district of Wisconsin had literally a normal caseload. Today in the western district of Wisconsin the one judge has the highest weighted caseload of any judge of any district in the country.

Last fall, in October, without a recommendation of the Judicial Conference, our full committee declined to add this judgeship at that time, notwithstanding that it was the busiest district, with the busiest judge in the Nation. It did not have Judicial Conference approval.

The situation has changed in the meantime. On January 19, a constituent part of the Judicial Conference, the Subcommittee on Statistics, reported on the basis of its findings that one judgeship should be created now in the country and not wait for the quadrennial census; that of the western district of Wisconsin. And on Monday the full committee, the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference, confirmed that recommendation, and will make that recommendation to the Judicial Conference in April. In fact, it says that that additional judgeship should be created now, and it is up to the Congress whether or not it is a regular, a permanent, or a temporary judgeship.

We have called here for a permanent judgeship. Why? The district judge has justified not one additional but two additional judgeships for the western district of Wisconsin. Presently the chief judge related that to the Judicial Conference. We here are asking for but one.

You have heard justification here for four judgeships made today in areas having a weighted caseload of between 300 and 400 cases. This court has 577—the highest in the country—and this judge disposes of well over 400 cases in a year, which is almost 100 more than the national average. In 2 years, by the time the next Federal judgeship omnibus bill will come around, he projects that he will have a weighted caseload of over 900.

Incidentally, this district has 1.65 million people in it—1,650,000.

You in Congress who are interested in congressional redistricting know that we have 435 Members with an average district in the country of between 450,000 and 500,000. We have 382 judges in the country. On an average, then, they would be representing in the courts between 500,000 and 550,000 people. They would be approaching the number then that we have in this Chamber. However, this judge that we have in Wisconsin has to represent the highest number of people in the country—1.65 million—or three times the average.

It is for that reason that I appear here today making the urgent request that this judgeship be approved.

This is a unique case. It is the only one of the constituent parts of the Judicial Conference that action is asked on now by the Congress. I am hopeful that my colleagues both on the subcommittee and in the House will concur in that judgment and approve the additional judgeship for the western district of Wisconsin.

The jurisdictional territory of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin comprises 44 counties lying in the western portion of the State. The statute provides that court shall be held at five locations: Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison, Superior, and Wausau. The district is authorized one U.S. district judge whose headquarters is at Madison.

The judicial business of this district has increased sharply in the last few years. Civil case filings increased from 206 in 1968 to 432 in 1971 and criminal case filings increased from 67 to 141. During the fiscal year 1971 the weighted caseload per judgeship was 577, almost 90 percent above the national average of 307 weighted cases per judgeship. This was the highest weighted caseload per judgeship of any district in the Federal judicial system.

In the last 3 fiscal years the termination of cases has failed to keep pace with filings. As a result, pending civil actions have increased from 198 on June 30, 1968, to 469 on June 30, 1971, and pending criminal cases have increased from 30 to 130 during the same period. On June 30, 1971, the pending caseload per judgeship in the western district of Wisconsin was the second largest nationally.

As filings have increased, so have case dispositions. In 1968 there were 218 civil cases and 67 criminal cases disposed of by the court. In 1971, termination increased to 301 civil cases and 118 criminal cases. As noted above, terminations have failed to keep pace with filings.

Complete statistical tables showing the judicial business of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin during the last 14 years follow:

TABLE 1.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Authorized judgeships, 1.
Resident judge: James E. Doyle.
Places of holding court: Madison, Eau Claire, La Crosse, Superior, Wausau.

Year	District population	Percent change over 1950
1950	1,387,545	
1960	1,484,383	7.0
1970	1,649,970	18.9

TABLE 2.—U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

	Civil and criminal cases commenced, terminated, and pending						Distribution of civil cases					
	Total civil cases[1]			Total criminal cases			Private civil			U.S. civil		
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending	Commenced	Terminated	Pending
Fiscal year:												
1959	205	216	143	87	95	4	123	131	105	82	85	38
1960	176	185	134	56	58	2	86	100	91	90	85	43
1961	171	187	118	94	75	21	108	109	90	63	78	28
1962	160	160	118	47	62	6	93	96	87	67	64	31
1963	151	108	161	86	72	20	76	47	116	75	61	45
1964	162	155	168	75	79	16	70	74	112	92	81	56
1965	197	137	228	98	63	51	93	45	160	104	92	68
1966	174	151	251	49	76	24	108	85	183	66	66	68
1967	198	239	210	88	82	30	112	137	158	86	102	52
1968	206	218	198	67	67	30	140	153	145	66	65	53
1969	256	247	207	70	53	47	159	161	143	97	86	64
1970	351	220	338	141	81	107	244	129	258	107	91	80
1971	432	301	469	141	118	130	326	207	377	106	94	92

[1] Private civil and U.S. civil cases shown below.

TABLE 3.—UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

[Civil cases commenced during the fiscal years 1959 through 1968, and civil cases pending on June 30, 1958, June 30, 1967, and June 30, 1968, by nature of suit]

Nature of suit	Civil cases pending June 30, 1958	Civil cases filed, by fiscal year									Civil cases pending June 30, 1967	Civil cases filed 1968	Civil cases pending June 30, 1968
		1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967			
Total	154	205	176	171	160	151	162	197	174	198	210	206	198
U.S. plaintiff, total	27	74	77	44	58	67	80	92	54	66	35	55	34
Land condemnation	2	1	1	2		2							
Note cases and overpayments	13	33	31	22	22	25	27	47	6	8	6	14	10
Antitrust					1								
Labor cases	2	7	18	8	4	5	6	10	18	14	7	22	14
Tax		3		1		1	2			1	2		1
Other	10	30	27	11	31	34	45	35	30	43	20	19	9
U.S. defendant, total	14	8	13	19	9	8	12	12	12	20	17	11	19
Tort Claims Act	2	1	3	2	3		5	3	3	6	5	2	6
Prisoner petitions	1	4		9		1	3	4				1	
Tax refund	9		3	3	3	4		3	5	10	11	7	13
Social Security					3				1	1	1		
Other	2	3	7	5		3	4	2	3	3		1	
Federal question, total	17	23	12	25	21	19	16	21	39	37	45	67	47
Marine contracts		1	2	3			1			1			
Jones Act		1						1		1	1	1	1
Federal Employer's Liability Act				4	1		3		3	1	4		2
Miller Act	2	4		1		2	1		8	2	4	1	2
State habeas corpus										4	1	32	9
Labor cases	1	3	1	1	3	1		3	8	3	3	3	
Antitrust	1		1		1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2	4
Patent	8	1	2	5	8	7	4	4	7	8	17	5	11
Copyright and trademark	2	3	5	9	4	4	5	7	3	8	5	9	6
Civil Rights		1				1			2	1	1	7	5
Other	3	9	1	2	4	3	1	5	6	5	6	7	7
Diversity of citizenship, total	96	100	74	83	72	57	54	72	69	75	113	73	98
Contract actions	15	8	12	13	10	6	7	17	13	20	29	20	28
Stockholders' suits				1									
Real property	2	1	1			1		1	3	1	2		
Personal injury, motor vehicle	60	69	46	53	50	32	35	36	36	36	50	28	44
Other personal injury	12	14	14	15	11	15	9	14	16	17	30	24	26
Other	7	8	1	1	1	3	3	4	1	1	2	1	

TABLE 4.—UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—CRIMINAL CASES[1] COMMENCED AND PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1967 AND JUNE 30, 1968 BY NATURE OF OFFENSE

Offense	Criminal cases						
	Commenced				Pending June 30, 1967	Commenced 1968	Pending June 30, 1968
	1964	1965	1966	1967			
Total, criminal cases	54	92	45	83	30	65	30
General offenses:							
Homicide		2	6	5	4	7	6
Robbery				1			
Assault	2	1		2			
Burglary			1	2		1	1
Larceny and theft	3	6	4	8	1	6	
Embezzlement	11	9	2	3	6	2	3
Fraud	16	36	11	16	4	10	2
Auto theft	2	10		11	4	13	5
Forgery and counterfeiting						2	
Sex offenses				1	1		1
Narcotic laws	4	5	10	3		2	1
Miscellaneous general offenses							
Special offenses:	2						
Immigration laws	2						
Liquor, Internal Revenue	5	7	1	7	4	12	9
Selective Service Act	7	16	10	24	6	10	2
Other Federal statutes							

[1] Excludes transfers.

TABLE 5.—UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—TIME INTERVAL FROM ISSUE TO TRIAL OF CIVIL CASES[1] IN WHICH A TRIAL WAS COMPLETED

Fiscal year	Number of trials	Median[2] time interval (in months)	National median time interval in months	Fiscal year	Number of trials	Median[2] time interval (in months)	National median time interval in months
1961	23		11	1967	28	22	12
1962	12		10	1968	25	12	12
1963	3		10	1969	22		13
1964	8		11	1970	9		12
1965	4		11	1971	11		11
1966	18		11				

Footnotes at end of table 6.

TABLE 6.—UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—AGE OF CIVIL CASES[1] PENDING AT THE END OF FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year	Total	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	Over 3 years		Fiscal year	Total	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	Over 3 years	
					Number	Percent						Number	Percent
1961	116	90	18	6	2	1.7	1967	210	130	54	13	13	6.2
1962	118	88	23	6	1	.8	1968	198	123	53	15	7	3.5
1963	160	97	44	17	2	1.3	1969	206	155	36	7	8	3.9
1964	167	85	52	20	10	6.0	1970	336	224	88	16	8	2.4
1965	228	125	52	34	17	7.5	1971	469	269	142	43	15	3.2
1966	251	129	68	26	28	11.2							

[1] For both tables 5 and 6 excludes land condemnation cases. For table 5 also excludes habeas corpus cases, deportation reviews, and motions to vacate sentence.

[2] Not computed where base is 25 or less.

TABLE 7.—WEIGHTED CASELOAD PER JUDGESHIP FOR ALL U.S. DISTRICT COURTS AND FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Fiscal year	Number of district courts in the United States	Number of judgeships		Weighted caseload per judgeship[1]						
				Civil		Criminal		Total		
		United States	Western Wisconsin	United States	Western Wisconsin	United States	Western Wisconsin	United States	Western Wisconsin	
									Number	Rank[2]
1962	87	289	1	185	170	57	20	242	190	58
1963	88	289	1	195	145	56	31	251	176	72
1964	88	289	1	207	142	57	37	264	179	74
1965	88	288	1	214	171	60	50	274	221	59
1966	87	318	1	200	198	55	35	255	233	51
1967	89	322	1	198	221	54	43	252	264	34
1968	89	323	1	207	205	58	40	265	245	51
1969	89	322	1	225	275	64	32	289	307	32
1970[3]	89	382	1	196	385	80	127	276	512	2
1971[3]			1	217	428	90	149	307	577	1

[1] Based on civil and original criminal cases filed. The weighted caseload reflects the amount of judge time used for types of civil or criminal cases divided by the proportions of total terminations. A description of the method used appears in the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, 1971. The weighted caseload per judgeship refers only to the overall average per judgeship for each district as provided by 28 U.S.C. 133. Therefore, the number of judgeships does not include the services of senior judges or services of visiting judges. The weighted caseload for the United States excludes the District of Columbia and territories.

[2] Refers to the rank of the district court compared to all of the districts for the year indicated. The lower the ranking the higher the average weighted caseload.

[3] The weighted caseload figures for 1970 and 1971 are based on revised weights provided by the 1969–70 Federal District Court Time Study, Federal Judicial Center, June 1971.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that has been said by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

We both submitted bills in the first session of this Congress. The bar of Wisconsin is unanimously in favor of this addition. The chief judge of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals has recommended the creation of an additional judgeship.

As has been previously stated, the subcommittee of the Judicial Conference in making the recommendation stated that the recommendations took special notice of the critical condition, the critical condition that presently exists within the district, and urged the creation of this judgeship in advance of the omnibus bill.

We have been talking about Indiana here and the caseload in Indiana of 336 per judge, and the weighted caseload per judge of 376 in the northern district of Texas, and 382 in the southern district of Florida and 398 in the western district of Missouri. However, in the western district of Wisconsin the caseload is 577 with one judge.

I appreciate the careful attention that the committee has given to these matters, but this is an emergency case.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the committee to join the gentleman from Wisconsin and, in fact, the entire Wisconsin delegation, in adding this badly needed judicial position to the western district of Wisconsin.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) for a number of reasons.

Mr. Chairman, on the basis of weighted caseload, the western district of Wisconsin ranked first in 1971 and second in 1970 among the 89 district courts in the Nation. Today, it has the highest weighted caseload nationally: 577 cases compared to 307 per judgeship nationally.

For that reason and other reasons which I do not care to elaborate upon, I recommend the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 4, line 20, delete the section reference "SEC. 6."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall become effective one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that section 6 shall take effect immediately upon enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 5, lines 11 through 14, strike section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PUCINSKI, 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. 11394) to create an additional judicial district in the State of Louisiana, to provide for the appointment of additional district judgeships, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 783, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments 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? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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 bill was passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CELLER

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of H.R. 11394.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Amend the title to read as follows: "To provide for the appointment of additional district judgeships, and for other purposes."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-244)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As the dock strike on the West Coast continues to impose a cruel and intolerable burden upon the American people, I appeal once again to the Congress for emergency action to end these transportation disputes.

There are now two bills before the Congress dealing with transportation stoppages, and immediate action is urgently required on both:

—S.J. Resolution 187, which would quickly halt the West Coast strike and lead to a fair and early settlement under binding arbitration.

—And the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act, S. 560, which would grant the executive branch sufficient authority so that future disruptions in the transportation industry could be averted.

The American public is rightly frustrated today by the inaction of Congress in ending the West Coast strike. Some crops are rotting while others are stalled in their bins, export customers are looking for more dependable trading partners, and jobs and businesses are threatened with extinction. Tens of thousands of people, who share no part of this dispute, are suffering needlessly.

Yet our Government stands idly by, paralyzed because the executive branch has exhausted all available remedies and a majority in the Congress has been unwilling to enact necessary legislation. This failure to act in time of need speaks directly to the question of why some Americans have lost confidence in their government.

We must act now, swiftly and decisively. Twelve days ago I proposed special legislation to end this strike and asked for enactment within a week. That deadline has passed without a response, and I must report to the American people today that I cannot predict when relief will come. To say that I am disappointed is to state the case in its mildest terms.

For those who argue that the Government should not interfere with collective bargaining, the short answer is that the bargaining in this case has thus far failed—and failed badly for 15 months. I share the belief that Government ordinarily should not tamper with the freedom of bargaining, but when the processes have broken down and the Nation's health and safety are at stake we in public office have no right to turn our heads.

I am also aware that some members of Congress believe this strike will soon be settled at the bargaining table. I sincerely hope they are right, and I urge the parties to continue their bargaining, but the 15 months of fruitless bargaining which have already passed convince me that we cannot depend on this solution.

ISSUES OF GREAT URGENCY

In the absence of an agreement, the critical question is whether all of us in Washington sense the urgency of these issues. I can assure you that the farmer whose grain is wasting away and the exporter who has lost his contract regard this strike as a matter of utmost urgency, and I plead with the Congress to recognize their plight.

For two years I have been trying to impress upon the Congress the need for new legislation in this field. In 1970, during the 91st Congress, and again in 1972 during the 92nd Congress, I proposed the comprehensive crippling strikes prevention program so that future transportation stoppages could be resolved. There has been precious little affirmative response. Yet I am confident that if the Congress had enacted those measures, there might have been no strike on the West Coast and the issues in dispute would have been fairly settled.

Let us resolve that this stoppage on the West Coast will be the last of its kind. The Congress should act immediately to end the West Coast strike and, with utmost dispatch, pass the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act.

THE CRIPPLING STRIKES PREVENTION ACT

Certainly the more far-reaching of the two proposals on which I am seeking action is the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act. It would give the President additional—and, in my opinion, essential—new authority to deal with emergency disputes in the railroad, airline, maritime, longshore, and trucking industries.

First, it would discontinue the emergency strike provisions of the Railway Labor Act of 1926 and provide that all transportation disputes be settled under the Taft-Hartley Act. Currently, disputes in the railroad and airline industries are subject to the Railway Labor Act while all other emergency transportation disputes are governed by the Taft-Hartley Act. Of the two acts, the railway labor law is clearly the inferior. Under it, the President can delay a strike or lockout for 60 days by appointing an Emergency Board to study the issues and recommend a settlement. Unfortunately, these provisions only seem to discourage hard bargaining because the parties are hesitant to compromise their position before the Board is appointed, and then, recognizing that the Board will probably seek a middle position, the parties tend to adopt a more extreme stance in order to pull the Board in their direction. Thus the gap widens between the disputants and because neither the Board nor the President has any additional authority, strikes often resume at the end of the 60-day period. These resumptions have occurred at the rate of more than one per year since 1947, and four times during this administration alone I have been forced to ask Congress for special legislation. This is a sorry record, best consigned to our history books.

THREE NEW OPTIONS

Secondly, I propose a major revision of the Taft-Hartley Act to give the President three new options in the case of all emergency disputes in the transportation industry. Under current provisions of this Act, the President may appoint a Board of Inquiry when he believes that a work stoppage imperils the Nation's health or safety. Upon receiving a report from the Board on the status of the strike, the President may direct the Attorney General to petition a Federal District Court to enjoin the strike for an 80-day "cooling-off" period. But there the formal authority of the Federal Government ends: the Board of Inquiry may issue no recommendation on a settlement and the President has no additional options when the 80-day period elapses except to ask for emergency legislation. On nine of 30 occasions when this machinery has been invoked since 1947, a strike or lockout has resumed after the 80-day period, as it has now on the West Coast.

To permit a more flexible Federal response, I propose that the President be granted three options when the "cooling-off" period fails to produce a settlement:

—First, he could extend the period for 30 days, a most useful device if the disputes seems to be near an end.

—Secondly, he could require partial operation of the troubled industry, so that those segments essential to the national health or safety could be kept in operation for an additional 180 days.

—Or thirdly, he could invoke a "final offer selection" procedure whereby the final offers of each party would be submitted to a neutral panel. This panel would select, without amendment, the most reasonable of the offers as the final and binding contract between the parties. Unlike bargaining which now occurs under the Railway Labor Act or under arbitration, this approach would encourage the parties to narrow their positions so that they could persuade the panel of their reasonableness. Thus genuine negotiations and settlement would be encouraged automatically.

Among the additional features of this proposal is the establishment of a National Special Industries Commission to conduct a two-year study of labor relations in industries which are especially subject to national emergency disputes.

As I informed the Congress two years ago, the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act creates a balance between two cherished but sometimes inconsistent principles: the protection of the national health and safety against damaging work stoppages, and the protection of collective bargaining from interference by the Government. "Ideally," I said then, "we would provide maximum public protection with minimum Federal interference."

Without doubt, my proposal would tip the present scales back in the direction of greater protection for the public but we must face up to the hard realities that the old way simply has not worked. The scales, in fact, have been heavily weighted against the public. The actions I propose would not only correct the balance but would also preserve and enhance the processes of collective bargaining.

THE WEST COAST DISPUTE

The present tie-up on the West Coast vividly illustrates why we need the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act. Both the failure of negotiations and the resulting economic losses have been a painful lesson for us all.

Talks and negotiations between the parties have dragged on for 15 months, and I have used every remedy at my command, but to no avail. The Taft-Hartley machinery has been tried, and it has failed. Two extensions in time have been arranged by Government mediators, and twice the mediators' efforts have fallen short. And I have met personally with the parties. Yet this strike has resumed. In my view, it is abundantly clear that we need comprehensive solutions.

Only now are we beginning to realize the full damages of the first 100-day strike which closed down the West Coast ports between July 1 and October 9, 1971. I recounted some of these losses to the Congress in my message 12 days ago, but the facts bear emphasis:

—It is estimated that American exports would have been $600 million higher during this 100-day period except for the work stoppage.

—The strike was particularly hard on our farmers, who have been exporting the product of one cropland acre out of four. During the June-September period, farm exports from the West Coast dropped from $288 million in the same period in 1970 to $73 million in 1971.

—Wheat farmers suffered the worst calamities of all, as their sales to major Far Eastern markets fell off drastically. Japan, for instance, purchases over 50 percent of her wheat from the United States. Since April, we have lost sales to Japan of at least 25 million bushels of wheat valued at $40 million. Ominously, the day after the strike resumed last month, the Japanese purchased 8.7 million bushels of wheat for a spring delivery, but only 1.6 million bushels were bought from the United States.

—Our merchant fleet also sustained heavy losses, as did exporters of vegetables, rice, cotton, and livestock, and wood products, and numerous related industries.

APPALLING HUMAN COSTS

Overall, the 100-day strike thrust a spike into our progress toward economic recovery, threatened our balance of payments, and undermined the confidence of foreign buyers who need to rely upon dependable deliveries. But the most appalling costs were in human terms—those tens of thousands who were not parties to the dispute but suffered because of it.

Those same people are suffering needlessly again, as the costs of resuming the strike begin to mount. I met yesterday with the Governors of California and Washington, whose States along with Oregon lost an estimated total of $23.5 million a day during the 100-day strike, and they have reported to me that the cost of this resumption is intolerable to their economies. The State of Hawaii is also beginning to feel the punishment. If the strike persists for several weeks, we can anticipate a significant increase in unemployment on the West Coast and huge financial losses for many people across the country.

We can and must end this dispute. Because the parties have already been bargaining under different ground rules for many months, I do not think it would be fair or wise in this case to impose the "final offer selection" solution which I am proposing in the more comprehensive Crippling Strikes Prevention Act. I also see no merit in another "cooling-off" extension, because it offers little hope of resolution and it only increases the uncertainty in foreign markets. Instead, I urge the adoption of a plan for settlement by arbitration. As I explained to the Congress 12 days ago, I am asking that a three-member arbitration board be appointed by the Secretary of Labor to hear all the issues and then issue a settlement that would be binding for at least 18 months. No strike or lockout would be permitted from the day this legislation is enacted until the expiration of the binding settlement established by the board.

I strongly favor free collective bargaining, but the time has come for decisive action. I call upon the Congress to take such action on both this emergency bill and the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1972.*

HANOI AND OUR HOMEMADE CRITICS

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine editorial from Sunday last in the Birmingham News entitled "Hanoi and Our Homemade Critics." This is accompanied on the editorial page by a cartoon by Birmingham's distinguished political cartoonist, Charles Brooks, which portrays President Nixon rowing a rowboat vigorously toward a shore designated "an honorable peace in Vietnam."

With him in the rowboat is another figure who is entitled "Demo Senate War-Critics" and this man is jumping up and down, and rocking the boat and making waves, and impeding its progress while he is shouting vigorously at the top of his lungs—"Abandon Ship. Abandon Ship. I Demand We Abandon Ship."

I think this is a perfect portrayal of the President's present war critics and I include the editorial in its entirety for the edification of the House:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 30, 1972]

HANOI AND OUR HOMEMADE CRITICS

As the President ended his speech Tuesday night on the U.S. proposal to end the war, he appealed to the people of this country to unite in "our search for peace—a peace that is fair to both sides—a peace that can last."

Critics at home, who have consistently fought the U.S. government through two administrations, who have constantly harped and downgraded our nation's every effort to deal with this perplexing problem, were immediately at it again.

The proposal didn't go far enough, they said. Never mind that the only remaining point for which the North Vietnamese are holding out is the overthrow of the Saigon government.

One critic even went so far as to imply that he believed Hanoi, not the President.

These critics represent a minority viewpoint, to be sure. But they do hold respectable positions in Congress. They are in a position to vocally call attention—and contribute—to a troublesome division in the country over the war.

Had the nation not endured this crippling divisiveness in the last several years of the war, the course of the war could well have run differently.

Constant harping criticism in the U.S. Senate has encouraged the North Vietnamese to cling to a totally one-sided bargaining position at the Paris peace talks.

The constant fault-finding with succeeding U.S. administrations by members of Congress has helped erode in the minds of many young people the confidence they have a right to hold in their government.

The Senate war critics have made an impact, of course, on our nation's policy. It

was their demands for deescalation which led to the present Vietnamization program—a program which has removed a half million American soldiers from Vietnam.

But there is no way of telling how many American lives—how many thousands of lives—have been lost because the American critics have continued to hold out the hopes to Hanoi that total victory might reward an unbudging, completely intransigent stance.

Hanoi has a will of its own, of course. And it has demonstrated that it is a very strong will. But the fact that American dissidents have encouraged that persistence of will cannot be denied.

If ever there was a time for unity in this country on any cause, when there was a vital national interest in putting aside differences, the time is now.

The President has presented terms which the enemy can meet if it chooses to do so. These terms are not merely self-serving, warmed-over ideas which have been rejected in advance by the enemy. The terms *are* fair to both sides.

Thus, the President has put a test to both the enemy and the critics at home.

If the enemy values peace above its hopes for a complete military victory, it will accept the terms of his proposals.

If the critics at home are at all mindful of this nation's honor and have an ounce of compassion for the nation we have fought to preserve, they will desist from their querulous criticism and, in unison with the rest of the country, point the finger at Hanoi and say, "Now it is your decision."

We do not believe that this nation must make every concession which must be made.

There are risks for the future of South Vietnam contained in the President's proposals. There are risks our side has decided to take for peace.

If the other side is not prepared to take reciprocating risks for peace, then it must be apparent to all that Hanoi's real interest is conquest: To rule all of Southeast Asia.

How can those who have taken a moral stand on the war find such thirst for conquest more "moral" than the decision of this nation, made a decade ago, to attempt to contain that expansionism?

Peace will not come to Southeast Asia simply by the withdrawal of American forces. The Communists will continue to fight for conquest, if they do not agree to a peaceful settlement before our exit.

And if they continue to fight, nothing will stand between them and their victims; no force will be there, unless the U.S. leaves the non-Communist nations in Southeast Asia strong enough to defend themselves, to prevent bloody reprisals on a massive scale.

No American should want the blame for the spilling of blood, as blood would surely be spilled, to be on his hands.

All Americans should now make an honest effort to put aside whatever differences they may have had about the war and to demand, in concert, that the North Vietnamese demonstrate their good faith at the bargaining table. And if Hanoi acts in good faith, it will accept the generous terms the President has offered.

CALLOUS DISREGARD FOR THE FAMILY FARMER

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

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Nixon administration is once again showing callous disregard for the family farmer. He is the victim of a misguided economic policy that is practiced all too frequently by the Office of Management and Budget.

You will recall that the Congress appropriated $350 million for the fiscal year 1972 operating loan program of Farmers Home Administration. This program is, of course, open only to those farmers who cannot secure operating credit from conventional sources.

I am advised that OMB has impounded $75 million of the amount appropriated by Congress. If the funds were not urgently needed I would not be here today asking the administration to turn this money loose.

But there is an urgent need for additional funds to service a backlog of approved loans. At least five States—Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Dakota, and South Dakota—have completely exhausted their funds. Several other States—including Iowa, Idaho, South Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Virginia—will not be in the farm operating loan business much longer.

The need for an expanded program is evident.

The executive branch has not permitted the loan program to be increased over the past few years. An appropriation of approximately $275 million was requested for the past 5 years and many of the States have been running out of funds earlier and earlier with each passing year.

This year the Congress wisely appropriated $350 million, a needed increase of $75 million. The Office of Management and Budget in all its wisdom, apparently feels that our farmers do not need these additional loan funds.

I say they do.

My district alone needs $452,900 to fund loans approved to date. These loans are needed to produce a 1972 crop.

Mr. Speaker, how long will the family farmer have to get down on bended knee to plead for his survival?

I urge my colleagues to contact the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Management and Budget asking that these funds be released at the earliest possible date.

I have sent the following telegram to President Nixon and to Secretary Butz:

I am advised that Office of Management and Budget has impounded $75 million appropriated by Congress for the operating loan program of Farmers Home Administration.

With five months remaining in the current fiscal year, at least five States, including Georgia, have completely exhausted funds, and programs in several other States will not be in business much longer. I am sure you must know an urgent need exists for additional funds to service backlog of approved loans.

Inasmuch as the program is open only to farmers who cannot secure operating credit from conventional sources, I urge you to intervene with OMB on behalf of America's family farmers.

USE OF THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM BY OVERSIZE-OVERWEIGHT VEHICLES

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the use of the Interstate System by oversize-overweight vehicles is a matter of great concern to me, and to many Americans. Highway safety, wear, and repairs, all relate directly to the types of vehicles allowed to operate on the roadways. Congress was well aware of this when it first enacted legislation regulating the size and weight of vehicles on the Federal Highway System. These regulations, however, have been continuously and systematically sidestepped by issuance of special permits pursuant to section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code. The special permits were originally intended to provide an escape from title 23's size-and-weight limitations for the occasional necessity of moving large and heavy loads on a single-trip basis. As Frank Turner, Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, stated before the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee in September of 1969:

We do not . . . understand those clauses to permit larger vehicles regularly and continually to use the Interstate as a matter of course on a blanket basis. We consider the permit procedure to cover *unusual, infrequent,* and *non-recurring* special circumstances on a *one-trip, individual* permit authority. (Emphasis added.)

Over the past few years, the issuance of special permits has become, contrary to the Federal Highway Administration's understanding, an almost routine matter, with no continuity between States in cost, regulation, and issuance.

The Highway Research Board's Report No. 80 on "Oversize-Overweight Permit Operations on State Highways" dramatically illustrates the problem. In a recent year, over 2 million special permits were issued. Several States, notably Pennsylvania, Texas, and California, have issued permits in astonishingly large numbers. Mr. Turner in his 1969 testimony noted that—

In many cases special permits are being issued covering all operations of a vehicle or fleet for an entire year, and renewed annually, so that in effect the basic law is being regularly abrogated for some users.

The blanket issuance of special permits is, however, only one-half of the problem. The variance among the several States on fees, schedules, renewals, and operations is astounding. Twelve States do not even charge a fee for the issuance of a special permit. Although some States have provisions for single-trip issuance, most States will issue special permits on an annual basis. The Highway Research Board in Report No. 80 specifically recommends "developing a national policy for uniformity between States on the conditions under which an oversize-overweight permit will be issued." The report refers this "national policy development" to AASHO—American Association of State Highway Officials—however, I feel this must be accomplished at the Federal level. AASHO, in 1963, drafted extensive guidelines for permit issuance procedures. It immediately, however, removed such guidelines and the present situation has developed. Frank Turner, in his 1969 testimony, "strongly urged that you—Congress—include a clear definition of what is intended by 'permit' operations—

preferably in the bill itself in line with the AASHO language. In many respects the statute has become meaningless when permits are issued for recurring operations which should be brought under the limitations."

The legislation I am introducing today would amend section 127 of title 23 to include a national policy on special permit issuance. It would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to formulate such rules and regulations as are necessary to the development of a uniform and workable permit issuance system. The bill will require single-trip issuance and a uniform fee schedule. I feel it is time we put an end to the divergent and distorted practices for special permit issuance that exists now in the several States. Allowing abrogation of the intent of the law cannot be continued. This bill will bring to the attention of the Congress this important issue.

ECONOMIC FORECASTS

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, once again it is the season for economic forecasts. What is encouraging is that virtually all economists expect 1972 to be a very good year. In a recent issue, Business Week magazine listed 26 economic projections for 1972 by private economists and seven economic projections resulting from the use of well-known econometric models. The consensus of this group was that 1972 gross national product would approximate $1,148 billion, an increase of almost $100 billion over 1971. This is an increase of approximately 9 percent over 1971 GNP. Of this 9 percent, approximately 5.7 percent would be real growth and 3.4 percent would constitute price increases. According to Business Week, these forecasters attribute their optimism to several factors, many of which stem from President Nixon's vigorous and far-reaching economic initiatives during 1971. Some factors mentioned include the dollar devaluation, wage and price controls and tax reductions.

This agreement among private economic forecasters and econometric models is shared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In this month's report by the Council to the President, the Council predicted that GNP would probably increase in 1972 by about $100 billion, compared with an increase of about $75 billion in 1971. The CEA predicted further that the real increase in output would be about 6 percent and the increase in prices would be about 3¼ percent. This prediction is very close to the consensus of the private forecasters. In support of its prediction, the Council listed several factors, including probable increased business inventory investments and U.S. net exports, and increases in Federal Government purchases during 1972. Mr. Speaker, I think that we should be most encouraged by this optimism and near unanimity of agreement among both public and private economists as to our probable economic performance during 1972.

NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION SHOULD BE TAKEN BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic shooting by British paratroopers of 13 persons in Derry, Northern Ireland, last Sunday, January 30, was an event which many of us dreaded, but felt was inevitable. The heightened tension between the Catholic minority and the British troops, the continuation of the abominable internment policy of Prime Minister Faulkner, and the lack of any concrete action by the Government of the United Kingdom in correcting any of the injustices against the Catholic minority surely indicated to all that a tragedy such as "bloody Sunday" was not far off.

The bitterness between the Catholics and the Protestants is now deeper, the IRA is now entrenched in the minds of many as the only protector of the Catholic minority, and the avenues of exploration to bring peace to Northern Ireland have become fewer and fewer.

And still the Government of the United States is silent. As Nicholas von Hoffman stated:

> After our activities in Vietnam—Americans have to be careful about sounding self-righteous, but even so fairness does demand that we do not dismiss the Catholics of Northern Ireland as a pack of maddened criminals.

If only as human beings who greatly value freedom and liberty, we have a right and a duty to strongly express our concern over the atrocities of Northern Ireland.

I am not now and have no intention of asking our Government to intervene directly in this tragic situation.

I do feel strongly that we should bring this matter before the United Nations General Assembly. I am today being joined by Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, the distinguished majority whip of the House of Representatives, in introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, through the U.S. delegation, take this before the United Nations. My resolution urges the United Nations to, first call for the immediate termination of the current internment policy and the simultaneous release of all persons detained thereunder; second, arrange for consultation among all the parties involved, including the Irish Republican Army, to bring about a cessation of the conflict; third, replace the British troops in Northern Ireland with a peacekeeping force of the United Nations; and, fourth, arrange an international inquiry into the tragic events of Sunday, January 30, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, last month I received a letter from a young lady who lives in County Tyrone, Northern Ireland. Let me quote part of this letter:

> British troops Do Not keep law and order here. Granted in 1969 they were welcomed by the minority, but government policy resulted in their role being aggressive rather than defensive to one section of the community.

This entire tragic situation is, in my mind, magnified because it is the British flag, a flag which has so long been regarded as a symbol of freedom and justice, which is perpetuating the blatant injustices. It is the British flag which is continuing to prop up the Faulkner regime in Northern Ireland, a regime so coldblooded and callous as to belie the fact it is a European country.

Let us look at the facts. Prime Minister Faulkner, with the knowledge and consent of the British Government, initiated, and is carrying forth, the internment policy, admittedly treating the prisoners with brutality, but denying that they are being tortured. This distinction is one which I find hard to make.

Prime Minister Faulkner has also taken to stating every other week or so that he has been successful in breaking the back of the IRA. This statement is consistently followed by an increase in the bombings by the IRA. Surely most men who truly desire peace and justice would not continue to make these statements, no matter how true they may believe them to be.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my call for our Government to speak up. Our silence has been deafening to the ears of concerned people everywhere. Secret negotiation will not do here. Public action is demanded.

The resolution follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE CURRENT SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Whereas the violence and bloodshed in Northern Ireland have continued to increase at a steady rate; and

Whereas the Governments of the United Kingdom and of Northern Ireland have maintained their internment policy against the minority there and have treated these men and women in violation of the accords of the Geneva Convention; and

Whereas the British troops have not restored order to the area but have actually heightened the tension and violence, as witnessed by the precipitous action of the British troops on Sunday, January 30, 1972, wherein 13 minority citizens of Northern Ireland were killed on the streets of Derry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States delegation to the United Nations, should take immediate steps to bring before the General Assembly of the United Nations the question of the tragic situation in Northern Ireland and call for the following actions:

1. Immediate termination of the current internment policy and the simultaneous release of all persons detained thereunder.

2. Arrangements for consultation among all the parties involved, including the Irish Republican Army, to bring about a cessation of the conflict.

3. The replacement of British troops in Northern Ireland with a peacekeeping force of the United Nations.

4. An international inquiry into the tragic events of Sunday, January 30, 1972.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD AWARDED HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise

and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1972, I had the honor and the privilege to be present when the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan, was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Belmont Abbey College in Belmont, N.C.

I would like to share with my colleagues the citation which accompanied the presentation of this degree and the speech delivered by the distinguished minority leader to the academic convocation.

BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE, BELMONT, N.C., THE PRESIDENT AND THE FACULTY OF BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE, TO ALL WHO SHALL BEHOLD THIS DOCUMENT, GREETINGS AND PEACE IN THE LORD

In an age of enforced specializations, of elliptical and lopsided human development as the usual price of excellence, Gerald Ford is a reassuring instance of wholeness and balance. In an age when it seems that the constant concern of politics is with image and rhetoric, Representative Ford is one of the men who consistently get things done—one of these on whom we depend for the accomplishment of the necessary work that sustains the complex systems by which we must live.

The range of his activities throughout both youth and maturity has extended to almost every major area of achievement. His distinctions have been academic, athletic, civic, military, and political. The diversity of organizations which have chosen him for national honors is revealing: they include the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the American Political Science Association and the American Good Government Society, the American Academy of Achievement, the magazine Sports Illustrated, the AMVETS, and eight universities and colleges.

Mr. Ford's work on some of the most vital committees of the House of Representatives and his contribution to the Republican leadership in the Congress brought him in 1965 to his present position as Minority Leader of the House. A 90% attendance record throughout his twenty-two year Congressional tenure is typical of his performance as a "Congressman's Congressman." It reflects his subordination of personal political interests to the achievement of real solutions to national problems. The remarkably large majority by which he has been elected and reelected twelve times since 1948 makes very clear the opinion of his Michigan constituents about his merit as a leader and public servant. He has been for our time a pillar of the political order upon whose effectiveness and stability the common welfare depends.

It is for all these reasons, and in acknowledgement of his achievements as a political leader and statesman that the President of Belmont Abbey College in the presence of the Faculty does now proclaim Gerald R. Ford, Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*.

And that the rights and privileges of this high Degree be accorded to him for all time, we issue this Decree under our Seal, at Belmont Abbey College, in Belmont, North Carolina, this the twenty-first day of January, in the Year of Our Lord nineteen hundred and seventy-two, and of the Founding of this College, the ninety-sixth.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AT AN ACADEMIC CONVOCATION OF BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE, BELMONT, N.C., JANUARY 21, 1972

Thank you most deeply for the great honor you have bestowed upon me. It will make me even more thoroughly aware of all the responsibilities that are mine. It will remind me constantly of the tremendous contribution that small colleges throughout America are making to the academic excellence of our country.

Belmont Abbey College is a most inspiring institution. It is inspiring because it reflects the best qualities of America—the eagerness of young adults to prepare themselves for positions of leadership in communities across the land and the willingness of a dedicated faculty to help them attain that goal.

College students today have reached their present age at a particularly important time, both for them and for America. As you know, 18, 19 and 20-year-olds now have the right to vote in local, state and national elections.

This causes concern among some. But I do not in the least share this concern. I have consistently supported the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds. I believe it is a change which was long overdue. I have long supported it because I believe the great bulk of our young people are ready to take on adult burdens at 18.

It may surprise you, but contrary to popular opinion that view is not an invention of our times. Rather, it is deeply rooted in history.

Why should 21 be the magic age for a person to become an adult? Why not 20 or 19, or indeed 18?

I did a little research into the matter and discovered that the idea of 21 being the age of majority started back in the Middle Ages.

During most of the Middle Ages, in Northern Europe, the age of majority generally was 15, not 21. Only the small knightly class had a higher age, which was eventually fixed at 21. The reason for this was unrelated to experience or maturity. The determining factor was the need to bear heavy arms, to lift a lance or sword while wearing steel armor. Since the strength and skill required for knightly pursuits were not acquired before the age of 21, that became for knights the age of majority.

This practice of the gentry came gradually to apply universally. The age, then, that was for so long regarded as a boundary between maturity and immaturity derived its origin from the physical needs of medieval knights.

I need hardly note that we are no longer in the Middle Ages—and the action of the Congress in giving the vote to 18, 19 and 20-year-olds is testimony to that fact.

Young people today are better educated and mature physically much sooner than they did even 50 years ago. I make that observation as an experienced father of two young men who are college students and a boy and a girl who are in high school.

In my opinion, young people above the ages of 18 or 20 are too old to be classified as youth. They are young adults, and they deserve to be treated as such.

It has been so throughout history. There are numerous examples where public leadership at an early age was fully possible for those who were ready and willing to assume the responsibilities.

When he was only 24, William Pitt was made prime minister of England, at that time the most powerful nation on earth. He proved to be one of the most able leaders in modern history.

At 19, Caesar Augustus inherited the Roman Empire and immediately demonstrated his ability by raising an army and leading it himself against rivals who were challenging his position. His greatness is unquestioned.

At 17, Joan of Arc was leading a victorious army.

At 21, Alexander Hamilton was already an important and recognized figure in the American Revolution.

At 23, Alexander the Great became King of Macedon, and within seven years he had conquered a large portion of the known world.

So we can see that throughout history youthful years have seldom kept the gifted from great accomplishments.

The desire of young people today for recognition by society and for control over their own lives is not something new but something old. While it may appear to some that we are in the vanguard of a great youth revolt, the truth is that we are returning to cultural patterns that have been found over thousands of years to be most suited to developing the natural gifts of men.

Young people today want to be released from the bondage of youth, to be taken seriously as citizens, to compete as full members of the community. And I think they should.

In fact, I hope that our young adults entering community life—whether it be after completion of high school or college—will take an active part in community affairs and not become simply slaves to the business of making a living. Older persons would welcome their participation and their contributions of time and energy.

To you young adults in particular I would say: You are leaders, by virtue of your background and schooling. Think of yourselves as leaders—and not just leaders of youth but leaders of people. You will shortly be in a position to serve a much larger community, a community where your constituency will include many people older than yourselves. It will be on the basis of your ability to appreciate more than the needs of your own age group that you will be recognized as leaders.

As young adults, as leaders, you will be confronted directly with a number of community problems no matter in what area you live.

You will become even more aware than you are now of our many urban ills—crime, poverty, unemployment, inadequate housing and transportation.

These problems must be attacked on a regional basis, rather than in piecemeal fragmented fashion.

Local governments can work together as one in attacking crime, improving transportation and housing, finding jobs for the unemployed through metropolitan area job centers.

At the same time new attitudes are necessary at other levels of government.

State and federal officials must come to realize that the problems of the city go far beyond specific slum areas and social ills. City metropolitan area governments must be given the resources—money and authority—to solve the larger problems of the whole community.

The key to such local problem-solving lies in a proposal which President Nixon laid before the Congress more than a year ago. It is called Federal revenue sharing—the allocating of a percentage slice of income tax revenue to states and local units of government with almost no strings attached.

I hope you agree there must be a cutting of controls from Washington and State capitols if local governments are to have the flexibility to solve urban problems.

I mentioned earlier the business of making a living. It is all very well to talk about community leadership and a role in community affairs but all of us must, after all, make a living.

The greatest challenge facing us as Americans today is to achieve prosperity in peacetime.

Seldom in the history of the United States have we had peace and prosperity at the same time. Prosperity usually has come with a wartime economy, a booming defense industry.

We are now trying to achieve prosperity at the same time that we end our involvement in a costly and tragic war.

What are we dealing with? We are seeking to bring under control an inflation that roared ahead almost unchecked between 1965

and 1969. We are also seeking to stimulate an economy that has been throttled back as we have fought inflation, have partially shut down our defense industries and have cut our fighting forces by a million men.

The challenge that faces us is whether we can make inflation-fighting work while at the same time stimulating the economy to bring about peacetime prosperity.

We are fighting inflation with limited price and wage controls. The effort known as Phase II is working. It has a lot going for it.

Simultaneously, we now have the stimulus of tax cuts voted late last year by the Congress. This should ultimately mean the creation of thousands of new jobs.

What are some of the other challenges that face young adults today?

Certainly one of the key problems is the restoration of the environment.

We have already taken giant steps toward cleaner air through passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970. Now we must focus on the need to clean up the nation's waterways. We must take every feasible action to make our lakes and streams clean again.

One of our greatest challenges is to build a foundation for future peace. We can do this only by repelling efforts both on the Right and on the Left to shunt America off into a new posture of isolationism. We must maintain our position of leadership in the world if the world is to have any chance to live in peace.

We are turning from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. But there is no question in my mind that negotiation will prove fruitful only if we negotiate from a position of strength.

We are achieving success in foreign affairs because we are continuing to show the world that we are determined to discharge America's responsibilities.

The President is preparing for summit meetings in Peking and Moscow in an effort to ease tensions between the United States and those nations.

We have engaged in long talks with the Soviet Union on curbing the deployment of nuclear weapons, and we are on the brink of an agreement.

We did not withdraw troops from Europe in the absence of an agreement for mutual troop withdrawal.

We stood up to Russia in the Syria-Jordan crisis in October of 1970.

During 18 months of a cease-fire, we have maintained the balance of power in the Mideast. Through Secretary Rogers' leadership we are inching slowly toward a negotiated settlement in this troubled area.

We are not going to let Russian expansionism in the Indian Ocean go unanswered.

What we are telling the Soviet Union and the world is that we will not allow the other super-power to gain any advantages and we will continue to lead the world toward peace.

I therefore think young adults in America today can look forward to a generation of peace.

Peace will come because we are building it—slowly, carefully, wisely.

We are not just wishing for peace. We are working for peace.

We are putting America on a new course. We are taking her in new directions that point toward a new age of greatness for the American people.

We are laying the foundation for prosperity without war and we are building a new strategy for peace.

Our goals are clear. Our purpose is strong. With the help of the young adults of America, we cannot fail.

RECOGNITION OF BANGLADESH

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to urge the President of the United States to grant official recognition to the new state of Bangladesh. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN introduced this same resolution last week in the Senate.

The administration's policy with regard to the Bengalis throughout their struggle to achieve self-determination has been a denial of the democratic principles outlined in our Declaration of Independence. Our Government adherence to these principles is now being questioned by other democratic nations as well as many of our own citizens. We must correct this apprehension by granting official recognition to the democratically elected government of Bangladesh.

A further and more urgent reason for granting this recognition is to assure that U.S. relief efforts will begin at once to help the millions of Bengalis who are victims of the tragedy of war. The State Department maintains that regular developmental assistance cannot be granted until formal government-to-government agreements are established. As a humane and freedom-loving people, we cannot sit idly by while the 75 million people of Bangladesh face death, disease and deprivation. We must extend our hand in brotherhood and offer the assistance of which we are capable and which is desperately needed by the people of Bangladesh.

Under unanimous consent I include this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RECOGNIZE BANGLADESH

Whereas the people of East Bengal have clearly indicated a firm decision, following a tragic and costly civil war, to become an independent nation called Bangladesh;

Whereas the citizens of that newly formed nation have confirmed Shiekh Mujibur Rahman as their Prime Minister;

Whereas the government of Bangladesh is an effective government in its own country and in a position to meet all of its responsibilities and obligations: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that the President should recognize Bangladesh as an independent country, should recognize the government of Bangladesh, and should commence negotiations leading to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and Bangladesh, and that the President take appropriate steps toward securing funds to be channeled through multilateral agencies for tthe resettlement of the refugees and the rehabilitation of the country.

SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Northern Ireland once again mourn the victims of yet another confrontation between Catholic citizens and British troops. We in Congress have voiced our continuing concern over the situation in Northern Ireland, and have repeatedly warned that brutal and inhuman policies such as internment without trial and interrogation of innocent people are not going to solve the problems which face the people of Northern Ireland.

Two hundred and thirty people have been killed since the disorders broke out 3 years ago, and already this year 25 more have lost their lives in similarly tragic incidents. It should be abundantly clear that the present British practices and policies with regard to Northern Ireland have not worked, and that if continued, can only lead to more bloodshed and death.

There are deep-seated causes for the problems that have plagued the people of Northern Ireland, and it is imperative that those causes be discovered and dealt with squarely and forthrightly.

However, in the meantime it is incumbent upon us, and all those concerned, to reach an interim solution which will prevent further incidents like those of January 31.

In order to achieve this interim solution I am today joining with the very able and concerned Congressman from Rhode Island, the Honorable ROBERT O. TIERNAN, in introducing a resolution which calls for the following four-point program:

First, the removal of British troops from Northern Ireland and the replacement of those troops with a peace keeping force from the United Nations.

Second, an immediate end to the interment policy.

Third, the arrangement of a consultation among all the parties involved, in an attempt to bring about a cessation of the conflict.

Fourth, arrange an international inquiry into the tragic events of January 30.

The parties embroiled in struggle and strife the proportions of the present one in Northern Ireland, seldom possess the unimpassioned perspective necessary to impartially and fairly resolve their differences. However, an interested party, like the United Nations, once removed from the direct effect and influence of that conflict, may be able to achieve the stability and order which 3 years of British military presence has been unable to provide. It is my firm belief that the plan Congressman TIERNAN and I have introduced is the only road to a permanent and lasting settlement of the problem of the Irish people. While it represents only a beginning, it is a step which must be taken if the killing and bloodshed is to be brought to an end. As Americans, interested in the freedom and security of all people, and in behalf of all humanity, we must impress upon the President of the United States the absolute necessity of bringing this matter before the U.N. through our representatives to that body.

WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is presently being asked to

consider temporary legislation to help toward the resolution of the west coast dock strike. This ad hoc effort is made necessary not by the dispute alone, but is a result, as well, of our present law and our present procedures for handling such disputes. As we consider the present circumstances and survey the economic results brought on by this work stoppage, it seems to me imperative that we look at the possibilities of basic changes in our laws governing labor disputes, not only in transportation, but in public services where the public interest can be adversely affected.

As I see it, the Nation simply can no longer ignore the nearly disastrous impact upon our economy of certain widespread work stoppages.

We cannot continue to muddle through at the 11th hour with outdated rescue equipment.

We can no longer ignore the economic havoc inflicted on the general public and on noncombatants near the battle zone.

When in 1937 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Wagner Act, they decreed that the National Government could enter into the business of regulating the relationships between labor and management. The act gave sanction to labor and it did so in the face of opposition from industry, from the Liberty Lobby, from the National Lawyers Committee, and from the majority of the American Bar Association. The Congress had established ground rules for labor peace to replace the industrial warfare that had prevailed in so many corners of the country.

Today we are—and have been—at a point where the interests of third parties recommend that we again talk about another basic change in the ground rules. And that we ask both labor and management to participate in a rethinking of our position in this country in cases that may involve work stoppages that can affect millions of individuals in critical ways.

While some labor leaders may speak of the right to strike as thought it were an absolute right, the right to strike exists only within the protections afforded by law. Otherwise there is only the right to quit. The protections given to management, likewise, are the creations of manmade law. Each side has been granted protections and guarantees from each other, including the sanctity of the collective contract.

Yet today widespread strikes in public services and in transportation can do vastly more damage to third parties and the general public than the two warring sides to a dispute can inflict on each other.

Today the public interest demands that labor and management seek, together with elected representatives, new ways of resolving labor disputes in ways that grant protections to the public. We may look on the successes of present labor law, but we ought to look as well at where and when it has failed and what the cost has been to nondisputants. Present machinery has served some well, but it has served others badly, and new law to further extend the long tunnel of negotiation, mediation, arbitration, parley, and counciliation may merely extend the periods of public jeopardy in such disputes without bringing new inducements to serious bargaining into play.

Repeatedly Presidents of the United States—Democratic and Republican—have been forced by circumstances and the law to become, in effect, crisis managers in widespread transportation strikes, and the Congress has been compelled to act as final arbiter of the rules in disputes that might have been settled earlier and other means—if they existed.

As in other fields, it seems only reasonable that we work toward a refinement of rational means for protecting our citizens from the economic chaos and individual loss caused by work stoppages which, in their effect become—strikes against the public, wherein bystanders are the innocent victims of industrial war. Toward that end, I have introduced a bill to establish a U.S. High Court of Settlement. If enacted the Public Interest Economic Judiciary Act of 1972 would help to protect the public interest, free the President and the Congress from the time-consuming roles of referees.

Summary of the main features of the bill to establish a High Court of Settlement for management-labor disputes adversely affecting the public interest:

There would be established a U.S. High Court of Settlement:

First, composed of seven members; second, serving terms of 14 years; third, nominated and appointed by the President; fourth, with the advice and consent of the Senate; fifth, compensated at the same rate as Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court; and

Sixth, appointed solely on the grounds of fitness to assume the duties of the office.

When could they act?

When a work stoppage or threatened work stoppage has adversely affected or may adversely affect interstate commerce and the public interest.

What is the triggering mechanism?

First, the President must request that the court review a particular labor-management dispute.

Second, within not more than 5 days, the court must elect to assume jurisdiction over the dispute.

What are the powers of the court when it has assumed jurisdiction?

First, the court, in the act of assuming jurisdiction, must enjoin the work stoppage for a 90-day mediation period.

Second, the court must order the disputants to utilize the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service during the 90-day period.

What happens after the 90 days?

First, if the dispute is not resolved during the 90 days, the court must hear oral arguments from all parties to the dispute.

Second, the court may direct the parties to the dispute and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to submit in writing such documentation and summary as the court shall require.

Third, if, at the end of 120 days, the dispute is still not resolved, the court shall direct the disputing parties to submit their final offer, and upon accepting the final offers, shall enjoin any out of court settlement of the dispute.

Fourth, after having thus received the final offers and having thus enjoined any outside settlement, the court shall within 30 days decree one or the other of the final offers, or shall decree any final settlement which they shall determine themselves.

The decision of the High Court of Settlement is final and binding.

The court shall have the power of declaring parties in contempt of its orders and directives.

However, "questions of violation of any right conferred by the Constitution of the United States shall remain the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court, upon petition for a writ of certiorari."

My own public record through my years of service in the Congress is abundant evidence of the fact that I have always been a staunch advocate of the promotion of the well-being of working men and women through maintenance of the basic and essential threat; namely, the right to strike.

I do not believe we could ever have hoped to achieve the overall standard of living enjoyed by working Americans today if we had not had organized labor—backed in its efforts by the full weight and by the full protection of Federal labor law.

Do any of us honestly believe—as many who are anti-labor still suggest—that some natural, inevitable evolution of human justice would have promoted the rights of laboring America—without the union? Without the picket? Without the threat or the actuality of the walkout? Anyone who believes that working men and women could have reached their present level of well-being without these guarantees reads history much differently than I.

But, as I see it, we have reached a watershed. We face new perils. We must look down the road we are traveling and not back upon the way we have come.

In introducing this legislation, I invite discussion, and I urge not only "Big Labor" and "Big Industry," but working men and women, and labor leaders, and businessmen in smaller enterprises to become involved in serious dialog and earnest examination of the hard facts of life in a technocratic society of intense interdependence, where lengthy and widespread work stoppages bring sharply home the truth of Franklin's saying:

> We must all hang together or we shall all hang separately.

This proposed Public Interest Economic Judiciary Act of 1972 is not offered as a final solution, nor is it thought to be the last word in any sense, but hopefully it might help to generate new discussions, and perhaps to be a vehicle for dialog on what has become a major national concern that requires efforts toward permanent solution, and away from the emergency and temporary remedies we have so long depended upon.

It is time, as I see it, to talk sense.

The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States High Court of Settlement which shall have jurisdiction over certain labor disputes in industries and other enterprises affecting interstate commerce and the public interest

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Public Interest Economic Judiciary Act of 1972."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds, and hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States—

(a) that work stoppages affecting interstate commerce and public services are damaging to the public interest in the highly interdependent economy of the United States;

(b) that sound and stable relations between employers and employees and the best interests of both are best secured by the settlement of issues and disputes through the processes of negotiation, mediation and voluntary arbitration that have characterized the free collective bargaining process in the Nation;

(c) that when such issues and disputes have not been settled and have resulted in work stoppage or may imminently result in work stoppage, which may adversely affect other enterprises and activities of other citizens, then the general welfare of the greater public is in jeopardy and such work stoppage must be enjoined and such issues and disputes must be settled through due process in a duly established court of the United States of America.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COURT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a chief justice and six associate justices who shall constitute a court to be known as the United States High Court of Settlement, hereafter referred to in this Act as the "court." Such justices shall be appointed solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

Such Justices shall hold office during good behavior for a term of fourteen years, except that at its establishment, the President shall appoint the Chief Justice to a term of 14 years, and the Associate Justices shall be appointed for terms of 12, 10, 8, 6, 4, and 2 years, respectively.

(b) The Chief Justice of the court shall receive the same compensation as the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and the Associate Justices shall receive the same compensation as is received by the Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court.

(c) The principal seat of the court shall be in the District of Columbia, and the court shall render all of its final decisions at such place, but the court may meet or exercise any of its other powers at any other place.

(d) The court may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as the court may need to carry out its functions and incur other expenses as may be necessary.

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

SEC. 4. (a) The President of the United States, acting as the guardian of the public interest, may, in the event of any work stoppage or threatened work stoppage in industries and other enterprises which may adversely affect interstate commerce and the public interest, ask the court to immediately examine the issues and disputes involved.

(b) The High Court may elect to take jurisdiction over the dispute and thus invoke its powers to enjoin, adjudicate and settle such dispute. The High Court must make such election to assume or not assume jurisdiction within not more than five days of the President's request as stipulated in Section 4a (a.).

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COURT

SEC. 5. (a) Whenever the court shall invoke jurisdiction, the court must, pending final resolution of such dispute, enjoin a work stoppage. The court must, on the enjoinment of such work stoppage, order the parties to seek the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in settling the dispute.

(b) In the event no settlement is reached in the ninety days following the court's assumption of jurisdiction, the court shall direct the parties to appear for oral argument on the dispute, and may direct both parties and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to submit in writing such documentation and summary of the dispute as the court shall deem useful to its considerations.

(c) In the event no settlement is reached in the 120 days following the court's assumption of jurisdiction, the court shall direct the parties to submit to the court on a date certain their final offers for settlement of the dispute.

(d) The court on accepting the final offers shall enjoin any out of court settlement of the dispute and shall within thirty days decree one or the other of the "final offers" in its entirety, or shall decree any final settlement which they shall determine themselves.

(e) The court on announcing the decision on the final offers shall order the parties to conclude a settlement contract in strict accordance with the decision.

(f) The court in discussing the merits of the final offers shall meet in closed session, and shall be free in determining its own requirements as to information and argument, but the court in rendering judgment on any dispute shall vote by secret ballot, and the Chief Justice shall direct an Associate to prepare, or may himself prepare the written opinion of the court for public distribution on the day of public announcement.

(g) No order or decree of the court relating to rates of pay or conditions of employment shall be retroactive to a date prior to the date that such rates of pay or conditions of employment ceased to be governed by a valid contract between the parties and the decree must cover uniformly the period since the lapse of the valid agreement or contract.

(h) The court, in its discretion, may decree the terms of settlement, based upon the final offers, for periods of one, two, or three years from the date that the valid contract or agreement lapsed.

(i) The decisions of the court shall be final, and the court shall have the power of declaring parties in contempt of its orders and directives, but questions of violation of any right conferred by the Constitution of the United States shall remain the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court, upon petition for a writ of certiorari.

THE LATE AIME J. FORAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, Aime Forand was a man of unusual foresight. The wisdom of his landmark medicare legislation has left a lasting impression on the Congress and the American people. He knew firsthand about the great need for this kind of health care, not only for the elderly, but also for the workingman and those who had achieved success, as he did, by dint of their own perseverance.

From his own experience as one of 16 children, as a millhand at age 14 trying to support his meager family budget, as a pick and shovel laborer, a dump truck driver, a radio repairman, private chauffeur, grocery clerk, lubricating oil salesman, newspaperman, and later as chief of soldiers' relief for the State of Rhode Island, Aime Forand, from rubbing shoulders with the common man, understood, as few Congressmen could, the urgent need for medicare.

I know if he were here today Aime Forand would have been deeply interested in the national health insurance programs now before Congress. His medicare legislation opened the door for the current health insurance legislation. He was outspoken on this issue, because of his deep conviction of its importance and the sting of his words touched the conscience and logic of his colleagues more powerfully than any objections from the American Medical Association. His words in 1961 still ring true in the present battle for better health insurance:

A lot of Congressmen tell me the doctors are putting on terrific pressure against the bill (medicare). So I tell them there are a lot more old people back home than doctors.

I give the medical profession a lot of credit for extending the span of human life, but I also charge it with the responsibility of helping to make those years worth living.

Aime Forand was a lifelong supporter of the workingman and those who had suffered from the excesses of big business and greedy lobbyists. As their spokesman, Aime Forand showed the workingman the fight for a better life could be won, even against the most powerful of lobbyists: the American Medical Association. Later, as a founder and first president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, he helped the elderly organize to continue the fight on their own.

Effective senior citizen protest began when Aime Forand showed them the name of the game is organization. He relinquished his House seat in 1960 and devoted full time to fighting for passage of medicare. In 1961, he established the National Council as a rallying point in the drive for medicare. When victory finally came in 1965, Aime Forand was there when President Johnson signed the bill into law and declared that it had come into being only because of the persistence of Aime Forand and the 300,000 members of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

He took his job seriously as a representative of the people. His background gave him the experience to represent people from many walks of life.

He left school after the seventh grade to support his 16 brothers and sisters, his mother and blind father. In his endless search for education, he attended night school and took correspondence courses from Columbia University. He was a prodigious reader.

During World War I, he served in France as a motor transport sergeant. After the war he worked as a salesman, a court reporter, and in 1922 was elected to the State legislature. He represented Central Falls until 1927. Two years later,

he became secretary to Congressman Jerimiah E. O'Connell. In 1930 when Mr. O'Connell was appointed to the superior court, Aime Forand went to work for his successor, Congressman Francis B. Condon. When Mr. Condon was appointed to the bench in 1935, Mr. Forand became chief of the State division for soldiers' relief.

He told friends:

It began to look as though I would have to go to Washington as a Congressman myself in order to stay there.

Mr. Forand was first elected to Congress from the First District of Rhode Island in 1936. He served one term, and suffered a temporary setback by losing a bid for reelection in 1938, but he ran again in 1940 and served in the House from 1941 until his retirement in 1961.

Aime Forand was a most able legislator, a skilled parliamentarian, and enjoyed a well-known reputation for faithful attendance in the House. He was a deeply religious man and exceedingly devoted to Gertrude, his dear wife of 40 years. Once he had made up his mind on an issue or a course of action, he held his ground, often against overwhelming odds.

At the time of his retirement, he was the ranking majority member of the House Ways and Means Committee under Chairman WILBUR MILLS. During his 17 years on the committee, he was greatly concerned with legislation to help the workingman, such as social security and unemployment insurance.

He was one of the chief supporters of social security legislation from its inception. In 1961, United Press International called him the "Champion of Social Security" for his many years of support for social security measures during his years on the committee.

He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance and later was chairman of the Subcommittee on Technical and Administrative Problems of Excise Taxes.

During his last 3 years he was regularly a House conferee on Ways and Means legislation.

He knew the complexities of parliamentary procedure by heart, and often chaired the Ways and Means Committee when Chairman MILLS was absent. Speaker Sam Rayburn would frequently ask Mr. Forand to take over the chair when he was absent or when Mr. Rayburn wanted to take part in floor debate himself. His colleagues admired and respected his firm control and ready knowledge of the rules when he occupied the Speaker's chair.

On or off the floor, Mr. Forand was known as a hard worker. He never missed committee meetings. In 20 years in Congress he missed only 111 of 3,489 rollcalls. He often said he had no time for Washington social circles.

He said:

I'd rather go home and do my work than go to a function any time.

Aime Forand was a very religious man. He was close to his Roman Catholic faith. On very important issues and key votes, such as adopting the draft or the declaration of World War II, he would get up early and go to mass to seek guidance to make the right decision.

He worked closely with his colleagues from Rhode Island. On labor matters he often collaborated with the late Honorable John E. Fogarty. Aime Forand was a strong supporter of the Democratic Party, and never deviated from its principles.

For relaxation, he liked to "putter around my vegetable garden" at his home in Bethesda. He often volunteered to grow plants for the Department of Agriculture's experimental station in Beltsville, Md., and was one of the first to grow the now famous beefsteak tomatoes.

He understood how things grow. It was said that the same perseverance he used to see his bills through Congress also made his vegetable garden thrive. He loved to work in the woods in back of his home in Cumberland, R.I., and with his appreciation of nature, I am sure he would have been in the forefront of those concerned about our environment.

In retirement, he first lived in Maryland, and then Pompano Beach, Fla., for several years before buying a home in Boca Raton in 1966. There he spent his time "just relaxing in the yard, enjoying Florida, taking it easy and receiving friends from Rhode Island and across the country."

His dedication to the well-being of his fellow Americans will be missed. Aime Forand was one of those rare human beings who could repeat the proud boast of the old Romans:

Si Monumentum Requiris Circumspice. (If you wish to see my monuments, look around you).

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Aime J. Forand, the Nation has lost one of its great social innovators and a statesman and citizen of great distinction. While Aime Forand was best known as the chief architect and early supporter of medicare, we in the Congress knew him as a dedicated representative of the people of Rhode Island, a man of varied and unusual background, and a tireless proponent of the interests of the elderly in the Nation. His rise from a laborer and lubricating oil salesman to Member of Congress, and second ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, is exemplary of the determination and energy which he displayed all his life.

Aime Forand's contribution to the American way of life is embodied in the plan that we call medicare, as it was his personal commitment to that concept which was largely responsible for its passage. Few Members of Congress leave such an indelible imprint on the Nation's social and economic fabric.

Mrs. O'Neill and the entire O'Neill family join me in expressing deep sorrow over the passing of Aime J. Forand, and we extend our heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of this great American.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of the Honorable Aime J. Forand came as a profound shock to those of us who knew him so well and admired him so much. For 22 years, Aime Forand ably represented the people of Rhode Island's First Congressional District. But all through that time he was in fact the Congressman of every citizen of this country. One of 16 children, he had to drop out of school in seventh grade to help support the family, because of his father's illness. He knew what adversity meant and he knew what the combination of poverty and sickness could do to an individual and a family.

Early in his congressional career, he launched his fight to bring what is now medicare to the Nation's senior citizens. He had seen the misery of the aged and the ill at first hand, and it became his lifelong goal to do something about it. For almost a decade he pushed his dream and finally, 5 years after he left Congress, in 1960, it became reality. Every man, woman, and child in this country owes much to our late friend from Rhode Island.

He was, too, a master parliamentarian and for 18 years was a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. He was a quiet and gentle man, an extremely hard worker and a devoted supporter of the ideals which made this country great. The House of Representatives, the people of Rhode Island, and the Nation have lost a true friend. To his dear wife and family, I offer my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my profound sorrow at the untimely passing of our late colleague, the Honorable Aime J. Forand.

It was a privilege for me to serve in the House with him and to cosponsor several measures amending the Social Security Act regarding medicare, disability benefits, and increased benefits. He was a man who served his district and country with dedication, particularly as a legislator in matters involving social security. He was recognized as the father of medicare. He gave unstintingly of himself toward the enhancement of the goals and objectives of the House. He has left an indelible imprint on the record of Congress and on all those who came in contact with him.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his beloved wife, Gertrude, his brothers and sisters. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his many friends.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for more than two decades this House was favored with the presence of the late Aime J. Forand, an able and distinguished legislator from the State of Rhode Island.

Aime Forand was one of the kindest and most gracious men I have ever known. It was a pleasure, as well as an honor, to serve with him here in the House of Representatives.

For 18 years, Aime Forand was a knowledgeable and powerful member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was a most outspoken proponent during those years for legislation to provide adequate health care for older Americans. Millions of Americans over 65 now have access to hospitals and medical services thanks to Aime Forand's untiring efforts. Although Congressman Forand was no longer a Member of Congress when the legislation was finally passed, he is widely recognized as the father of medicare.

Aime Forand voluntarily retired from service in the House of Representatives in 1961. He died rather unexpectedly 12 years later on January 18, 1972. But just as his influence was long felt after his departure from the Congress, so will it continue for many years into the future. He has left a legacy of achievement of which any Member would be proud.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is common today that when a major superhighway is completed—and already clogged with traffic—for people to ask themselves: "What did we ever do without it?"

I feel the same way about medicare. What did we ever do without it? What did those millions of elderly people—who today have this medical care protection—do before medicare? They did without. They suffered and they died, because they could not afford the tremendous cost of medical attention.

Today we are paying tribute to the man who is indisputably the "Father of Medicare"—my old and dear friend, Congressman Aime J. Forand, who died on January 18.

Those of us who shared Aime's concern know how long and hard he worked over the years for medicare. We know of his tireless and taxing efforts for medicare and other "people" legislation. We know how well he represented his people of the First District of Rhode Island, along with all other Americans who were the "have-nots."

Today, many words will be entered into the RECORD in praise of this great and good man. But I think we owe Aime Forand still a greater tribute—this is to continue the great work he started.

I feel sure if Aime was among us today he would be grossly dissatisfied with the state of our national health delivery system.

Despite the immeasurable benefits that medicare has brought—and I am certainly not belittling them—it is incongruous that in the richest Nation in the world, hundreds of thousands of our citizens—including many children—die each year, because they either cannot afford the high cost of medical care or it is just not available for them where they live.

And anyone who believes that our medical insurance system is adequate just has not experienced illness recently.

Our late colleague Aime Forand started this Nation on the correct direction for adequate medical attention for all. We can best pay tribute to his memory by pledging to continue the fight he started—to pledge to ourselves and each other today that we will not rest until the people of the United States have the medical attention they deserve at prices they can afford to pay.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I look back upon the years when Aime Forand and I served together in the House. I admired him greatly both as a man and a legislator. I respected his skill and his determination, from which no one could divorce him, to bring health care to the needy and to the aged. He had taken on a major goal for the advancement of the welfare of the people of this country and he won.

But this was not his only contribution. His careful workmanship on the Committee on Ways and Means and his role as chairman of its Unemployment Insurance and Excise Tax Subcommittee placed him in the position of doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

For those of us who knew him well, Aime was a gentle soul and the width of his heart equaled the prowess of his brain. The people of the United States were indeed fortunate as were, of course, the people of his district in Rhode Island, to have found the man who could and did best serve their needs.

To his family and to his friends, of whom there were many, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to my esteemed friend, our distinguished former colleague, Hon. Aime J. Forand, Representative from Rhode Island, a veteran of 22 years service in the Congress, from 1937 to 1939 and 1941 to 1961.

Among his many contributions to the national cause, the outstanding example it is generally agreed, was his early sponsorship of medicare legislation. He was among the first supporters of this legislation beginning in 1957. When the medicare proposal became law in 1965 following his retirement from Congress, Aime Forand was called to Independence, Mo., to witness the signing of the measure by President Johnson in the presence of former President Truman. This was one of the highlights of his political career.

During his service in the House of Representatives, Aime Forand became the second ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance. He specialized in tax legislation and parliamentary procedure and often was called upon to take the chair in the absence of the Speaker. He was chairman of the Democratic Caucus and at various times was a member of the Democratic Steering Committee and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. He was an ardent supporter of the Roosevelt New Deal and the Truman Fair Deal programs.

Having come up the hard way as the main provider for 15 brothers and sisters from an early age, he had experience as a mill hand, a chauffeur, a grocery clerk, and a newspaper reporter before entering the Army in World War I.

Returning from France following a year in the American Expeditionary Force, he was elected in 1922 to the State House of Representatives in which he served through 1927. Two years later he came to Washington as secretary to Rhode Island Congressman Jeremiah E. O'Connell. When O'Connell was elected to the State supreme court, he was succeeded in Congress by Francis B. Condon, and Aime Forand merely changed employers. When Condon also was appointed to the State Supreme Court, Aime Forand announced for the Democratic nomination, was chosen by the party, and elected to Congress in 1936. Failing reelection in the Republican resurgence of 1938, he returned to office in 1940 and remained for two decades establishing a record as a stanch reformer and a man of the firmest convictions.

Adhering to the Democratic standard from first to last, he supported the national ticket in 1960, the year of his retirement, in the capacity of chairman of the Senior Citizens for Kennedy Committee. And when the medicare bill appeared before the Congress under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, he once again became active as chairman of the National Council of Senior Citizens, working for enactment of the bill.

I had the pleasure of serving with Aime J. Forand for many years. He was a warm and wonderful friend and one of the best of legislators. I shall always treasure my own memories of service with him. He was an outstanding Congressman in every meaning of the term. His contributions to Congress were many and because of their nature, they were among the most meaningful in our history.

Mrs. Sikes and I extend our most profound sympathy to his bereaved family, and in particular to Gertrude, his beloved wife.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness over the passing of our former colleague from Rhode Island, that I join today in this tribute to the late Aime J. Forand.

We have heard references made today to the fact that Aime Forand was the "father" of medicare—and this is true, for no individual Member of this body worked more diligently than he in the long struggle to provide adequate medical care for America's elderly.

In the process of this determined fight for medical care, Aime Forand taught all of us a lesson that we should carry with us always. The lesson is this: That without regard to whether a man has the privilege and honor to serve in the House of Representatives, or whether he is simply a concerned citizen, he does have the opportunity to influence the course our Nation follows.

Aime Forand battled long in this Chamber for the passage of medicare. It was not in the scheme of things that this legislation should be enacted into law while the distinguished gentleman served in the Congress. But this did not deter Aime Forand. Although poor health made it necessary for him to terminate his career in the House, it did not deter him from continuing the battle for medicare as a private citizen.

It was 5 long years after Aime Forand left the Congress before medicare was enacted into law. And during those 5 years, as a private citizen, he prosecuted the battle for this legislation with the same vigor which marked his pursuit of this goal as a legislator. He fought for this legislation despite failing health. And he eventually triumphed.

The real victors, of course, are the American people. The legislation which Aime Forand sponsored as a legislator—and for which he later battled as a private citizen—will live on as a monument to his determination to right an ancient wrong that we had been committing against our elderly.

Future generations may not appreciate Aime Forand as fully as we do—for we knew him personally, we witnessed

his untiring labors, and we were party to the eventual enactment of his legislative concept into law. But whether future generations revere Aime Forand's name or not, they will appreciate the great gift he gave to America's elderly: The gift of freedom from the crushing financial burden of illness—and with that freedom, the dignity that rightly belongs to those who have retired after a lifetime of work.

To future generations, Aime Forand may be the "eagle forgotten." To us, he was a dedicated legislator, a dedicated citizen—a man who has left his indelible marking on the fabric of our society. May we all succeed as well.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to join in this ceremony of eulogies to our former colleague, the late Aime Joseph Forand of Rhode Island.

Alime, as he was affectionately known to all of us, was a Member of Congress when I began my service in this body. In fact, he had already established himself by that time as one of the hard-working, dedicated, and effective Members of the House of Representatives.

His experiences of life before coming to the Hill were varied. He was born in Massachusetts, educated in the parochial schools, served in World War I in Europe, was a successful reporter in the news media in Rhode Island, and had served as secretary to two different former Members of Congress from Rhode Island.

I think that the words of Benjamin Disraeli can perhaps best illustrate or explain the success of Aime Forand. Disraeli spoke as follows:

The secret of success is constancy to purpose.

I can remember just as if it were yesterday—and Aime left this body 12 years ago this last month—Aime's plea for the welfare of the common people. He served on the House Ways and Means Committee for many years and, during all of this time, he gave of his many talents, his energies, and his time for the purpose of securing benefits for the handicapped, unfortunate, and aged members of our body politic. He never faltered in his efforts and he was fortunate enough to live until he saw many of his programs come into fruition.

He has been missed greatly and he will be missed more, especially by his friends, as the years come and go. It can truly be said that the United States of America is a better place in which to live, because of the service of Aime Forand.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Aime Forand was many things—among them: able legislator, skilled parliamentarian, champion of social justice, inspiration for our youth, protector of our elderly.

It was because of our mutual interest in assuring health care for the elderly that I knew him even before I came to Congress. He viewed that which became known as medicare as a social-welfare-health measure. I viewed it as a way in which the average American could protect his savings and protect himself against unknown, possibly devastating, medical bills in his retirement.

I am proud to know that, while most of his life was spent as a citizen and a Congressman from the great State of Rhode Island, Aime Forand, by birth, was a native of Massachusetts.

His understanding of the problems of the less fortunate commenced at the age of 14. At that time, as one of 16 children whose father had gone blind, he became a mill laborer to help support his family. This meant that he had to quit school in the seventh grade. It did not mean, however, that his education ceased. He continued it—in night school and, later, through Columbia University correspondence courses.

Aime Forand knew well the meaning of hardship and sacrifice, and working his way up the ladder under the American system of competitive opportunity, and its rewards. He also knew the sting of momentary defeat, and the joy of fighting back to ultimate victory.

In short, his determination was strong; his dedication deep; his service outstanding; his contributions many. He is missed—but he is remembered—for the world is a better place for his having been here.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the laurel, "father of medicare" has been bestowed on our friend and colleague, Aime J. Forand, who died last Tuesday night at his home in Boca Raton, Fla.

The people of this Nation have traditionally reserved this title of "father" to those whose contribution to the well-being of mankind has been so great as to command respect, pride, and gratitude. Few, if anyone, could question the propriety of extending this title to Aime Forand, who devoted his life to helping others, and most particularly, the elderly.

Aime Forand was born in Fall River, Mass., on May 23, 1895. A few years later, his family moved to Cumberland, where Aime entered school. He left school in the seventh grade, in order to help his blind father and 15 brothers and sisters. He was 14 when he took on the job as a millhand, and later worked as a private chauffeur, grocery clerk, newspaper reporter, dump-truck driver, radio repairman, and finally secretary to two Rhode Island Congressmen before entering public service himself.

He was self-educated. After leaving school, he once explained, "From that time on, it was home study for me. I took a bookkeeping course sold by Sears Roebuck. I went to night school and took shorthand until I could write 100 words a minute." In 1951, he was awarded an honorary LL.D. by Providence College.

He served 12 months in the Army during World War I, he became secretary to former Congressman Jeremiah E. O'Connell and Francis B. Condon. In 1935 he was appointed chief of the State Division of Soldier's Relief and Commandant of the Rhode Island Soldier's Home. He later said that it was his firsthand experience in these positions, which involved medical needs of the aged, that prompted his introduction of the Forand bill, which paved the way for the enactment of medicare in 1965.

He was elected to Congress in 1936 as a New Deal candidate. After a defeat in 1938 he returned to Congress to stay through 1960. Although his legislative career was distinguished in many fields, his concern for the elderly always commanded his most devout attention.

Congressman Forand first introduced his old-age medical aid bill in 1957 and waged an unsuccessful 4-year fight for its enactment. The measure had strong support from organized labor and other organizations, but was bitterly opposed by the American Medical Association.

In 1960, he said, "I have reached the point where I am exhausted," and announced he would not seek another term in Congress. But his work continued. More than any other single person, he was responsible for the 1961 White House Conference on Aging, although ironically he was not invited. He had headed the senior citizens for Kennedy campaign in 1960 and later became chairman of the National Council on Senior Citizens, an organization that worked for enactment of a medical care program for the aged under social security. The King-Anderson bill later embodied many of the provisions endorsed by the organization.

When he was Commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers' Home, he made the comment, "The needy will never again be just statistics to anybody who has to deal with their personal problems." He devoted his life toward that end. And thousands, perhaps millions of persons who may now live to enjoy life longer, are thankful to Aime J. Forand, the father of medicare.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sorrow that I learned of the death of our beloved former colleague, Aime Forand.

It was my privilege to work with Aime throughout the years. He was a dedicated member of the Ways and Means Committee, who worked tirelessly for enactment of legislation that would help those who were unable to help themselves.

Prior to his service as a Member of this House, he distinguished himself with the American Expeditionary Force in France during World War I. Later, he worked ably as a newspaper reporter in Pawtucket and Woonsocket, R.I. From 1923 to 1926 he was a member of the Rhode Island Legislature, and subsequently was Commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers Home.

When he came to the House in 1937, he was well prepared to render efficient and effective service to his constituents, having previously served a total of 7 years as secretary to two former Rhode Island Members, Congressmen Jeremiah O'Connell and Francis B. Condon.

Aime was one of the leading proponents of medicare, and continued to serve the aged as founder and first president of the National Council of Senior Citizens.

I deem it an honor and great privilege to have known and worked with Aime, and want to take this opportunity to express my deep sympathy to his family.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened by the death of our former colleague, Aime J. Forand. He was a fine man in every respect, and I valued and enjoyed our friendship and association. Aime served long and honorably in the Congress and on the Ways and Means Committee—he was an excellent parliamentarian and legislator, and the quality of his service to his district and Nation was recognized by all his colleagues. Much of his effort and skill were directed

toward improving the welfare of our older Americans; he was known, in fact, as the "Father of Medicaid," for which he worked tirelessly. Even in his retirement, Aime continued this work and founded and was the first president of the National Council for Senior Citizens. Certainly, he will be long remembered for his devotion and dedication to this important cause.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in sending our heartfelt sympathy to his dear wife, Gertrude, in her bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the passing of Aime Forand, a former Member of this House.

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

There was no objection.

A RESPONSIBLE FISCAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNGATE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS), is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, within a few days we are going to be asked to increase the national debt by a tremendous amount of money. The President has sent a message to the Congress saying that he will require an increase in debt of some $80 billion to take us through the remainder of this fiscal year and the next fiscal year. Of course, accurately speaking, he will not need $80 billion in new dollars. He will only need $50 billion, but the reason for the $30 billion additional is that the national debt limitation is already $430 billion, and we have exceeded that, so by the time we complete fiscal year 1973, we expect to be some $480 billion in the hole. The permanent national debt now stands at $400 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious thing. As most of the Members of the House, I have generally supported the Presidential requests for increasing the debt limitation, because I thought since the Congress had incurred the bills, the bills ought to be paid, but I think we are in a different situation now. I think we must recognize we have a responsibility to govern and not just to drift, and that we must do something serious about the situation we are in, and that appeals just to increase the debt as we have in the past cannot be equated to the appeal now. This is the largest peacetime request we have ever received to increase the national debt.

The Ways and Means Committee has been holding 2 days of hearings, 1 day of executive session, and perhaps some time this week we will make some recommendations to this House. I do not intend to support the requests for the increase in the national debt unless it is accompanied by a commitment from the administration that it is going to make suggestions to us as to how we should reasonably and rationally finance this Government. We cannot go on piling up national debt. The figures now show that the rate of increase in the national debt is outstripping the rate of increase in the gross national product. Obviously we have not been following the proper course of action.

Just as this administration finally recognized and announced on August 15, that they were going to follow a new economic policy, the broad outlines of which I subscribe to, I am hopeful that the administration will now revise its past attitude toward the matter of tax reform and the plugging of the loopholes in the income tax, so that we can eventually get around to financing this Government on a sound basis.

Whenever I say "the plugging of loopholes in the income tax," some people will say, "Oh, you just always want to spend more money." No, I just do not want to spend more money. When the President says he wants to send back to the people the spending power, I say it is a good idea, but what people are we sending this spending back to? Will we send it back to the people who just have some kind of vested interest in a tax loophole, or will we make it possible for all people to participate in the economies and efficiencies in government that we ought to have?

It has been estimated by responsible sources that if all the unjustifiable loopholes in the Federal income tax law were plugged, that the average family of four in this United States could save over $300 a year in its personal income tax.

I think any kind of an effort which would allow people to save $300 on their personal income taxes each year would be a very worthwhile effort, one that we cannot lightly shrug off.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the increase in the debt ceiling, hoping I can create some leverage to bring about meaningful tax reform.

Yes, I know that the Congress is responsible for levying taxes and we cannot shirk our responsibility, but all of us know, as practical men, that we are not going to have any meaningful responsibility unless the President, with the great powers that he has, also gets behind a meaningful effort to reform these tax laws.

So for that reason I intend to make my stand here, to dig my heels in and say, "Mr. President, we need tax reform. We look to you for leadership. We expect leadership from you. We are not going to continue to drift in this country as we have in the past. We are going to try to finance this Government on a sound fiscal basis. We are not interested in increasing spending. We are interested in curbing unnecessary spending. Oh, yes, we may argue about what kind of priorities the Nation should be getting, but we are not going along piling up national debt as a rate greater than what the gross national product grows, and this is the time to adopt a new fiscal policy for this country."

This is the time that we must make our stand, and we make it here.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that the economic tax policy as announced by the President last year has not worked. At that time we were heralded with predictions that if we would only repeal the automobile excise tax we would create 150,000 new jobs in the United States in the automobile industry. The facts and figures on the automobile industry are a little hard to come by, but it is my best information that not a single new job has been created because of the fact that we repealed the automobile excise tax.

Oh, yes, we had a sudden spurt of spending in September and in October, but the companies merely took care of that by using the capacity they already had and by using employees they already had, and no new jobs have been created.

The latest figures I have in my possession actually show that employment in the automobile industry was lower in November than it was in June. And we have lost $2 billion in revenue in this time.

We passed a job development credit tax, widely heralded as producing about 400,000 new jobs in the United States. I must admit that it is too soon to really tell whether this will work. In fact, if I understand the job development credit properly it will probably only work when the inflationary pressures build so high that businessmen try to find ways of expending the profits they are making. Then the job development credit, alias the investment credit as we have known it in the past—the off again, on again investment credit that we have had off and on so many times during the 1960's—will probably then become effective. But there is no evidence to date that the job development credit is working at all. In fact, orders for durable goods and orders for new plant and equipment—the things the job development credit was supposed to spur—have actually decreased. The decreases have not been striking. They are not alarming. But the orders have not gone up.

So I say I think we made the wrong decision in relinquishing that badly needed revenue. It has not produced any new jobs. It is just going to produce a greater deficit and greater pressure for more inflation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been a lot of loose talk about how the so-called big spenders on my side of the aisle are the ones responsible for the fact that we are facing a fiscal 1972 budget deficit of $38.8 billion according to the unified budget concept. The Federal funds deficit will certainly be much higher than that.

I think it is time that we stopped blaming each other for the fiscal mess we are in and start looking at the facts of the situation.

The facts show that fiscal 1972 appropriations by Congress actually total something like $2.2 billion less than the President's budget request. As far as outlays go, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House has indicated that it has been pretty much a standoff between the President and Congress.

Why, then, are we in the fiscal mess we are in? I think, basically, because our national policies to reduce employment and restore confidence and economic health have thus far been pretty dismal failures—and our tax structure, because of loopholes, has been castrated to the

extent that it simply is unable to provide the Federal revenues we need.

Also, of course, we have been far from responsible in reordering our priorities and eliminating needless Federal spending in some areas.

Because of our depressed economic situation, our national income has been much less than it would have been at a full employment level and thus our tax collections have fallen far from the estimates of last year. If we had been operating at full employment last year, our GNP would have been an estimated $73.4 billion greater than it was.

In addition, because of economic recession, we have had to increase greatly our outlays for social programs such as unemployment compensation, welfare, and medicare and medicaid.

According to a study of the 1970 recession published recently in the Brookings Institution papers on economic activity, the cost of additional Federal payments for these programs was $6.4 billion. This cost was in addition to losses of billions of dollars in potential and needed tax collections and is likely to grow even larger if we don't take effective action on our unemployment and economic stagnation problems.

There is every reason to believe that appropriate fiscal, monetary, and other Federal policies—applied when needed—can indeed play an important role in restoring consumer and investor confidence and promoting a healthy economy. In our present circumstances, it is clear that our failure to authorize or implement appropriate policies as soon as they were needed has been a decisive factor in the length and extent of the recession in our economic activity.

The so-called Revenue Act of 1971 gave the President the tools he had asked for to prime the economic pump. But, as numerous reputable economists and many of us in Congress said when they were requested, these were blunt tools, ill-suited to what the economy really needed.

And, as should have been expected, we are now hard pressed to find a single job in the automotive industry which was created by repeal of the auto excise tax, which, by administration estimates, was supposed to create 150,000 additional jobs.

We are also hard pressed to find a single investment in plant and equipment which was made because of the new so-called job development credit—and if there are any such investments hidden in current statistics, it is most unlikely that any jobs were created by them. Our figures for December show that investment in plant and equipment was down by 1.3 percent.

And not only has the Revenue Act of 1971 failed to stimulate the economy and restore confidence, it has deprived us of tax revenues which could have been used for meaningful public service jobs or other programs and has contributed more than $5 billion to our budget deficit for fiscal 1972.

If the Revenue Act provisions remain in effect, they will cost us a total of something like $125 billion by 1981.

Thus, while we in Congress paid lipservice to the need for tax reforms, we added yet another costly layer of loopholes to our tax laws by enacting the Revenue Act of 1971.

Here we have come to what I think is one of our major problems today—that of creating an equitable tax structure which will provide the revenues we honestly need for social programs to achieve our national goals and priorities while not unduly burdening any group of American taxpayers.

Our depressed economic situation has focused attention on the fact that we have failed shamefully in this area and that the present tax structure serves us very poorly. It has become obvious that both justice and sound economics demand that we give this problem our immediate attention.

Recent hearings on Federal subsidies before the Joint Economic Committee have produced some dramatic evidence relating to the problems of tax reform and more sensible Federal spending policies.

During these hearings the eminent economist Joseph Pechman and his colleague at the Brookings Institution, Benjamin Okner, presented a paper with vivid illustrations based on computerized data of just how ineffective and inequitable our tax structure is.

They noted that, because tax loopholes and special tax exemptions of all kinds erode tax liability, our tax rates in this country are not 14 to 70 percent, but really range from less than 2 percent of income to a maximum of 32 percent of income at levels of $1 million and over.

As we know, 112 persons with incomes of $200,000 and over paid no taxes at all in 1970.

Mr. Pechman and Mr. Okner have suggested on the basis of this analysis that, if most of these loopholes were eliminated, we would have the following choice in 1972: an increase in tax revenues of $77 billion—or a substantial reduction in tax rates for all of us, with the amount of tax revenues remaining the same.

The chance to have such a choice is most appealing at a time when our national debt is already more than $426 billion, our fiscal 1972 deficit may be $38.8 billion—and yet many taxpayers are overburdened at the same time that our tax structure is not producing sufficient Federal revenues to meet our needs.

Any combination of the choices presented by Mr. Pechman and Mr. Okner would of course be possible. And while it may be unrealistic or undesirable to plug $77 billion worth of loopholes in the coming year, I believe that the Pechman-Okner paper has much to recommend its analysis and suggestions. Without objection, I would like to insert the paper in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

There are of course a number of proposals already pending before us in Congress. Some of these are most important and should be considered as soon as possible.

Yet I think perhaps none is as important as a real redoing of our tax structure and a real rethinking of our fiscal and spending policies.

I think we should at least make a beginning in this area before we go before the voters of this Nation in November. We simply cannot continue spending ourselves into increasing national deficits and ignoring the fact that our tax structure is riddled with loopholes which are, in the great majority of cases, economically and socially unjustifiable.

To cite just one example: The oil depletion allowance is a tax loophole which was originally intended to encourage the exploration and development of American oil resources. Yet today more than half of these tax deductions support oil exploration in foreign countries by American firms.

Unfortunately, the justification for such tax loopholes is seldom reviewed and it is even difficult to know each year how much of a tax subsidy we are providing to various sectors of the American economy through our tax loopholes.

If these loopholes had to be justified each year in the same manner that appropriations requests for Federal spending programs have to be justified, it is most doubtful that they would be allowed to continue to exist.

Certainly it is our duty to provide for a better review of the operation of our tax laws and to eliminate unjustifiable loopholes which require the great majority of American taxpayers to pay an additional $300 or $385 a year in Federal taxes.

The Congress has been asked to raise the so-called debt ceiling by $50 billion to a total of $480 billion. The administration has indicated that this ceiling will probably only last through February of next year rather than through fiscal 1973. They have asked that we grant this increase in the debt ceiling because it is needed to continue the operation of the Federal Government and have stated that they are confident that their estimates on GNP and anticipated Federal revenues are more accurate than last year and that the fiscal 1973 deficit will be smaller than this year's.

However, many of us on the Ways and Means Committee remain unconvinced. Last year the administration predicted an $11.6 billion deficit for fiscal 1972. Last fall this estimate was revised to $28 billion, and now we are told that the "real" figure will be about $38.8 billion—a difference of $27 billion from the original estimate.

And it is still 5 months to the end of the fiscal year.

Administration officials have assured us that the economy will expand this year and more GNP will result in higher tax collections. They have asked us to trust in them, grant a $50 billion increase in the debt ceiling, and not question their fiscal or economic policies until next February—but simply adhere to a rigid expenditure ceiling in the amount of the President's budget.

They have not reacted favorably to our suggestion that we grant only part of the requested $50 billion increase and ask them to come back and tell us how the fiscal situation is at that time.

They have not shown us why their estimates are going to be any more accurate this year than they were last year.

They have not shown us what it is in the budget that is going to restore consumer and investor confidence and reduce unemployment.

They have completely rejected our suggestions that we may have to look for

new sources of Federal revenue to eliminate growing deficits and finance needed programs such as further aid to education—though they have suggetsed that we "seriously consider" the complex, inflationary and regressive value—added tax for future use.

They have told us that if we simply hold to the President's budget, all will be well—not notwithstanding the fact that we did hold to the President's budget pretty well last year and are now facing a $38.8 billion deficit, which is the highest in our history outside of the World War II years.

They have asked us to believe their predictions that unemployment will drop to 5 percent by the end of the year—but they have not told us what will be done if we are not on the road to economic recovery. They ignore the failures of the so-called Revenue Act of 1971, in which they had placed so much faith.

I think most of us believe that a $50 billion increase in the national debt ceiling is a pretty serious matter—one which should not be simply granted on the basis of administration assurances that we can trust in them for better performance ahead on the part of the economy. Such assurances have proved to be most disappointing in the past.

I think it would be extremely irresponsible of us to grant any increase in the debt ceiling on the basis of the unfounded assertions regarding the economy and our fiscal position which have thus far been made by the administration.

It is my belief that it is our right and our duty to first ask the administration what support or concrete proposals we can expect in return for an increase in the debt ceiling in such long neglected areas as tax reform, meaningful Federal employment programs, and effective stimulation of the economy if needed.

A number of us in the House have indicated that we will vote against the $50 billion requested increase in the debt ceiling unless the administration provides Congress with a plan for meaningful tax reform early this year. We have done so because we think that tax reform is one of our most pressing economic and social issues and that it cannot be accomplished without leadership from the administration.

There are strong indications that the loopholes in our tax laws are an extremely ineffective means—and most costly means—of promoting social goals. If the social goals involved are worth spending scarce tax money on, it appears that we can promote them much more inexpensively and equitably through means other than tax loopholes.

I do not pretend to have any easy answers to our present fiscal mess. However, I think the time has come to act against deficit financing and the tax loopholes which benefit the well-to-do at the expense of the great majority of Americans. These factors have, I believe, brought us far away from a proper perspective on how hard tax revenues are to come by and how carefully they should be used.

Many will say "this is not the time" for moving from rhetoric to action with regard to a firm stand on either the debt ceiling or on meaningful tax reform.

But this has been said all too many times in the past. If something in these areas is not done—or at least begun—now, then when will it ever be done?

As an American taxpayer and voter, I myself would like to know.

The Pechman-Okner article follows:

WHY ARE INCOME TAX RATES SO HIGH?

(By Joseph A. Pechman and Benjamin A. Okner, The Brookings Institution) *

We are pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the study of the Economics of Federal Subsidy Programs being conducted by the Joint Economic Committee. We are particularly pleased that the Committee is directing its attention to the subsidies on the tax side of the budget, as well as to those on the expenditure side. Tax expenditures are not only large—they account for about 25 percent of total budget outlays as conventionally measured—they are also very inequitably distributed, since the value of tax expenditures depends upon the tax rates at which they would otherwise be taxable, and these rates rise as income rises.

It is particularly appropriate that the Committee should be examining tax expenditures at this time, when federal revenues are clearly inadequate to pay for urgent public needs. Some public officials are already hinting that it may be necessary to turn to another tax source—usually the value-added tax, the burden of which is similar to that of a general sales tax—to finance these needs. But it is unnecessary to go to this extreme. The Committee will find hidden among the tax expenditures a rich mine of revenue that could be used more effectively and more equitably for financing social programs than for subsidizing the particular groups that benefit from them.

Our contribution to the Committee's inquiry will be to estimate the amount of erosion of the federal individual income tax in the aggregate and by income classes, at projected 1972 income levels. The term "erosion" is related to, but is not the same as, the term "tax expenditure." By erosion, we mean the value of those features of the income tax law that are inconsistent with an economic definition of income or that are unnecessary for effective income taxation. The term tax expenditure is more comprehensive than the term erosion, because some tax expenditures—e.g., deductions for medical expenses and for outlays on child care by poor families with both spouses working—are regarded by most people as appropriate provisions in a personal income tax. Of course, there are also tax expenditures and erosion in the corporation income tax, but we confine ourselves to the individual income tax.

The erosion calculations are based on a new file of income data which was prepared at the Brookings Institution for estimating the distribution of federal, state, and local tax burdens by income classes. We call this file the "MERGE File" because it combines information on 30,000 families and single persons from the 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO), conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and from a sample of about 90,000 federal individual income tax returns filed for the year 1966. The File contains data for low income SEO families who are not in the tax population, as well as the more complete—and more accurate—income tax information for higher income individuals. The basic economic unit in the MERGE File is the family or single unattached individual, and all of our analyses are presented in terms of families rather than tax returns.

Briefly, the process by which this remarkable file was developed consisted of estimating for each family unit in the SEO File the kind of tax return or returns (if any) that would have been filed by each family member. For those who were expected to be tax filers, the SEO unit was matched with a tax return selected from the Tax File, and the income data in the Tax File were substituted for the corresponding information in the SEO File. For those who were expected to be nonfilers, the only income information available was from the SEO record. As in the case of most field surveys, there was virtually no upper "tail" of the income distribution in the SEO File (i.e., incomes above $30,000). At these levels, the Tax File was substituted in toto for the SEO File without going through the intermediate procedure of matching the two files. Finally, the income information in the MERGE File was corrected for nonreporting and underreporting, so that—with the appropriate weights applied to the sample units—the file accounts for the total income estimated to have been received in the United States in 1966.

The estimates for 1972 are based on projections of individual income sources from the 1966 levels.

RATIONALE OF THE EROSION CALCULATIONS

To determine the extent of erosion, we begin with a comprehensive definition of income which provides the "norm" against which the existing personal income tax can be assessed. We use a concept which corresponds as closely as possible to an economic concept of income, i.e., consumption plus tax payments plus (or minus) the net increase (or decrease) in the value of assets during the year. The modifications we make in this definition are dictated largely by practical administrative considerations or by historical precedents which need not (or could not) be broken for this purpose: first, capital gains would be included in income when realized or when transferred to others through gift or bequest; second, gifts and inheritances would be excluded from income; third, a separate corporation tax is retained, with dividends taxed in full at the personal level; and, fourth, employer contributions to private pension plans would not be considered current income to the employee. The first of these modifications is made because it is probably impractical to include capital gains in income until they are realized or transferred. The second and third accept the present practice of separating estate and gift taxation and corporation income taxation from individual income taxation. The fourth is dictated by the fact that taxation of employer contributions to health and pension plans involves difficult practical problems that would require basic revisions in the nation's private pension structure.

A tax base which closely approximates this modified definition of economic income would involve the following revisions of the present federal individual income tax law: taxation as ordinary income of all realized capital gains and of gains transferred by gift or bequest; elimination of the tax exemption for interest from state and local government bonds; limitation of depletion allowances to cost depletion; taxation of interest on the current-year increment in the cash surrender value of life insurance policies; inclusion of net imputed rent in taxable income and elimination of the deductions for real property taxes and mortgage interest; taxation of transfer payments as ordinary income; elimination of most itemized deductions and of the standard deduction (but not the low-income allowance); elimination of the special exemptions for the aged and blind and the retirement income tax credit; and elimination of the dividend exclusion. In addition, we eliminate the rate advantages (but not the mechanics) of in-

*This statement is a summary of the paper prepared for the Joint Economic Committee Compendium of Papers on the Economics of Federal Subsidy Programs, "Individual Income Tax Erosion by Income Classes." The views presented in this statement are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the officers, trustees, or other staff members of the Brookings Institution.

come splitting for married couples and the maximum tax on earned income.

When the federal tax actually paid is related to adjusted gross income corrected for the items just enumerated, we find that the present-law tax is a relatively low percentage of income at all income levels. It rises from an effective rate of less than 2 percent of income below $5,000 to 9 percent at $10,000 and to a maximum of 32 percent at income levels of $1 million and above (table 1). Moreover, the average effective rate does not exceed 25 percent until income levels of $100,000 and over. This is very different from the impression one gets from examining marginal rate schedules that rise from 14 to 70 percent.

In light of these relatively light tax burdens, it is appropriate to ask two questions: First, how much more money could be raised from the individual income tax if all the eroding features of the tax law were eliminated? Second, if the comprehensive tax base were adopted, how much could the rates be reduced and still yield the same revenue as the present income tax?

YIELD OF A COMPREHENSIVE INCOME TAX

We estimate that, in 1972, total adjusted gross income (AGI) of all family units in the United States will amount to $776 billion under present law. Adoption of the comprehensive income tax would raise adjusted gross income to $914 billion, an increase of $138 billion or 18 percent. It would increase taxable income by $166 billion and, at 1972 tax rates and exemptions and a flat $1,300 standard deduction, would raise tax liabilities by $77 billion (aTble 2). About 10 percent of the tax increase would come from families with incomes under $10,000, 43 percent from families with incomes between $10,000 and $25,000, and the remaining 47 percent from those with incomes of $25,000 and over (Table 3). Although taxes would increase substantially at all income levels, the relative changes would be greatest for the very poor and the very rich. Largely due to the addition of transfer payments to the tax base, families with incomes under $5,000 would find their tax liabilities increased threefold; and, as a result of the revised treatment of capital gains, families with incomes of $100,000 and over would have tax increases of almost 100 percent.

The changes resulting from the adoption of the comprehensive income tax for families at different income levels can be seen at a glance in Figure 1. (Figure 1 not printed in the RECORD.) The top-most line on the chart indicates the effective tax rates that would be paid under the comprehensive tax; the lowest line indicates the rates now paid by these families. The intervening lines in the chart show the extent of erosion due to the major structural features enumerated above. The major conclusion one is forced to draw from this chart is that, while income tax erosion reduces taxes at all levels, the group benefitted most are those at the top of the income scale.

ALTERNATIVE TAX RATE SCHEDULES

All or part of the increased revenue that would be collected under the comprehensive income tax can be viewed as a reserve to be used for general tax rate reductions. In this section, we explore ways in which taxes might be cut and the implications of each for effective rates of tax at various income levels and for the distribution of income after tax.

To illustrate the range of possibilities, we have calculated tax liabilities with five rate schedules that differ fairly substantially in their degree of progressivity (Table 4). However, each schedule will yield approximately the same amount of revenue that would be collected in 1972 under the Revenue Act of 1971.

1. The simplest way to cut taxes and still maintain the same yield as would be derived in 1972 is a straight 43 percent across-the-board cut in all marginal tax rates. This would lower the bottom bracket rate to 8 percent and would drop the top bracket rate to 40 percent. This is rate schedule 1 in Table 4.

2. In schedule 2, the marginal rates begin and end at higher levels than those in schedule 1—10 percent in the lowest bracket and 50 percent in the highest bracket—but the rates between $6,000 and $60,000 of taxable income are lower.

3. Schedule 3 greatly reduces the rate at the bottom and the top of the income scale, but imposes higher rates than schedule 1 for taxable incomes between $2,000 and $10,000 than schedule 2 for taxable income between $2,000 and $14,000, along with equal or lower rates for taxable incomes of $14,000 and over. The marginal rates in schedule 3 range from a minimum of 5 percent to a maximum of 40 percent, which involves a 64 percent cut in the lowest rate as well as a significant cut—43 percent—in the highest rate.

4. Schedule 4 applies a flat 16 percent rate on all taxable income.

5. The final schedule combines a top marginal rate of 44 percent with a generous low-income allowance of $2,000. To keep within the revenues produced by the present-law income tax, the lowest bracket rate in schedule 5 begins at 7 percent.

In Table 5 we show the effective rates of tax under present law and under each of the alternative rate schedules. Schedule 4 is the least progressive of all the alternatives considered by a wide margin. On the average, the effective rates of tax would be substantially higher under this schedule than under present law for all income classes below $25,000, while those at higher income levels would enjoy large tax savings. For example, under present law, the average tax paid by families with incomes of $1 million and over is $743,000; under schedule 4, the average for this income class falls to only $345,000—an average tax reduction of more than 50 percent.

Schedule 5 is the most progressive and, we believe, most attractive of all the possibilities considered. (Under this schedule, all four-person families with incomes below $5,000 would be exempt from tax.) Average tax payments would fall for families with incomes below $25,000. Higher-income families would pay more taxes than they do now, but the increases are not excessive, in our judgment. Again looking at families with incomes of $1 million and over, the average tax under schedule 5 rates is about $938,000 as compared with $743,000 under present law. This would represent a 26 percent increase in tax liability for the most affluent families in the nation.

Of course, the drastic reforms of the tax base, even when coupled with the tremendous rate reductions under schedule 5, will not reduce taxes for all families. In general, under the comprehensive income tax base and schedule 5, the tax burdens of homeowners would increase relative to those of renters; the burdens for capital gain recipients would increase relative to recipients of other income from property; married couples' burdens would rise relative to those of single persons; and the burdens of those who now itemize personal deductions would increase relative to those who use the standard deduction. We believe that such shifts in the distribution of tax burdens are desirable and would improve the equity of the income tax, but others will doubtless have other views.

In closing, we should like to add that our criticism of the present individual income tax should not be interpreted as a call for another tax to replace it or to provide additional revenue when and if it is needed. Table 1 reveals that, despite the enormous amount of erosion, the income tax is, on balance, progressive. We see no valid reason for turning to a mass consumption tax—whether it is a retail sales tax or a value-added tax—to raise more revenue. At 1972 income levels, a rate increase of 1 percentage point across the board would increase the yield of the federal individual income tax by about $4.8 billion a year and the yield of the corporation income tax by about $0.8 billion, or a total of about $5.6 billion a year. After the recent tax-cutting spree—which most people seem to have enjoyed—revenues will fall short of urgently needed expenditures by perhaps $10 or $15 billion a year. Trial balloons have already been launched to see whether the public would accept a value-added tax to raise such revenues if they are earmarked for social programs. But such revenues can also be raised from the income taxes by raising the current rates by 2 or 3 percentage points. In our view, there is no valid justification for introducing a consumption tax in lieu of additional reliance on the income taxes, however imperfect they may be.

TABLE 1.—DISTRIBUTION OF EXPANDED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME[1] AND FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX BY INCOME CLASSES, 1972[2]

[Income classes in thousands; dollar amounts in millions]

Expanded AGI[3]	Expanded AGI amount	Federal individual income tax	
		Amount	Percent of income
Under $3	$7,968	$36	0.5
$3 to $5	27,610	475	1.7
$5 to $10	145,033	7,655	5.3
$10 to $15	216,483	18,843	8.7
$15 to $20	180,340	19,354	10.7
$20 to $25	109,886	13,301	12.1
$25 to $50	142,941	20,707	14.5
$50 to $100	41,178	9,672	23.5
$100 to $500	31,355	9,241	29.5
$500 to $1,000	4,360	1,324	30.4
$1,000 and over	7,109	2,279	32.1
All incomes	914,262	102,888	11.3

[1] Expanded adjusted gross income is adjusted gross income as defined in the Internal Revenue Code modified to include the income items listed in the text.

[2] Based on projections of individual income sources from 1966 levels. Assumes personal income of $925,000,000,000 in 1972.

[3] Revenue Act of 1971 applied to 1972 incomes.

Note: Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON BETWEEN AGI, TAXABLE INCOME, AND TAX LIABILITY UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER A COMPREHENSIVE INCOME TAX, 1972 INCOME LEVELS

[Amounts in millions]

Item	AGI	Taxable income	Tax liability
Present law[1]	$776,146	$478,230	$102,888
Elimination of rate advantages of income splitting[2]			21,565
Plus:			
½ realized capital gains	17,149	16,491	9,334
Constructive realization of gain on gifts and bequests	10,403	9,544	4,374
Tax-exempt State and local bond interest	1,916	1,892	1,193
Other preference income[3]	1,235	1,089	560
Dividend exclusion	2,200	1,924	673
Interest on life insurance policies	9,917	9,093	2,685
Homeowner's preferences[4]	15,545	28,700	9,642
Transfer payments	79,750	55,075	13,074
Personal exemptions and deductions		42,165	14,158
Equals: Comprehensive income tax	914,262	644,205	180,145

[1] Revenue Act of 1971 applied to 1972 income.

[2] Includes $113,000,000 revenue effect of eliminating the 50 percent maximum tax on earned income.

[3] Excess of percentage over cost depletion and accelerated over straight-line depreciation.

[4] Includes effects of adding net imputed rent and disallowing itemized deductions for mortgage interest and real estate taxes.

Note: The increase in taxable income is less than the change in AGI because some income goes to families who are not subject to tax.

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON BETWEEN TAX LIABILITIES UNDER PRESENT LAW AND UNDER A COMPREHENSIVE INCOME TAX, BY INCOME CLASSES, 1972 INCOME LEVELS

[Income classes in thousands; money amounts in millions]

Expanded AGI [1]	Tax liability: Comprehensive tax (1)	Tax liability: Present law [2] (2)	Increase in tax liabilities (3)	Percentage distribution of tax increase (4)	Percentage increase in tax liabilities (5)
Under $3	$128	$36	$92	0.1	255.6
$3 to $5	1,489	475	1,014	1.3	213.5
$5 to $10	14,238	7,655	6,583	8.5	86.0
$10 to $15	30,263	18,843	11,420	14.8	60.6
$15 to $20	31,737	19,354	12,383	16.0	64.0
$20 to $25	22,866	13,301	9,565	12.4	71.9
$25 to $50	38,099	20,707	17,392	22.5	84.0
$50 to $100	$17,121	$9,672	$7,449	9 6	77.0
$100 to $500	17,076	9,241	7,835	10.1	84.8
$500 to $1,000	2,638	1,324	1,314	1.7	99.2
$1,000 and over	4,489	2,279	2,210	2.9	97.0
All incomes	180,145	102,888	77,257	100.0	75.1

[1] Expanded adjusted gross income is adjusted gross income as defined in the Internal Revenue Code modified to include the income items listed in table 3.

[2] Revenue Act of 1971 applied to 1972 incomes.

TABLE 4.—ALTERNATIVE MARGINAL TAX RATE SCHEDULES BY TAXABLE INCOME CLASS

[Income classes in thousands]

Taxable income	Present law [1]	Alternative tax schedules under comprehensive income tax: 1	2	3	4	5
Under 0.5	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.05	0.16	0.07
0.5 to 1.0	.15	.09	.10	.07	.16	.08
1.0 to 1.5	.16	.09	.11	.08	.16	.10
1.5 to 2.0	.17	.10	.11	.10	.16	.11
2.0 to 4.0	.19	.12	.12	.13	.16	.13
4.0 to 6.0	.22	.12	.13	.15	.16	.14
6.0 to 8.0	.25	.14	.13	.16	.16	.15
8.0 to 10.0	.28	.16	.15	.17	.16	.16
10.0 to 12.0	.32	.18	.16	.18	.16	.20
12.0 to 14.0	.36	.20	.18	.19	.16	.22
14.0 to 16.0	.39	.22	.20	.20	.16	.24
16.0 to 18.0	.42	.24	.22	.21	.16	.26
18.0 to 20.0	.45	.26	.22	.22	.16	.28
20.0 to 22.0	0.48	0.27	.24	0.23	0.16	0.29
22.0 to 26.0	.50	.28	.25	.24	.16	.30
26.0 to 32.0	.53	.30	.26	.25	.16	.32
32.0 to 38.0	.55	.31	.28	.27	.16	.34
38.0 to 44.0	.58	.33	.30	.29	.16	.35
44.0 to 50.0	.60	.34	.32	.31	.16	.36
50.0 to 60.0	.62	.35	.34	.33	.16	.37
60.0 to 70.0	.64	.36	.36	.35	.16	.38
70.0 to 80.0	.66	.37	.38	.37	.16	.40
80.0 to 90.0	.68	.39	.40	.38	.16	.41
90.0 to 100.0	.69	.39	.45	.39	.16	.42
100.0 and over	.70	.40	.50	.40	.16	.44

[1] Revenue Act of 1971 rate schedule for married couples filing separate returns.

Note: Rate schedules 1 to 4 are applied with a $1,300 low-income allowance; rate schedule 5 assumes a $2,000 low-income allowance.

TABLE 5.—EFFECTIVE TAX RATES UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE INCOME TAX AND ALTERNATIVE RATE SCHEDULES, BY INCOME CLASSES, 1972 INCOME LEVELS

[Income classes in thousands]

Expanded AGI [1]	Present law [2]	Schedule 1	Schedule 2	Schedule 3	Schedule 4	Schedule 5
Under $3	0.5	0.9	1.1	0.6	1.8	0.1
$3 to $5	1.7	3.2	3.6	2.6	5.6	1.7
$5 to $10	5.3	5.8	6.2	5.9	8.7	5.0
$10 to $15	8.7	8.1	8.3	8.7	10.7	7.8
$15 to $20	10.7	10.1	9.9	10.6	11.8	9.9
$20 to $25	12.1	11.9	11.4	11.9	12.4	11.9
$25 to $50	14.5	15.1	14.1	14.3	13.1	15.6
$50 to $100	23.5	23.4	21.8	21.4	14.0	24.9
$100 to $500	29.5	30.8	33.7	29.8	14.3	33.8
$500 to $1,000	30.4	34.4	41.9	34.2	14.2	37.7
$1,000 and over	32.1	36.0	44.7	36.0	14.6	40.0
All incomes	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.3	11.3
Measure of after-tax income inequality	.3691	.3675	.3689	.3691	.3837	.3638

[1] Expanded AGI is adjusted gross income as defined in the Internal Revenue Code modified to include the income items listed in the text.

[2] Revenue Act of 1971 applied to 1972 incomes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say to the distinguished gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS), good for you, sir. You are performing a most valuable public function this evening in pointing out the realities of the deficit and of the budgetary mess in which this country finds itself.

The gentleman has reviewed the sorry history of recent deficits, past, present, and future deficits—$25 billion last year, $39 billion this year, and $25 billion or more in the year to come. All this while the progressivity of our tax system, particularly the income tax, has been steadily diminishing, and most particularly in the last 3 years.

We see, too, the evidence that the shares of the Nation's income by various groups in our society are showing an unfortunate trend, in which those at the top are getting a larger share and those at the bottom are getting a smaller one. The latest figures, by the very prestigious Brookings Institution, for the year 1967 show that the lowest fifth of American families received 3.2 percent of our national income, while the highest fifth of our American families received 45.8 percent, or more than 14 times the amount of the lowest group.

Moreover, the top 1 percent of American families in 1967 received 6.8 percent of the national income. That is more than twice the percentage of national income received by the whole bottom 20 percent.

Indeed, this spread between the rich and the poor may well be getting worse. It is the poor who have borne the brunt of unemployment in the last 2 years. It is the better off, the well to do, the corporations, and the high-bracket individual taxpayers who have gotten the major benefits of individual income tax cuts and corporate income tax cuts and the provision of new loopholes.

Indeed, it came as a surprise to many Members just the other day when it was disclosed by the Treasury that 112 Americans with more than $200,000 apiece in income during the year 1970 paid no Federal income tax whatever. How many scores of thousands lie behind them who may have paid a peppercorn or two of tax, the Treasury does not disclose. This in the year after a law called the Tax Reform Act of 1969 was passed, an act that was supposed to put an end to excessive tax inequities.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so right when he says that it should be the first order of business for this body and the other body and for the Executive to close the loopholes and do something about the capital gains gimmick, and about tax-exempt bonds, and about mineral depletion, and about the deferred income tax and tax credits on foreign operations, and indeed about the investment tax credit.

There is a $20 to $30 billion loophole-plugging job to be done. And nothing could be worse than to make this permissive society more permissive by per-

mitting the President to get by with a $50 billion debt increase without requiring him even to come to Congress with a Presidentially backed program for plugging these loopholes.

That is why I join with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) in announcing my position on the President's $50 billion debt increase request.

Mr. Speaker, during my 19 years in this body, under Republican Presidents and under Democratic Presidents, I have voted in favor of their debt limit increase requests. But I intend to vote against the $50 billion request of Mr. Nixon until and unless he comes before the Congress in good faith with a program for plugging the loopholes in the Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, a program that is comprehensive in scope and meaningful in amount. If he will do that, he will have my vote. If he fails to do it, I shall vote against his debt increase request.

I was very disappointed to read in the New York Times this morning that before the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday, the committee on which the gentleman from Florida so significantly sits, an administration witness had some interesting things to say about closing tax loopholes. This witness was Dr. Ezra Salomon, who is a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He, according to the New York Times report, yesterday said that Congress should not try to reduce next year's budget deficit significantly, not even by closing tax loopholes.

And, he described such an eventuality as tragic.

Well, it might be tragic for those who benefit by the loopholes, but it surely would be a God's blessing for the hard-working American taxpayer who has sweated so long under an inequitable tax system.

Let me say to the President's economic advisers and to the President himself, that the administration is adopting the most vulgarized Keynesianism, the idea that any old kind of a deficit is glorious and should redound to our credit.

The late Lord Keynes would twirl in his grave if he saw what was being done in his name in this country today. Keynes never suggested a sloppy fiscality that peppered the tax system with loopholes, and the roster of expenditures with all sorts of giveaways to people who do not need them. This sloppiness is producing a recordbreaking deficit at a time when we need to deal efficiently with the economic problems of this country.

We had another indication of the recklessness of the administration's tax giveaway policy just the other day when the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Connally, was addressing here in Washington a group of leaders of 1,000 of the largest corporations in this country. He berated them, saying, "Here we are giving you everything, profits unlimited, investment tax credits beyond the dreams of avarice, and what have you done with it? Nothing."

With an economy working at only 72 percent of its capacity, is it any wonder that when they are given a tax credit, they do nothing with it.

In fact, the giving of the $8 billion tax bonanza, the return of the bonanza in part through campaign contributions, makes no jobs.

If you want to make jobs, and the gentleman does—and I want to make jobs—the most efficient way of doing it is by actually making the jobs. I refer here to the bills now suported by more than 60 Members of this body—we would welcome support from our friends and brothers across the aisle.

The aim and essence of that program is to provide 500,000 public service jobs at the State and local levels, federally funded.

I say it is wicked that there are medical corpsmen from Vietnam who are walking the streets looking for work today at a time when our hospitals desperately need orderlies and aides, but lack the money to hire them.

I say it is wicked that we let our State and National forests go to rack and ruin because we lack sufficient junior foresters to do the job of policing them.

I say it is wicked that we let crime on the streets increase when the policeman on the beat could profit so tremendously from having a police aide, in uniform, walking the beat with him.

I say it is wicked that we close our museums in the great cities of this country because the museums of our cities cannot sweat any more taxes out of the hard-pressed homeowners, and so we have to close them down for days because we do not have enough money to pay for guards. Let us take some of the unemployed and put them to work as museum assistants.

Five hundred thousand jobs now would be no problem whatever. Then think of the multiplier effect when those newly employed workers, who were previously unemployed, start spending the money, the prevailing wage which they are going to get. That, according to any multiplier rate I have ever heard of, is going to have a two for one effect, so you will get one million additional jobs because of the 500,000 jobs you have created. That is 1.5 million jobs.

Then you get the accelerator effect, year in and year out, in season and out of season, whether we have an investment tax credit on the books or whether we do not, the American businessman—bless him—tends to spend about 10 percent of the GNP on plant and equipment. He is going to be doing that next year, as he did last year, whether or not we have the 7-percent investment tax credit.

If the businessman has a larger base, by this extra 1.5 million jobs I am talking about, on which he can posit the sums he spends for plant and equipment, that is going to add another couple of hundred thousand jobs. And if you add to that the added confidence which will inhabit the breast of those who are working, who will then start spending a little more of their consumer-spending income, you are going to get close to two to two-and-a-half million more jobs, and you can bring unemployment down below 4 percent.

I will not sit still for the pusillanimous estimate by the administration's economists that we have to settle for 5 percent or 5½ percent unemployment, not on your life, not while the job is the key that Americans use between their work and their living. We must provide jobs, and the efficient way to do this is in the very kind of jobs-now program which the gentleman from Florida is backing.

So I thank the gentleman for permitting this intervention. He is on the right track. He and his fellows are few in number now. But as the message gets out that the only way to tax equity in this country is by a Presidentially backed program of plugging tax loopholes, I predict his tribe will increase.

Again I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I want to pay tribute to the gentleman who is a distinguished member of the Joint Economic Committee. I actually believe that the report of his committee had probably more to do with the new economic policy that we now have in this country than anything else. His insight into our international trade problems and international payment problems has perhaps done more to turn around a sorry situation there than any other activities this Congress has ever undertaken. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida on taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the implications of the Revenue Act of 1971, which was passed by Congress a few weeks ago and signed into law by President Nixon, and as we study the $246 billion fiscal 1973 Federal budget recently proposed by the President, we are inundated with a mass of statistics.

Statistics tend to have a hypnotic effect, and there is a tendency to assume, without very much supporting evidence at hand, that the magnitudes and priorities which those statistics reflect are more or less appropriate. To determine whether that assumption is justified, we must take a fresh start at answering some of the basic questions upon which our entire economy and tax structure are based:

Do we actually believe in progressive and equitable income taxation?

Is our objective for every American family employment and an adequate income?

Are we opposed to tax favoritism and special advantages?

Is direct economic assistance usually more efficient than indirect subsidies and "trickle downs"?

I believe the answer to each of the foregoing questions is "yes." The President's budget and the recent tax bill, which I opposed, seem to assume that each of these questions should be answered "no."

We must have tax reform, and we must have it very soon. The most recent data on tax returns, covering 1969 returns, indicates that 21,317 individuals earning more than $20,000 paid no Federal taxes whatsoever. Three hundred and one persons earning more than $200,000 paid no tax. Fifty-six individuals with

annual incomes exceeding $1 million paid not a penny in Federal tax.

The current tax laws are so riddled with loopholes that almost any wealthy individual who has a competent tax lawyer can, if he works at it, avoid paying thousands of dollars in Federal taxes. Many deductions—including, for example, those which involve interest on State and municipal bonds, investment in railroad cars, and residential rental housing—are, as a practical matter, available only to the rich. One tax expert, Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institution, has shown persuasively that such tax exemptions as these are not only inefficient subsidies which could be replaced by less expensive direct payments, but that the attractiveness of tax-free bonds to wealthy individuals deprives businesses of socially necessary venture capital.

Other special tax advantages worth millions and even billions of dollars to their beneficiaries are alleged to have a rational basis when in fact they are merely handouts to those who have more influence in the Congress than the poor and middle-class citizens of our country.

The notorious oil depletion allowance is a case in point. Most of the major oil companies pay almost no income tax. In 1970, Standard Oil of California, which had net income before taxes of $589.6 million, paid Federal income tax at the astonishingly low rate of 5 percent. Standard Oil is no exception: in 1970 the 19 largest oil companies in the country had net income before taxes of $8,857,-753,000 but paid Federal taxes at the deplorably low average rate of only 8.7 percent. Recent testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress has demonstrated that it would cost the Government less to pay directly for oil exploration than to continue to subsidize exploration with special allowances.

On the whole, however, the oil depletion allowance is probaby no more antisocial than the pervasive discrimination in favor of corporations and against individuals which characterizes our tax laws. In fact, we have witnessed in recent years the gradual erosion of the corporate income tax. This radical change has been effected not by any statement from the Congress of a comprehensive new policy with regard to corporations; rather, it has resulted from the diminution of potential corporate tax revenues caused by reinstatement of the investment tax credit, new and accelerated depreciation allowances, special benefits for foreign subsidiaries, and other esoteric tax developments which are obscure to the average lawyer in origin and effect, and which are totally incomprehensible to most citizens.

The investment tax credit is a very important example of how we are losing billions of dollars in necessary tax revenues. According to President Nixon, the deficit in the fiscal 1972 Federal budget will be $38.8 billion. The President contemplates a $25.5 billion deficit in fiscal 1973. The cumulative deficit for the four Nixon administration budget years will be more than $90 billion. Under such circumstances as these, we must have very persuasive evidence before we abolish sources of revenue. Has such evidence been presented with respect to the recently reinstated investment tax credit? I think not?

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 repealed the investment tax credit presumably because it was bad tax policy and bad economics. On April 21, 1969, President Nixon firmly opposed the use of the investment tax credit. He stated:

> This subsidy to business investment no longer has priority over other pressing national needs.

In February 1970 the President's Council of Economic Advisers declared:

> The national priorities of the 1970's do not require or justify this special incentive.

When President Nixon agreed in 1969 that the investment tax credit was not needed to stimulate industrial investment, business at that time was operating at 85 percent of capacity. If, as Mr. Nixon agreed, the investment tax credit was not necessary in April of 1969 under those conditions, it is difficult to see how a case for more capital spending at this time, when business is operating at approximately 75 percent of capacity, can be made.

When the investment tax credit is added to the benefits obtained by business under the asset depreciation range system—promulgated in 1971 by a Presidential Executive order—ADR—the need for which is challenged by many economists—the result is that business pays lower taxes and obtains billions of dollars in subsidies from the Federal Government for investments which, if economically justified, would probably be made without such subsidies.

Do we really want a full employment economy, or is that phrase merely political rhetoric? The Revenue Act of 1971, which incorporates virtually all of President Nixon's requests, and in which Congress acquiesced, will cost the Treasury of the United States $25.8 billion in lost revenue in the period 1971–73. According to another computation, that bill will cost the Treasury $9 billion each year over the next 10 years. Eight billion dollars of that annual loss is directly attributable to special provisions which benefit only corporations.

Some argue that the investment tax credit and other special advantages for business are desirable because they will create jobs and reduce unemployment. The national unemployment rate is currently running in excess of 6 percent. Approximately 5 million individuals are out of work. Surely, any proposal which would alleviate this suffering would be a good proposal. But the arguments that the special tax advantages which have been given to business will "trickle down" to the benefit of unemployed and other individuals are simply not valid. For example, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, which provides $2.25 billion over 2 years, is calculated to produce 130,000 jobs. These public service jobs could be quadrupled for only a fraction of the $9 billion a year which the Revenue Act of 1971 will cost the Treasury.

Given the economic circumstances which afflict our country today, it seems to me that any proposed new tax arrangements must have as their basic target the creation of jobs. I have therefore joined with Congressman HENRY REUSS and others in sponsoring legislation to create 500,000 additional federally funded public service jobs.

It is not fair to lay all of the blame for the current discriminatory tax arrangements at the feet of President Nixon. The Congress simply has not come forward with adequate proposals for tax revenues which could be obtained in socially acceptable ways. For example, the absence of a capital gains tax on property transferred at death results in a revenue loss of $3.1 billion annually. Although the House Ways and Means Committee stated in 1969 that it would undertake to study estate and gift taxes "as soon as possible" and that it had "the expectation of reporting out a bill on this subject in this Congress," no such action has been forthcoming.

As in the cases of individual and corporate income tax rates, statutory estate and gift tax rates are high—as high as 77 percent on estates above $70,000. But like income taxation, gift and estate taxation almost invariably bears little if any resemblance to the statutory rates. We should study with the greatest care Senator MCGOVERN's proposal that the entire system of estate and gift taxation be replaced with a new system which would establish a lifetime cumulative tax on the recipient. Such a system would be equitable because it would regard the money received as income to the recipient, which it is.

It is incumbent upon Congress to present to the American people specific and comprehensive proposals for closing loopholes which now make the payment of income taxes by the rich a national joke.

Do we really have a graduated tax system as claimed? A very thorough Census Bureau study based on 1968 data and reported in the May 1971 edition of Conference Board Record states:

> Families and individuals with incomes between $6,000 and $25,000 paid almost exactly the same share of their income in taxes—about 30%.

Hopefully, that inequity has been at least partially mitigated by the effects of the 1969 Tax Reform Act. However, gross discrimination along such lines continues.

Social security taxes continue to discriminate against the poor. For 1972, the social security tax rate is 5.2 percent on earnings up to $9,000. The wage earner who earns $9,000 this year will pay $468 in social security taxes. A corporate executive who earns $27,000 this year will also pay $468. The $9,000 wage earner will pay 5.2 percent of his salary; the $27,000 executive will pay only 1.7 percent.

My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman REUSS, has today proposed substantial changes in the social security laws, and I completely agree with him.

I voted against the Revenue Act of 1971 because, in my judgment, it would produce very little revenue. It had very substantial defects. One of the defects is that it increased further the discrepancy between what the wealthy earn and what the poor take home. It seems to me that

the social security tax is one of the basic reasons why the poor get poorer.

This tax has no ceiling and no floor and is very regressive. It actually penalizes the wage earner with a low or moderate income. This tax, in effect, is a payroll tax which inhibits and, therefore, tends to disrupt and depress the economy.

If the ceiling were removed from this tax and if the floor were raised so that no one under the poverty level would have to pay this payroll tax, a vast amount of spendable wealth would be created.

In my judgment, reform of the social security laws would be a very fruitful avenue of research and action for the committees of this Congress which are concerned with taxes.

I endorse the following statement made in a recent comprehensive study of our tax system by Joseph Ruskey and Richard Osserman, "Halfway to Tax Reform"—Indiana University Press, Bloomington: 1970:

> No tax reform program can be considered adequate unless it deals effectively with the major tax preferences and abuses that still remain, by:
>
> Eliminating percentage depletion in excess of cost of oil, gas and other minerals, as well as the privilege of deducting intangible drilling and development costs from income;
>
> Imposing a capital gains tax on property transferred on death or by gift;
>
> Terminating the capital gains treatment for stock options, for farm income that includes the sale of livestock, for the sale or licensing of inventions, and for royalties and other income derived from the sale of timber, coal, and iron;
>
> Minimizing tax avoidance through family income splitting by raising gift tax rates, and reducing gift tax exemptions and exclusions;
>
> Preventing the avoidance of estate taxes by imposing an inheritance tax when the beneficial ownership of a trust is transferred, by stricter taxation of "special" powers of appointment, and by taxing certain life insurance proceeds and death benefits under pension and profit-sharing plans. (Eventual comprehensive reform will require the elimination or narrowing of the differential between gift and estate taxes, or a single integrated tax covering all transfers from generation to generation with perhaps tax-free transfers between husbands and wives);
>
> Subjecting closely held corporations to the penalty of the Personal Holding Company tax unless at least 60% of their income is of the active rather than passive variety;
>
> Ending accelerated depreciation for all kinds of real estate accompanied by the taxation, at ordinary income tax rates, of all previous depreciation deductions recovered on resale;
>
> Eliminating the exemption from income tax of group life insurance coverage and the exclusion from estate taxation of the proceeds of such insurance;
>
> Strictly limiting private and special tax bills for the relief of individual taxpayers;
>
> Bringing into more equitable balance the separate rate schedules for married couples, heads of households, and single persons;
>
> Reviewing the immunity from taxation of items of imputed income such as the value of owner-occupied homes and the interest or dividends credited to the owners of certain types of life insurance;
>
> Further revising the tax treatment of banking institutions so as to eliminate completely their use of excessive tax liabilities, and ending other special immunities which favor them over other taxpayers;
>
> Revising the rate structure to achieve greater progessivity;
>
> Eliminating the 50% maximum tax on earned income;
>
> Most important of all, the preferred tax treatment of capital gains should be taxed on the same basis as items of ordinary income; and
>
> Not all revisions of the tax law that would result from such a program should be put into effect immediately. Some reform measures would require a transition period during which the effectiveness of substantive changes in the law would either be postponed or be only partially operative. In this way taxpayers who have arranged their affairs on the basis of present law would be given an opportunity to reshape them in the light of the new legislation.

As I have indicated, the Revenue Act of 1971 provides for an annual revenue loss of $9 billion, approximately $8 billion of which is attributable to corporations and only $1 billion of which is attributable to individuals. The Congress must pass tax laws which benefit people, not merely corporations.

May I say also to my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin, that I believe that the Joint Economic Committee has made an enormous contribution in the report issued by that committee on January 11, 1972. That study is entitled "The Economics of Federal Subsidy Programs" and catalogs in a very detailed and learned report consisting of 230 pages some $63 billion worth of subsidies in which there is waste and which we should examine very regularly and systematically. Therefore, I submit, gentlemen, that the Congress simply must move in the matter of tax reform: First, by plugging the loopholes that have been referred to; second, by the appropriate redistribution of income and by equalizing social security taxes and by all other means; and third, by the reduction of subsidies.

I concur with what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) has said, that we should not vote in favor of the $50 billion increase in the national debt which is being sought by the administration—the same administration which last year sought and received from Congress a $35 billion debt increase—until or unless we have a satisfactory statement from this administration to the effect that substantial and reasonable changes in the tax laws will, in fact, be proposed during this session of the Congress.

The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress has reported that in fiscal 1970 Federal subsidies cost at least $63 billion. The chairman of that committee, Senator PROXMIRE, has stated:

> This mammoth subsidy system represents a mindless means of spending taxpayers' money. There is virtually no analysis of economic benefits and little analysis of the cost of these programs.

In my judgment, when the President seeks, as he has this month, a budget authorization of $246.3 billion, he must make a better showing that these $63 billion in Federal giveaways are justified. He must demonstrate that cash subsidies of $10–$13 billion annually to encourage farmers to plant or not plant, to pay for the construction and operation of ships, to compensate beekeepers for dead bees, and for other such purposes, are in the national interest. He must demonstrate that subsidies of $38 billion which are used to facilitate the development of natural resources, to stimulate the purchase of machinery, and to encourage American companies to do business abroad, and for related purposes, are really needed. He must display for all the American people to see such evidence as exists that Federal credit subsidies at the current annual rate of $4–$5 billion now being used to assist in the purchase of farms and in providing inexpensive rural electricity and telephone service are needed and are being spent intelligently.

As far as I know, no such showing has ever been made in a comprehensive way.

What I seek in the economic sphere from the President of the United States more than anything else is some evidence that the human needs of our citizens are considered on a level of priority higher than the alleged fiscal needs of corporations.

To phrase the problem differently, I know of no recent request from a substantial segment of the business community for tax relief which has been denied. On the other hand, I know of no basic request from the representatives of the poor and unemployed people of this country which has been granted. We can apparently afford an investment tax credit, but not adequate direct job assistance. We can allegedly afford an increase in the Department of Defense budget to $78.3 billion, but we can only afford a federally guaranteed income of $2,400 for a family of four unemployable individuals. We can afford to pay the enormous interest required to finance the $38.8 billion debt incurred by the Federal Government this year, but we cannot afford to pay for child development programs which President Nixon has vetoed. In any equitable tax and budget arrangement, such priorities as these must be reversed.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman for yielding. I oppose an increase in the national debt without planning and programing for the future in justification thereof.

Our past is glorious—our future is uncertain.

If 20 centuries could be measured on a 20-inch rule—we could then better realize the progress of America in less than the last 2 inches of such a scale of time. In less than 200 years we have surpassed all recorded events in the history of mankind. In peace and in war—in wealth and in wisdom—we now stand in judgment of ourselves, before God and before the eyes of the world.

COMMUNITIES, COUNTRIES, AND CURRENCIES

The planet earth is a community of nations as this country is a nation of communities. Each in the complexity of modern economic theory is dependent upon the weld of each link. It is known

that a chain has no greater strength than the substance that connects each link—a country is no stronger than the economic continuity of a composite of the communities. A world without countries and a country without communities is like a chain without links. It is no more.

Money is the modern measure of economic success or failure. It is the acceptable medium of exchange—for you and for me—for each community and for every country.

No government, large or small, can keep the people—the people must keep the government. There are many reasons why—and particularly so in a democracy. The mayor and council of a city cannot keep the people of the municipality—the Governor and legislature of a State cannot keep the people of the political subdivisions of government—and the Members of Congress together with the President cannot keep the people of the Union. All combined cannot keep the people of the world. But severally and jointly we have the capacity to improve the system of social order or to eventually destroy the government of the governed.

We have paid a great price to see ourselves from afar. Yet, many refuse to see what is here to be seen—to hear what is here to be heard or to do what is here to be done.

This is not a time for gloom and I am hopeful that we may not consider the minds of men to be as concrete—thoroughly mixed and permanently set. Let us open our minds to the mountains before us and let us tackle the tasks to be done.

BUDGET REQUESTS VERSUS BUDGET REQUIREMENTS

The real problem most simply stated is that policies and programs of the past have resulted in current trends of too many people and too much wealth of this great country in too few places.

The failure of Government economists to recognize and relate the problems of the communities of this country with the economic inequities imposed upon all the people is a gross and serious error. The producers of food and fiber are forced to market the fruits of their labor at two-thirds of value and the wheels of industry turn at slightly more than two-thirds of capacity—5.5 million people are entitled to a minimum wage in an economy of no jobs while the rising cost of living visits every American home.

It is probably error to conclude that it all adds up to an upside down economy—but it cannot be denied that all is up should be down and all that is down should go up—and it cannot be denied that management of this public corporation—national Government—has plunged the stockholders—taxpayers—further in debt in the last 3 years than in the decade before.

The Honorable Secretary of the United States Treasury appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means with a prepared pleading and appropriate prayer for a record rise of $50 billion in the debt limit of this Nation to meet the terms of the current budget request of the President. The need for that request is present because the requirements of prudent management and future planning are clearly absent. The testimony of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the record of those hearings is of no value other than an amen to the pleading and prayer of the Secretary of the Treasury that is well known to all. In substance there exists no planning and no programing beyond 1973. The work plans to support budget requests are inadequate as requirements in support thereof. There are no suggested alternatives—no imagination for the future. There is no real foundation for constructive policies in support of long term programs. The budget requests and the unequaled demand for a record rise in the national debt limit is premised on uncertainty—not certainty. Pursuant to all rules of reason no court of equity could grant relief—the $50 billion increase in the national debt limit must be denied. It must be denied until proper planning and programing is initiated with 20–20 vision beyond 1973 with an insight to the future and unto the year of 2020.

FUTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The road to economic recovery will require more than rhetoric—more than money—and more than "jawboning." There is some economic precedent that things can be "jawboned" down, but I know of no precedent to suppose an economy can be "jawboned" up. "Puffing" is not economically productive.

I believe the people of this country are ripe for a departure from the traditional past—they are weary of policies and programs that have not worked and are not working now. If we are serious about communities and the quality of life in the gutted hinderlands of rural America and the core areas of the industrialized urban centers of this country than we must pursue policies and programs in the interest of people, performance, and production. We can not prepare for the future on the folly of our time and fables of the past.

The people of America have not lost all self-initiative and millions may still believe in the concept that "this is the house that Jack built"—and that it was a good one.

It is time that the Members of Congress recognize again that old-fashioned concept. I think it is time for a future economic development program that includes basic criteria as follows, to wit:

FUTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A national fiscal budget not in excess of the average of the last past 5 years unless——

First. The Congress in joint session declares a national emergency, and

Second. All such budget requests are supported by acceptable workplans as approved and authorized by the Congress.

A national planning and land use program for future economic growth in comprehensive planning for conservation and utilization of human and natural resources.

First. Protection of the environment—to provide for pure air, clean water, and productive soils.

Second. Enhancement of the quality of life through national zoning in an overall plan for maximized efficiency of long-term planning for full development of natural resources.

A national board of economic equalization—for a meaningful control of inflation by the people.

First. Patterned on geographical areas such as the Federal Reserve Districts—to equate costs and prices by region.

Second. Power of subpena to ascertain the relationship of the economic crunch to the economic bulge—and to provide a place where a citizen can be heard when the "shoe pinches." To induce self-imposed restraint absent of Government controls.

Third. Patterned after the Board of Equalization for tax-paying citizens with the right of administrative appeals and final resort to the courts of equity by writ of certiorari only.

Reduction of national debt vested in the option of the people.

First. Citizens and taxpayers desire control of our ultimate destiny and national debt—

To provide a means of payment on the national debt by each citizen electing to do so.

To provide payments annually of a sum equal to the percent in income taxes due not in excess of the rate of interest paid on Government securities times the sum total of tax due and payable in any 1 year.

Second. To provide responsibility with the people and the obligation of fiscal prudence with the governed.

I do not suggest these proposals as a panacea—they are alternative options for long-term planning. There are other alternatives beyond the scope of my statement today.

I cannot vote for an increase in the debt ceiling of this Nation without some constructive plan for certainty in the future. Some of you may have done so in the past because it was believed to be the responsible thing to do—the Government must go on.

The recent record of huge deficits of the national budget are unequaled in all history—$23 billion in fiscal year 1971, $38.8 billion in fiscal year 1972, and $25.5 billion in 1973. These are the reasons for the requested increase in the national debt ceiling. Such reasons make as much sense as a bank loan to pay for an old grocery account.

The current policies of control of the economy and elimination of inflation harm the honest and the failure to plug loopholes in the Federal income, gift, and estate tax statutes benefit the economic bulge of a few at the expense of many honest American citizens.

I commend those people that have given much in seeking solutions in the past. Let us now do what must be done for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told that USDA employs more than 83,000 people in Washington, D.C. I have no absolute knowledge of the total employees on the Federal payroll of the executive branch of this Government—but I have every reason to believe the most talented men in the world are available to the executive branch of Government. I am embarrassed that evidence in support of an increase of the national debt is woefully weak with no provision for

long-term planning or reduction thereof. Management of the public interest must be improved and if we simply permit an increase in the national debt by and upon the request of the President now—we can expect nothing new in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if no one is to protect the governed—the burden is upon the Members of this House of the people. The time is now.

We must dedicate ourselves to the cause of bringing to the people of this country a sense of economic equity and a fair, honest and reasonable financial return for their labors, investments and some assurance of security in the future.

It is not an effort for some—but for all—not just one community, not communities of one area or one region—it is a national policy and the cause is our country. No other goal is worthy of our best effort.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) and our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) for having taken this time this afternoon to highlight the failure of the new economic policy of the President—that policy which came about as a result of the unprecedented combination of inflation and recession at the same time.

The President's vaunted new economic policy has failed to cope with the basic problem of this country—unemployment. The unemployment rate for December of 1971 was 6.1 percent—not perceptibly lower than it had been all throughout that year. The President's own economic report, which would be expected to look at conditions in the most optimistic light, predicts 5-percent unemployment by the end of 1972—a drop of only 1 percent. Five-percent unemployment is unacceptable, but these figures mask the fact that certain strata of our society bear a disproportionate amount of the unemployment burden. The unemployment rate for teenagers is 17.5 percent; for black and other minority adults the rate is 10.3 percent. And in the inner cities, for black teenagers it is astronomical. Such a chronically high rate of people out of work is intolerable.

The administration has several approaches for dealing with the unemployment problem, none of which is adequate. In the international sphere, the administration is relying on the devaluation of the dollar to increase jobs by increasing exports. The administration forecasts that devaluation will create 500,000 to 675,000 jobs in the United States over the course of 2 years. However, during the next 2 years there will be 3 to 4 million new entrants to the labor market. So, the jobs created by the dollar devaluation will not even allow us to hold our own against the problem of unemployment.

Looking at the administration's fiscal policy, the cornerstone is the Revenue Act of 1971. The administration asserts that one of the major purposes of this act is job development—through the 7-percent investment tax credit for industry. However, since industry is operating at less than 75 percent of capacity, the logic of the investment tax credit is flawed. Corporations running at this level of capacity are unlikely to engage in new investment and, therefore, new jobs will not be created by this credit.

The administration seems to think that, as long as it runs a budget deficit, engendered by the investment tax credit and other policies, there will be adequate stimulus to the economy. However, under basic Keynesian doctrine, it is not sufficient to cope with unemployment by simply running a budget deficit. It is necessary to direct government spending in a way best suited to increasing employment.

Instead of asking for tax reform and the closing of loopholes, the administration has asked Congress for an increase in the debt ceiling. Before asking that the debt ceiling be lifted, the administration should ask Congress to enact meaningful tax reform. The Tax Reform Act of 1972, which I have cosponsored, will bring some $11 billion new revenue into the Treasury by 1973, and plug loopholes that favor the wealthy.

The budget for fiscal year 1973 reflects the misplaced priorities of the administration. Approximately one-third of the total budget, $83.3 billion, is devoted to the military. In stark contrast, less than $2 billion is devoted to pollution control and abatement, only $2 billion for low- and moderate-income housing assistance, and about $6 billion for education, and only $1.1 million to provide public service jobs under the Emergency Employment Act. This amount is grossly inadequate.

I have joined in cosponsoring H.R. 12011, legislation introduced by Mr. REUSS, which would create 500,000 federally financed public service jobs by amending and expanding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. Basically, this legislation authorizes $500 million for the fiscal year 1972, and $1 billion for the fiscal year 1973 to finance public service jobs. At least 80 percent of these funds are to apportioned among the States on the basis of the proportion which the total number of unemployed persons in each State bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States. The rest of the funds shall be allocated to be dispensed by the Federal Government. The funds allocated to each State shall further be apportioned to units of local government in the proportion that their unemployment bears to the unemployment in the State. Thus substantial funds will become available to localities to hire their unemployed to perform needed public service tasks—paramedical jobs, playground supervision, environmental improvement, sanitation.

This is the way to deal with unemployment: by spending money directly to put people to work, rather than by giving money to corporations in the hope they will make capital investments that they do not need.

As Prof. Robert Lekachman pointed out in his testimony to the House Labor Committee on January 26:

> Public service employment is an idea whose time has come. It represents the best available means of coping simultaneously with the persistent unemployment and unfilled public sector needs.

Further in his testimony, Professor Lekachman noted that a survey conducted in 1968 by Dr. Harold Sheppard of the Upjohn Institute showed that 130 cities, each with a population in excess of 100,000, could readily have put 279,415 people to useful work in activities which ranged from antipollution enforcement, through public safety, to sanitation and welfare. But the funds for such employment, unfortunately, were not available. Most of these jobs required little skill or skills that could readily be taught in short training programs. In view of the difficulties states and municipalities have had in supplying basic services since 1968, it seems certain that there is a need by States and municipalities for substantially more public service employees today. It is important to note that these public service jobs can be targeted to reach those unemployed who tend, because of lack of training, to be least likely to get a job during a period of economic recovery. I, therefore, hope that this legislation will be enacted rapidly. We cannot wait to provide aid to our unemployed; the Nixon administration has already waited too long.

In addition to providing no viable answer to the problem of unemployment, the Nixon administration has also rested its heavy hand upon those poor people in this country who do now have jobs. When the Congress enacted the President's economic stabilization legislation, it included a section—Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1971, title II, section 203(d)—which provides:

> (W)age increases to an individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor shall not be limited in any manner, until such time as his earnings are no longer substandard or he is no longer a member of the working poor.

This provision originated in the House, based on my bill, H.R. 11406.

The legislative history of this provision makes it quite clear that the intent of Congress was to define "substandard earnings" and "working poor," to mean a level of income of $6,960 annually, or approximately $3.35 an hour. Yet the President's Cost of Living Council has frustrated the intent of Congress by defining "substandard earnings" as applying only to workers earning up to $1.90 an hour, $3,968 annually. This decision was reached in the face of the unanimous opinion of the Pay Board that $1.90 an hour was so low as to violate congressional intent.

Dispensing tax boondoggles to corporations, freezing the working poor in poverty, is bad medicine for an ailing economy. It is essential that there be a viable program to cope with the problem of unemployment. Our public service jobs legislation offers a means to create 500,000 jobs. Meaningful tax reform will bring revenues into the Treasury to offset the large deficits which this administration's economic policies have produced. Such actions will generate confidence, thereby hastening the recovery of the economy.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON LIBRARY EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my high privilege as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education to participate in the official opening of the first presidential papers in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library at the University of Texas, in Austin.

President Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Johnson participated in the ceremony as did hundreds of America's most distinguished educators and scholars.

It was a momentous occasion and one that inspired all of those present, for indeed the opening of the White House papers dealing with education during the administration of President Johnson will give researchers a deeper insight into the most exciting and productive era for American education.

No one can deny that President Johnson earned the title—"The Teacher in the White House" because of his deep personal commitment to upgrade educational opportunities for all Americans during his term in the White House.

The ceremonies in Austin, Tex., last week were full of nostalgia and rededication.

Mr. Johnson himself was the center of attraction, and rightfully so, for no American President has ever earned the love and admiration of the Nation's educators more than has Mr. Johnson.

Mrs. Johnson—Lady Bird—was her ever-charming self; one of the most beautiful and compassionate women of our time. It was heartwarming to see Mrs. Johnson in the beautiful setting of the Johnson Library and one sensed the warm affection and spirit of mutual cooperation that has always existed between President Johnson and the First Lady.

The impressive assembly of educators was living proof of the high regard that academia holds for President and Mrs. Johnson. It was also evidence of the high respect that the Nation's educators hold for the University of Texas at Austin, host to the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

I watched with joy the pride that filled our colleague, Congressman J. J. PICKLE, in whose congressional district the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library is located. Congressman PICKLE is one of the most highly respected Members of Congress and it is fitting that he represent the district which houses such a distinguished university and the Johnson Library.

I was also pleased to see Sidney P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, honor President Johnson by personally participating in this momentous and historic occasion. Commissioner Marland has brought a new dimension of leadership and dignity to American education and his contribution to the rich program at the Johnson Library inspired those present.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education, I am placing in the RECORD today the entire proceedings of this historic occasion.

I am grateful to Dr. Harry J. Middleson, Director of the Johnson Library, for his cooperation and the outstanding manner in which he arranged the entire proceedings.

I particularly call my colleagues' attention to President Johnson's own remarks at the conclusion of the symposium. President Johnson demonstrates his continuing dedication to the high promise of American education.

I also call attention to the significant contribution made by the speakers and panelists.

The Lyndon Baines Johnson Library Education Symposium constitutes a high water mark in American education and I am proud to have been able to participate in the proceedings.

The transcript follows after the official program which I include in the RECORD at this point:

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN, THE LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON LIBRARY—EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM PROGRAM—EDUCATING A NATION: THE CHANGING AMERICAN COMMITMENT

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1972—10 A.M.

Presiding

Harry J. Middleton, Director, The Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

Welcome

Stephen H. Spurr, president, The University of Texas at Austin.

Welcome

Robert L. Kunzig, Administrator, General Services Administration.

Address

John W. Gardner, Chairman of Common Cause, Former Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Gardner will trace America's historic commitment to education.

Address

Wilbur J. Cohen, Dean, School of Education, University of Michigan, Former Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Cohen will report on the Education Task Forces of the Johnson Administration.

RECESS FOR LUNCH

Introduction

Donald E. Morrison, president, National Education Association.

Address

Sidney P. Marland, Jr., United States Commissioner of Education. Dr. Marland's address will concern itself with problems foreseen and action required in the areas of preschool through high school education.

Panel Discussion

Dr. Marland's address will be followed by a panel discussion of the subject. Taking part in the panel discussion, with Dr. Marland, will be:

Harold Howe, II, vice president, Division of Education and Research, Ford Foundation, Former United States Commissioner of Education.

Patrick L. Daly, vice president, American Federation of Teachers.

Walter E. Washington, Mayor-Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Jerome S. Bruner, Professor, Department of Psychology, Harvard University.

Jack L. Davidson, Superintendent, Austin Independent School District.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1972—9 A.M.

Introduction

Elspeth Rostow, Associate Professor, Department of Government, the University of Texas at Austin, Chairman of the Symposium Planning Committee.

Address

William J. McGill, President, Columbia University. Dr. McGill's address will concern itself with problems ahead and action required in higher education.

Panel discussion

Dr. McGill's address will be followed by a panel discussion of the subject. Taking part in the panel discussion, along with Dr. McGill will be:

Francis Keppel, Chairman of the Board, General Learning Corporation.

Jacqueline Wexler, President, Hunter College of the City University of New York.

Rosemary Park, Professor, Educational Planning and Programs, University of California at Los Angeles.

Frank Newman, Associate Director of University Relations, Stanford University.

Lorrin G. Kennamer, Dean, College of Education, the University of Texas at Austin.

Remarks

The Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Adjournment

MORNING, JANUARY 24, 1972

Educating a nation: The changing American commitment

(The Symposium convened at 10:10 a.m., and the following proceedings transpired.)

Mr. Harry J. Middleton, director, the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I am Harry Middleton, Director of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

The occasion which has given rise to this gathering this morning is the Opening for Research of the Papers on Education in the Library's Collections, the first group of papers to be so opened. Those papers, however informative a body of records they are judged to be, however helpful they prove to be to scholarship, are the documents of a time and a concept of commitment to the cause of full educational opportunity.

That word, commitment, is the link between the openings of the papers and the event which brings us together here. There are in this audience many illustrious men and women and many concerned ones; educators and political leaders, administrators and students, and a President and First Lady who left their mark on American education. (Applause)

That there should be such a gathering to explore the continuing and changing American commitment is a most hopeful and auspicious sign in a day when hopeful signs are not always easy to come by. To express my own pleasure that you are here, let me say that I endorse in advance, most heartily, the sentiments of welcome to be voiced by my co-host for this affair, the distinguished President of the University of Texas at Austin, Dr. Stephen Spurr. (Applause)

Welcome: Stephen H. Spurr, President, The University of Texas at Austin

Dr. SPURR. Mr. President, distinguished guests, colleagues. My task is a pleasant one and that is to welcome you to the state of Texas, the city of Austin, the campus of the University of Texas at Austin and the environs of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library, housing the first collection of the Presidential Papers on the college campus. This I do with all of the warmth and enthusiasm of a new arrival to this community, who himself has experienced the hospitality of the people of Texas and of this great university.

The present Symposium is distinguished not only by the event it records, but also by the caliber of its participants. We on campus will be its greatest beneficiaries and for this I thank you all in the name of The University of Texas. You are most welcome and we trust that you will enjoy your stay with us.

Let me emphasize the fact that this symposium, as is this Library, is a joint venture of The University of Texas and the Archives

of the United States Government. The scholarly values of such a partnership are self-evident. Scholars need collection of important papers to reconstruct, to distill and to evaluate what has occurred in the past. We, as American citizens, need this scholarly activity to give us a base from which we can plan the future on the best available basis of experience, principle and common sense.

The LBJ papers are obviously of great value to historians. They provide the raw materials for research, both to established scholars and to aspiring students. Substantial benefits accrue to The University of Texas in having such a collection on our campus, not only for the materials themselves, but also in the fact that they attract people such as you so that we may profit by the interaction. Great symposia such as this will be few and far between, being dependent for their existence upon opportunities that must be seized by the daring. They are augmented, however, by the coming and going of individuals—by scholars, public figures, tourists—who will come to The University of Texas and to the LBJ Library to see, to learn and to teach.

While the Johnson Library is part of the Archives of the United States, we at The University of Texas at the LBJ School of Public Affairs and elsewhere, will continue our role in the partnership by welcoming and by providing facilities to scholars who come to work at the Library and on the campus. Our own faculty and students look forward to enhanced opportunities for scholarship and teaching. We are eager to share these opportunities with our colleagues.

The years covered by the Johnson administration constitute one of the great periods of higher education. The lessons we have learned and shall learn from them will form a bridge to the future when we shall have an even more universal system of education than we have today, when both the variety and quality of opportunities will be further increased, and when the educational process will be woven even to a greater extent than now into the cultural, the sociological and economic pattern of our civilization.

In closing, may I remind you that our nation is 196 years old and that our Bicentennial is only one quadrinium away. I had to look up that word. We on this campus and around this state are planning to make the celebration a major occasion for a reappraisal of where we have been and where we are going. We already have a Bicentennial Committee hard at work and provided with a professional staff. Many of those concerned with the opening of these papers on education will play a continuing role in the Bicentennial program. In a sense, therefore, the opening of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Papers on Education is a curtain raiser for things to come. It will be a hard act to follow but we'll do our best. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON. Because of the illustrious nature of the assemblage here, introductions of those in the audience would be most unwise. We would be at it all morning. I believe an exception should be made, however, a happy exception, for the members of Congress that are with us. For although the rest of us have the luxury of talking about education, they are the ones who must deliver. The Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee has been the staging area for dramatic breakthroughs in many a tough battle. We are honored to have the Chairman of the subcommittee here this morning. The Honorable Roman Pucinski of Illinois. Would you stand, please, Congressman? (Applause)

We are also privileged and pleased to have our own Congressman from this district, the Honorable J. J. "Jake" Pickle. (Applause)

In addition to being a part of the scene here at The University of Texas, the LBJ Library has another life as well. It is a member of the Presidential Library System which in turn is a component of the National Archives and Records Service. Responsibility for that extensive operation belongs to the Archivist of the United States, Dr. James B. Rhoads, who will extend now a welcome on behalf of the United States Government. (Applause)

Welcome: Dr. James B. Rhoads, Archivist, the United States of Amreica

Dr. RHOADS. Mr. President, distinguished ladies and gentlemen. When this library was dedicated last May, President Nixon said of it, "Through its connection with a great university, it promises both to enrich the university and to be enriched by the university." The event that brings us together here this morning, illustrates the happy accuracy of that prediction. The Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and The University of Texas have joined forces to present a Symposium that will serve and, hopefully, advance the cause of education. Such a joining of forces for such a purpose is, I believe, a splendid example of the mutual enrichment envisioned by the President.

Presidential libraries provide a relatively new dimension in research and in research facilities. They perform a distinct service for scholarship by maintaining and by making available for research, the papers and records in their collections which are among the most valuable source materials of the nation's history. Although the papers of 23 presidents are preserved in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, none of the collections are complete and and many are quite small. Unfortunately, sigificant portions of other presidential papers were lost, accidentally, as in the cases of the William Henry Harrison and John Tyler papers; or intentionally, as occurred with the papers of Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, Abraham Lincoln, Chester Arthur and Warren G. Harding. Other collections were scattered among various public and private repositories or came into the hands of private collectors.

But in 1938, a new tradition was established for the care and preservation of these documents. Franklin D. Roosevelt made the decision to house his papers in a Presidential Library and to turn over the collections to the Government. What President Roosevelt started became the basis for a law passed in 1955; and Presidential Libraries Act, which enables the Federal Government to maintain and make available the papers of any president who chooses to donate them to the people of the United States. There are now six such libraries bearing the names of the 31st through the 36th presidents.

With the construction of the Johnson Library on this campus and the plans for the Kennedy Library to be housed at Harvard, a new precedent for Presidential Libraries has perhaps been established. That of promoting education by locating the library in a university community. Not only is this action an incalculable boost to the university's resources, it is also a massive infusion of research opportunities for students and teachers. I think that it is symbolic that this precedent should be inspired by Lyndon B. Johnson, the education president. His administration was responsible for the passage of 60 major education bills. A record unequaled in the annals of American history. For this reason, it is also fitting that the first papers opened in this library pertain to education. These manuscripts will be consulted for decades to come by those who want to know and want to understand America's effort to provide educational opportunities for its people. They will document what President Johnson has termed the venture of the Federal Government for the first time into a comprehensive attack on illiteracy in this country. This material will assist scholars in the study of the past and will guide policymakers in the determination of the future.

Presidential libraries would be fulfilling their purpose if they did nothing more than preserve and provide access to the papers they contain. This is their basic reason for existence, but their charters are broad and their possibilities for service unlimited. Intellectual centers such as these are inherently dynamic institutions constantly probing as searchlights for new and exciting ways to advance scholarship. The Presidential Libraries have hosted historical associations, sponsored seminars and historical conferences, produced a variety of publications and generally become involved in a wide range of educational activities.

The partnership between The University of Texas and the Lyndon B. Johnson Library represents an even broader enterprise. It embraces a challenge to embark on new academic explorations, utilizing the facilities, the resources, prestige and the goodwill of both partners. Today at this Symposium, we are taking part in the illustrious beginning of this partnership. I am glad to be a part of it and on behalf of the Government of the United States, I take great pleasure in extending a welcome to all of you. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON. In those years of the recent past, when the nation was aroused to the prospect and the challenge of extending the promise of fulfillment through new opportunities, the stage was crowded with giants. Concerned men and women who produced the ferment of change by making the machinery of government work for the betterment of people. One towering figure was John Gardner. To an audience such as this, an introduction of John Gardner is superfluous. It is enough, perhaps, to say that he brought with him into the arena of action, an idea of excellence and a faith in education. And a generation of Americans is better off because he was there and because he served. Mr. Gardner. (Applause)

Address: John W. Gardner, chairman of Common Cause, former Secreatry, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Mr. GARDNER. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, distinguished guests.

I am exceptionally pleased to be here and proud to play a part in this ceremony, to pay my respects to this great library and honor the President whom I served.

I'm going to talk about federal activities in education during President Johnson's administration and I'll try to relate those activities to the larger context of our national life and aspirations.

Let me begin with a bit of history.

The time is June 1776. The scene—a second floor parlor in the brick house of a young German named Graff, at the southwest corner of Market and Seventh Streets in Philadelphia.

There shortly after the eleventh of June, beginning perhaps on the very evening of the eleventh, the lodger who occupied the second floor bedroom of Graff's home began to draft one of the great documents in our history.

The lodger was, of course, the tall, lean, thirty-three year old Virginian known as Thomas Jefferson.

The document was, of course, the Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson said that he "turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing" the Declaration. Beyond that, we know very little about the actual conditions of drafting. If I could talk with the shade of Jefferson, I think I'd pass up a good many other interesting topics in order to question him about the drafting. I think I'd question him in particular about the second and most famous sentence in the Declaration. The sentence that, as it stands in the final version, reads: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are

created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

In rough draft he said: "We hold these truths to be sacred and undeniable . . ."

Jefferson later emphasized that he was giving expression to widely held views and, indeed, he was. The Declaration, he said, "was intended to be an expression of the American mind. . . ." And we know he had grounds for that assertion. As Julian Boyd put it, "The idea that men were born equal, that they were possessed of certain inherent and unalienable rights, that those rights included life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that it was the duty of government to protect and preserve those rights, and that the government which did not do so could be abolished—these were ideas familiar not only to . . . every pamphleteer, every lawyer, every minister of the gospel, but also to almost every American subject of George III in the epochal year 1776."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident . . ."

True to our modern temper, we have dissected the sentence, debated it and impugned it. I myself have questioned it, defended it, argued over it and written about it. But the dignity of the sentence remains. To me nothing can detract from the significance for Americans of the moral strivings reflected in that sentence. It is the most seminal sentence in the history of American values.

But we must not let our admiration blind us to certain facts. After the great words were written, 89 years passed before we abolished slavery in this land of the free. Another half century passed before we enacted effective legislation against child labor. It wasn't until 1954 that the Supreme Court ruled against segregation. And even today, human potentialities are warped and stunted in our slums.

Recognizing all that, what should be our attitude toward the words of the Declaration? I've heard it argued that in the light of attitudes and practices then prevailing, the words were sheer hypocrisy, the kind of lofty sentiment man expresses but never lives by, and that for the sake of honesty, they might better not have been written.

I take a very different view of the matter. I believe the later gains in human dignity would have come even more slowly if the Declaration had not stood as a reminder of what we should be striving for and had not yet achieved.

Before the Constitutional Convention in 1789, George Washington is said to have made the statement: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

When I was a young man, that seemed to me and it still seems to me, a noble proposal. But as a youth, I was also attracted by its seeming simplicity. Life hadn't yet revealed to me how difficult it is to raise any kind of standard, nor for that matter, how hard it is to be wise and how very hard to be honest—hard all the days of our lives.

I believe that Jefferson erected such a standard when he inserted into our first national document, a clear expression of what has proven to be the most enduring of American values.

We have been faithful and faithless by turns, to the ideals that he expressed. We have interpreted and reinterpreted his words. Our understanding of the values underlying them has evolved and deepened. And we're still struggling to do justice to the vision, heartened by our successes, ashamed of many failures and unable to predict what new moral insights of tomorrow will make present practice appear primitive. Perhaps that is a description of the reality surrounding all moral striving.

The story of our failures and partial successes in the 192 years since the Declaration is more than the story of the slow approach to an early goal. Not only is our practice becoming in some respects more compatible with the Declaration, our moral insight concerning the goal itself is in some respects deepening. We understand more now than we did then about the implications of those truths that were thought to be self-evident.

One of the things we know now is that there are other and perhaps more stubborn obstacles to individual fulfillment than the political tyranny and oppression that preoccupied the Founding Fathers; obstacles such as poverty, ignorance, disease, discrimination and mental or physical illness or incapacity. And these cannot be removed merely by assertion of unalienable rights, nor even by legally certified freedoms. The most exciting declaration of our generation is the assertion that we must attack all of those obstacles.

I listed ignorance as one of the obstacles to individual fulfilment and that brings me to the subject of this ceremony, education.

President Lyndon B. Johnson is the only president of the United States who has ever said that education is the first business of this nation. (Applause) And he believed it. And he acted on it. During his administration, expenditures for education more than tripled. I could fill the whole of this speech with no more than the simplest annotated listing of the programs launched. I could talk at length about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, about the programs to strengthen higher education, about the first national venture into non-commercial television or about the assistance given to libraries and medical schools and vocational programs and rehabilitation.

But the full record is available for all to read. I'm convinced that in the decades to come, historians will look back to the 1960's as a moment of seminal change in American education, a moment of innovation, a time of significant beginnings.

Let me talk about just one or two of those beginnings. Consider the matter of education for disadvantaged children. In the 1960's, we undertook the first large-scale, intensive programs to improve the education of the disadvantaged. The efforts were massive and they involved a great variety of approaches to the problem.

We calculated that there were about 15 million children living in poverty in the United States. And the more closely we studied these children from our urban slums and rural depressed areas, the more clearly we saw the extraordinary difficulties they faced when they entered school. Unprepared socially and psychologically, discouraged almost before they began, they often dropped out as early as they could.

Many, many millions of children benefited from special projects under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They benefited from individualized instruction, from enriched summer programs and from improved remedial programs. Many schools gave youngsters from poor homes a chance to learn and earn at the same time. Night classes were set up so that school dropouts could continue their education after work. New books, films and training aids were made available. Counseling services were established and teacher-aides were brought into the classroom so that teachers could devote more time to teaching.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, an equally significant experimentation was underway, particularly, of course, the immensely important work in pre-school education. There has been endless debate over the effectiveness of the Headstart Program. But it had one undeniably good consequence. One irreversable consequence. We will never again assume, as our schools once officially assumed, that to assemble all children of an age group in school in their sixth year of life is necessarily to give them an equal chance.

As we approached the problem of improving the education of the disadvantaged, most of us were acutely aware of the difficulties involved. Indeed, the task was so difficult and the obstacles so discouraging, that we sometimes felt very little sense of accomlishment, but we learned quite a few things.

First, we came to understand, as I've said, the importance of early childhood education and we will not forget that lesson.

Second, we came to understand the centrality of language handicaps in disadvantaged children.

Third, we learned the importance of remedial education to these youngsters who fall progressively behind because of early handicaps.

Fourth, we discovered the possibilities of individualized instruction. Situations which permit slow learners to work at their own pace at the same time that they enjoy participation in the class that includes more rapid learners.

Fifth, we rediscovered the central importance of motivation and the necessity to alter certain kinds of self-image that lead to self-defeating behavior on the part of many disadvantaged children.

Sixth, we explored many approaches to training for employability and the transition from school to work—better counseling, work-study, on-the-job training and effective teamwork among the schools, the unions and industry.

It appears to be the fashion now—at least in some circles—to be somewhat discouraged about the education of disadvantaged children. Many people have worked very hard on programs that have not fully succeeded. They have seen large sums of money spent without the clear, dramatic results that they had hoped. They're still searching for answers.

But I cannot accept discouragement as a reasonable reaction. As little as fifteen years ago, we weren't even thinking about the problem. Almost everyone in the field of education assumed that somehow our democratic educational system automatically handed an equal opportunity to every school child in the first grade. If you can't remember how complacent we were on that score, you have a very short memory.

The education of the disadvantaged is a task of great complexity. What reason had we to expect easy answers? We've been at it a very short time. I sometimes think that we're long on good intentions and short on stamina.

Along with these efforts and related to them, and very close to my heart, were our efforts to provide equal opportunity to black children and to children of other minority groups. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 set the stage for that effort and we took the first historic steps toward desegregation of the school system. I need not emphasize the enormous difficulties we experienced. One does no favor to the cause of equal opportunity by ignoring or suppressing evidence of real difficulties. But it would be wrong to write off the whole effort in a fit of pessimism as some are now inclined to do. In fact, it cannot be written off, no matter how anyone may feel at the moment. The movement toward justice for blacks and for other minority groups is an immensely powerful current in our national life. It cannot be stopped —not by the anger of its enemies, not by the mistakes of its friends. All who pursue the goal will not be infinitely wise in their strategies. They may have no ready answers for the dilemmas facing the movement at any given moment, they may make mistakes. But the movement will continue.

Let me mention one other field in which we made extraordinary steps forward—the education of handicapped children. We estimated that at least 10 percent of the school population, then roughly five million children, had handicaps severe enough to require special education. Of this number, we estimated that there were a quarter of a million children too ill or crippled to attend

regular classes, needing to have schools brought physically within reach; more than two and a half million with sight hearing or speech handicaps requiring special educational services; more than a million and a half of school-age mentally retarded children; and almost a million emotionally disturbed children. The usual teaching methods do not always work with these children, but a very large percentage of them want to learn and can learn.

Nearly 90 percent of all the mentally retarded can learn to do productive work and most can learn school subjects. In a four year period, we approximately doubled the number of mentally retarded children in special education classes—from 393,000 to 677,000. And we provided residential and community services to 400,000 more. At the same time we were learning more about mental retardation, learning how it can be prevented.

We encouraged more young people to enter careers of teaching, training and caring for handicapped children. In a three year period, we almost doubled the number of students in training in that subject at our colleges and universities. We steadily expanded the quality and quantity of these teacher training programs.

Now, there are those who said to me at the time, referring to handicapped children and particularly, perhaps, to mentally retarded children, "Why spend scarce resources of energy, talent and money on human beings who will never probably contribute significantly to the society, who will be marginal at best?" And I always gave two answers, the first a practical answer and the second, it seems to me, a conclusive one.

The practical answer is that the result of the effort is the difference between a self-sufficient human being and one who is dependent, helpless and a burden to himself and society. We can achieve the former and avoid the latter for most of these children.

The conclusive answer is much briefer. Every individual is of value.

At the heart of our conviction as Americans is the belief that every individual should be enabled to grow to his full stature and be what he has it in him to be. Over the years we've become increasingly determined to fulfill that promise and education offers the chief means of doing so.

Most Americans had always believed in the ideal of individual fulfillment. What was new in the efforts of the 1960's was the breadth and penetration of the efforts that we made to make the ideal come to pass. Never before in our history had we worked so hard on so many fronts to open the avenues of opportunity. Never before, to cite one example, had we mounted a penetrating attack on hard-core poverty. Our concurrent attack on racial discrimination, another barrier to individual fulfillment, was incomparably more vigorous than any attempted previously. The same may be said of our efforts to cope with mental retardation, mental illness, physical incapacity and so on. In fact, we launched the broadest possible attack on all the conditions that prevented individual fulfillment or stunted human growth.

I shall always be grateful to President Johnson for giving me the opportunity to serve as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare during some of those years. The job gave me a very special view of this nation. I saw children being taught, sick people being cared for, the aged being helped, the disabled retrained; I saw health research going on; I saw the schools and colleges expanding; young men and women being prepared for careers in science and the arts and scholarship. I saw the people in and out of government who made that whole part of American society work—teachers, nurses, businessmen who serve on school boards, doctors, ministers, social workers, housewives who do volunteer work, college students who tutor children in the slums and all those who give generously or raise money for good purposes.

Why do they do these things? Why do they do them with such conviction? To answer that is to say something about what I like to think of as the American commitment, which is not to affluence, not to all the marvelously cushioned comforts of a well-fed nation, but to the liberation of the human spirit, the release of human potential, the enhancement of individual dignity. Those are the great themes of our life as a people. Everything else is a means to those ends.

Unfortunately, some of our fellow citizens do not honor those ends, but many others do. Many live by the American commitment and live to further that commitment. It can be honored only by deeds. The Scriptures say "At the day of Judgement, it will be asked not did you believe, but were you doers or talkers only?"

The hard thing about being doers and not talkers is that we can't walk away from the difficult, often painful, tasks involved in achieving the ideals that we profess. If we say one thing and do another, then we're dealers in illusions and not a great people.

I saw people from every part of the nation, in every walk of life, tackling the toughest problems of our national life. I worked with such people day in and day out.

They came from all walks of life. Their occupational labels didn't really matter. They constitute the brotherhood and sisterhood of those who care enough about the American commitment to do something about it. It is an army without banners and its campaigns are not reported on the front page, but it marches.

Every time a teacher strives to give honest, individual attention to some child, she is advancing the cause. Every time an employer seeks to create the working environment in which individual employees can flourish and grow, he is helping. Every time a mother provides the special combination of love and instruction that makes for early intellectual growth, she is doing her bit. Every time a citizen works through a civic organization to create a government more responsive to individuals, he is contributing.

In short, anyone can contribute and I must say, I count the contribution as a measure of the men and women I meet. I don't want to know what their religion is or their political party or what philosophy they profess. I just want to know what they have done lately about the basic American commitment.

The commitment is deeper than political parties. It has to do with a powerful current that runs beneath the surface of American life down through the years and the decades and the generations and we must keep it running strong.

Now let me sum up and conclude.

Some believe that in the interest of humanitarianism we should weave a vast cocoon around everyone in the society so that everyone will be safe and secure and problems will disappear. But that's impossible. We can't make everyone safe and secure. We cannot hope for a world without problems. What we can hope for is a society in which every individual has a chance and no individual is irreparably damaged by circumstances that can be prevented.

Every individual is of value.

That defines the purpose of our effort. That's the purpose of all our trials and errors and seeking and finding. It's to enhance the individual human being. That's easy to lose sight of, especially when we're talking about huge government programs, but their only legitimate purpose is to create the conditions in which individual lives may be lived humanely.

What I'm saying, then, is first, that there is contained in this great library, a record of some of the most exciting years in the history of American education; and second, I'm saying that the story told therein is at the very heart of what this nation is about.

In closing, I want to pay tribute to the important leadership supplied by Francis Keppel and Harold Howe, both of whom are here today, the two men who served as Commissioners of Education during my years as Secretary. And I want again to extend my thanks to President Lyndon B. Johnson, whose powerful convictions made all of this possible. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON: When Wilbur Cohen was sworn in as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to succeed John Gardner, President Johnson introduced a new term into the language. He called it "Wilbur power." (Laughter) And he defined it as willpower with something added—the power of optimism over pessimism and involvement over indifference. The power, he said, that gets the job done.

As a young man, fresh out of college in the 1930's, Wilbur Cohen earned his credentials as a devoted public servant by laboring to get Social Security on the books of American law. There are few social reforms enacted since that time, that do not bear his imprint to some degree, and sometimes that imprint is practically a personal brand. He, too, needs no real introduction to men and women committed to the cause of education. Wilbur Cohen. (Applause)

Address: Wilbur J. Cohen, dean, School of Education, University of Michigan, former Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Dr. COHEN. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, distinguished members of Congress and many colleagues and friends in the audience who helped us in this great venture of education legislation.

My life since 1965 has been to follow John Gardner. (Laughter) That, of course, is a very, very difficult assignment.

I'm impressed by the fact that in addition to the President of the United States, who's here, we have so many present Presidents of colleges and universities. I know we have some past ones and I'm certain we have some hopefuls for the future in the audience. And I'm reminded of the story about the President of the university who died and went to Hell and the devil said "I'm going to make you President of Hell University." (Laughter) And he said, "Well, that's not so bad. I've been President of the university for quite a time." And the devil said, "Yes, but in Hell we have two Boards of Trustees of Hell University." (Laughter)

That's President McGill's joke and I pay tribute to him and he has several more that I've learned but since he's going to be on the program later, I'm not going to give his other jokes. (Laughter)

It's obvious that this is a very special occasion. Coming so early in an election year, it may be assumed by many columnists that President Johnson wished to open his 1972 campaign here in Austin. (Applause) This time, however, it can be characterized as a campaign to bring the unfinished agenda of education to the attention of the American people.

The public availability of the education papers in the Johnson Library, represents an unusual opportunity for educators, historians and students of political science, public administration and public policy.

The education reports and papers which become available today may, and I'm certain, will be approached from many different points of view. I'm going to mention five possible areas of exploration for scholars to open this subject for discussion. The papers, in my opinion, may be utilized to throw light on the substantive educational policy and programs of this nation; on the process

of presidential policy formation and decision making; on the legislative process and legislative decision making; on the administrative management of education programs; and, finally, on differential role participation in the process such as the role of the White House staff, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare, Labor, other Federal officials, and the education community. And this list for today's discussion is only illustrative and can easily be expanded.

In discussing these various aspects, I tried to do so with the specific objective of encouraging students in various fields to study the materials from different points of view and to report their conclusions not only for the benefit of future Presidents and Secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare, but for Congress and the American people as well, in the improvement of educational legislation.

First, a very brief overview of the major reports and documents which will be available to serve as research potentialities in the future.

First, the first Johnson Task Force on Education was under the chairmanship of John Gardner. This report, submitted in 1964, contributed to the development and support for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and also for the Teacher Corps. Among the 14 additional members of that Task Force were Francis Keppel and two future Commissioners of Education, Jim Allen and Sidney Marland. Also, Clark Kerr, Ralph Tyler, David Riesman and Jerrold Zacharias—a very distinguished group.

In 1965, President Johnson appointed two Education Task Forces. The first under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, dealt with international education. This report was primarily developed by Charles Frankel, then Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. But on that Task Force was a new face and a new man, Harold Howe, then Executive Director of the Learning Institute of North Carolina. Out of this Task Force came the recommendations for the International Education Act which, as many of you know, although passed, Congress never did fund.

The third Task Force was a report in 1965 and was of a much different character. Under the chairmanship of Dwight Ink and two other governmental officials, the report was issued on the reorganization of the Office of Education. This report was of key significance in the realignment of the office to assume its expanded administrative role in implementing the vast new legislative responsibilities of the Johnson education program.

In 1966, there were three Education Task Force reports submitted to the President. An interagency Task Force under the direction of Secretary Gardner, proposed eight areas in which new legislation and amendments to existing legislation or increased appropriations were recommended.

At the same time, an outside Task Force under the leadership of Bill Friday, President of the University of North Carolina, was hard at work on an overall review of the educational needs and programs. On this Task Force, Sidney Marland was Vice Chairman, and Lee DuBridge, President of the California Institute of Technology, later to become President Nixon's Science Advisor, were among the twelve other members of the committee. To give you a rough idea, the report was 148 pages.

Sixth, an outside Task Force on early childhood development was at work in 1966, under the chairmanship of Professor Joseph McVicar Hunt of the Department of Psychology at the University of Illinois. This very remarkable Task Force report entitled "A Bill of Rights for Children" covers a wide range of programs and proposals, many of which are still under discussion. Its distinguished membership included Professors Urie Bronfenbrenner, Jerome Bruner, Robert Cooke, George Tarjan, Halbert Robinson, Nicholas Hobbs and several others.

This report, among the others that will become available today, is 157 pages of tightly packed information on child development and child education in one of the most useful Task Force reports that have been made. This report played an important role in President Johnson's message on America's Children and Youth of February 8, 1967. It served as the basis for his recommendations of the "Follow Through" program and the Parent and Child Centers. And interestingly enough, in its recommendations it served as the basis for President Nixon's establishment of the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

In 1967, President Johnson appointed three more Task Forces in the field of education.

An Inter-Agency Task Force under John Gardner with Commissioner Howe, Doug Cater and ten other governmental officials made some 24 recommendations and raised a number of educational issues for further consideration. Their recommendations included a model school in the District of Columbia, advance funding of education appropriations, a most important recommendation that has partially been implemented, consolidation of vocational education legislation and additional student financial aid.

The eighth Task Force of the Johnson administration was an Inter-Agency Task Force under the chairmanship of Bill Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in H.E.W. which dealt with child development. This Task Force was commissioned by the President to review the ideas in the Hunt Task Force and the steps taken to implement the ideas in that report and to review all Federal Health, Education and Welfare programs for children. The Task Force report included such other items as family planning programs, the handicapped children's programs, public service employment for teenagers and young adults as well as day care and preschool programs for children.

Ninth, a Task Force on the education of gifted persons was appointed in 1967, and it will be of interest to note that the record shows that the Task Force on the gifted was suggested by Harry Ransom, Chancellor of the University of Texas when Joe Califano and his colleagues visited here in Austin in 1967. The chairman of the Task Force, F. Champion Ward, was Vice President of the Division of Education and Research of the Ford Foundation. Among its six distinguished members was David Packard, later to be Deputy Secretary of Defense in the Nixon administration and a subsequent major contributor to educational and charitable enterprises by virtue of the unintended action of the Congress. (Laughter) This report of 43 pages was actually printed when it was submitted to President Johnson. It is entitled "Talent Development: An Investment in the Nation's Future." A recent 1971 public report submitted by Commissioner Marland on the education of the gifted and talented undoubtedly benefited from the prior Ward report in view of the fact that there were some individuals who were consulted on both reports, and it'll be interesting to compare the subjects and recommendations in both these reports.

In the last year of the Johnson administration, the President appointed three Task Forces on education.

A Task Force on urban educational opportunities was under the chairmanship of Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education. The file shows that Paul Miller and I recommended that the report be made public since the President had already indicated he was not going to run, and I'm glad that my request is being fulfilled today.

An Inter-Agency Task Force on the administration of academic science under the chairmanship of Charles Schultze and later Ivan Bennett, Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, reported late in 1968. The Task Force recommended the establishment of a Council of Advisers on Science in Education and a new Cabinet Department of Higher Education and Science.

The twelfth and last Task Force established by President Johnson was chaired by the seventh Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Commissioner Howe, Sam Halperin and other staff members who are here did most of the work. There are some 140 pages in this report covering 21 recommendations and it'll be interesting for someone to evaluate which of these are currently desirable and, I suppose I can say today, that all presidential candidates of all parties are now welcome to put these very sensible recommendations into effect. (Laughter)

In considering these twelve Task Forces which are being made public today, it should be kept in mind that a number of other informational reports on education were made public during the tenure of the Johnson administration. Virtually all of the major education legislation required the appointment of advisory committees to advise the President, the Secretary and the Congress. Reports from these Councils were made public and represent a useful insight into current problems, viewpoints and recommendations. Whatever may have been the validity of charges concerning secrecy about reports in other programs, there were more reports, recommendations and comments made public on education legislation and programs during 1964 to 1968 than anyone could digest thoroughly.

During the last days of my tenure, I added to the indigestion by making public two special studies which had been requested by the President. The first is entitled "Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education," which still may be of some usefulness to those who are here in the resolution of the differences between the House and Senate in connection with the pending Higher Education Bill. The second, a very important report entitled "Toward a Social Report," was prepared in connection with the President's request for the development of social indicators. Both of these reports remain as sources of ideas still to be mined by explorers and adventurers.

Special note should also be paid today to the Oral History Project at the University of Texas which has taped over 1,000 interviews with persons involved in the Johnson administration. Some 18 to 20 interviews with persons primarily concerned with education will be available over the next few months. Additional interviews with other persons relating to education will be available when the papers dealing with Civil Rights and poverty become available. Some of the persons interviewed have put restrictions on their materials but a substantial amount of observation, comments and critical evaluation will be available shortly to qualified scholars.

In addition, the expression of views of some 200 persons from some 25 academic communities should throw light on educational as well as other issues. These meetings which the President instructed Joe Califano and other members of the White House staff to hold in 1967 and 1968 are worthy of study, both in terms of the impact on White House policy and also to the extent, if any, the impact they had on Departmental policies and programs. Irrespective, they make rather interesting reading at this time.

A study of the impact of academic leaders on the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon administrations might be of interest and I make one suggestion as an illustration. To start with Pat Moynihan, the Irish tenor, who served in all three administrations, might be a provocative case with which to start in looking at these papers. And other names will, of course, come to mind.

Thomas Cronin and Norman C. Thomas have published an analysis of the membership of 6 advisory bodies who helped guide the Office of Education in the Johnson administration during the period 1966 to 1969. They received replies from 176 educational advisors and conducted 31 interviews with the Office of Education officials. Their analysis, in their words, "highlights the elite, nonrepresentative character of the council members, their benign support for the United States Office of Education, President Johnson and the Great Society, and their symbiotic relationship with that agency." They refer to the "semi-incestuous character of the advisory council process" and conclude: "The critic's role needs both greater cultivation and greater reward. The question remains: How can we design advisory councils that can attract and keep knowledgeable and autonomous members?"

During the Johnson administration, a friend of the program, Elizabeth Drew, wrote a very perceptive and critical article in *The Atlantic*, May 1968, entitled "On Giving Oneself a Hotfoot: Government by Commission." She reported that "a group of highly qualified Washington observers of the stripe that the press frequently turns to for profound insights, formed a Commission on Commission-Watching." (Laughter) And she recorded their findings, humorously, of course, as follows:

There are eight reasons for the President to appoint a commission. There are three guidelines to follow on how to choose the commission. There are five procedures for a commission to conduct its work and five recommendations for future Presidents on how to handle commission reports. And I suggest that all of you read these if you're interested in appointing Task Forces yourself.

Cronin has also published another study White House Departmental relations which opens up many interesting aspects of exploration. The focus of his analysis was especially on the middleman role of the White House staff. He interviewed 43 members of the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon presidential staffs and more than 25 cabinet and subcabinet members from these three administrations. Cronin makes a number of observations which might be useful to future cabinet members. For instance, "Presidents frequently transmit some of their most unpleasant decisions for cabinet leaders via Bureau of the Budget leadership." In some cases, at least in mine, that honor was shared with Joe Califano and Doug Cater.

Now, with this overview, I'd like to briefly discuss the five areas of exploration to which I referred earlier.

The first is the value of these papers in terms of educational policy and program. The vast volume of the legislation enacted under President Johnson offers an unusual opportunity to evaluate its significance historically, not only in terms of past developments but current needs and future changes in educational programs.

Certainly, many additional changes in Federal education legislation are needed and the suggestions contained in the Task Force reports made public today should be examined for their current and future roles.

Some scholar should be able to cull from these reports some gems of thought which the Nixon administration has obviously neglected. And various presidential candidates, either in 1972 or 1973, could find some suggested educational programs to embrace. In a spirit of nonpartisanship which envelopes us today, we could suggest that some student looks for some of the recommendations in the reports which have been accepted by the Nixon administration. And, of course, there will be evaluations of the various features of the education legislation enacted during the Johnson administration, identifying and discussing the elements which have long-run significance as well as the errors and irritations of policies, personnel and priorities. I might suggest you'll find those in the oral histories and not in the Task Force reports.

There are many avenues to explore in the education legislation proposed by President Johnson. The proposals previously advocated and rejected form the backdrop. What were some of the alternatives which were considered and rejected? In what way did some of the education decisions—were they effected by the antipoverty program and it's administration?

The Task Force on Child Development, as I've indicated, is worthy of special consideration in view of the current interest and controversy over the recently vetoed Child Development Bill. And the efforts which are now taking place to redraft the bill to attain enactment this year.

The second area for exploration, Presidential Policy Formation and Decision-Making, is a very important area from which the Task Force reports and other papers would be very valuable. An evaluation of overall Presidential policy formation on all formulation on all domestic areas would necessarily have to wait on release of all of the Johnson Task Force reports numbering well over 100.

President Johnson has outlined his general philosophy about Task Forces which he commissioned but whose recommendations were not made public while he was in office. You can read his views on pages 326 to 328 of his book, *The Vantage Point*. He has indicated why he did not choose to follow the model utilized by President Kennedy who made some 20 Task Force reports public before his inauguration or shortly thereafter.

But President Johnson does not include in his memoirs how to distinguish between Task Force reports which should be made public and those which should not be made public. There were a number of public reports made during the Johnson administration. A Warren or a Kerner Commission Report is obviously one made public because it was established for just that purpose. I recall the several discussions I had with President Johnson on the membership of the Income Maintenance Commission when I was urging him to establish this commission so that their public report could contribute to the public discussion of the guaranteed income which I assumed would have and require longrange changes in public attitude, which I think is one of the major reasons why a President does appoint commissions that make public reports even though they don't seem to result in immediate legislation in his administration.

A President is subject to criticism when he makes a report public or when he keeps it confidential; either way. If he makes a report public, the pressure is on him immediately to tell when and how he will implement the recommendations and how much they will cost. If he doesn't make the report public, he will be criticized for keeping it secret. I am sure that future Presidents and their staff will welcome some distillation of this experience of these twelve Task Force reports. Personally, after spending a good deal of time reviewing them, I think the nongovernmental members of several of the Task Forces might have had no objection to public release of the reports at the time and I believe they may have aided the President in the pursuit of his objectives. President Johnson obviously felt differently on this matter. But in opening up the reports today, so early after the termination of his administration, he gives the opportunity to review this matter for all of us so that we may become Monday morning quarterbacks on this issue.

The third area, the legislative process, is, of course, a very important one in which the papers will be very useful. President Johnson has given a brief account of the legislative process relating to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, but there is a much more complex story in this whole legislation. And although a number of articles and books have been written on the Johnson educational legislation, in my opinion the accounts of practically all of them except, perhaps, the SEA Act are still incomplete. For instance, the Medicare legislative account is far more complete. The book by Richard Harris, *A Sacred Trust*, serving as a model, in my opinion, to what ought to be done for President Johnson's education legislation.

Since the Johnson legislative record is unequaled and probably will remain unequaled, the full story of the legislative process during the Johnson administration still remains to be written and the related story of the legislative process during the time the President was the majority leader of the Senate remains to be written, particularly the development of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which was one of the most important achievements precedent to the development of the Johnson education legislation.

If you survey the 60 different pieces of legislation in this area, you will find that higher education legislation, vocational education legislation, the Teacher Corps and many other areas in the Johnson education program have not yet received the intensive attention of scholars and educators that is warranted.

On the special aspect of the significance of the Task Force, there is only one report that I am aware of in this area and it is somewhat of a model, and it is a Ph.D. dissertation on Secretary Gardner's Task Force of 1964, in which Mr. Kearney, now the Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction in Michigan, in writing his doctoral dissertation for the University of Chicago, came to these six conclusions and I mention them only to stir up a little controversy so that scholars will be able to take these papers which are now being available and see what kind of light they throw on the process. Here are Kearney's six conclusions about the Gardner Task Force.

1. There was no relationship between the Task Force and Title II of the bill;

2. The Task Force did not represent a significant or essential ingredient in the development of Titles I and V;

3. It may have influenced the development and content of Titles III and IV;

4. It may have served its paramount significance in serving as a legitimating agent for ideas already in existence;

5. Only indirect relationships seem to have existed between the Task Force and other groups involved;

6. Other factors and events appear to be more important than Task Force efforts in the formative stages of the legislation.

I only mention these so that Mr. Gardner and Mr. Keppel who are quite the central actors in that theme that might feel that they'd like to read that doctoral dissertation. (Laughter)

I think I should say that as Dean of the School of Education, I produced 140 doctoral dissertations in my school last year so I'm very much interested in using these papers for others for the next two years.

A third way to look at the papers being released today is what effect did the Johnson programs, policies and personnel have on the administrative management of educational programs and government. It is one thing to evolve a program through Presidential leadership and the legislative process. This usually takes many risks, involves many compromises and is well publicized. But what we have been finding in education, in health, in poverty, in civil rights and other programs is that the process of administrative implementation of great ideas involves other kinds of people and processes and some other kinds of qualities of mind and motive. I speak from experience, having been sent by President Johnson to Chicago in

1965 to resolve difficulties over a Title I grant to the ESEA—a situation about what much has been written in the newspapers of the time. If those of you would like to read about it, I refer you to Frank Keppel's oral history about the subject and mine, as well, which are being opened today in these papers. But the one that I have not been able to read is to hear what Mayor Daley said about it. (Laughter)

In this connection, I would like to say that there is a model also that has recently been issued under Commissioner Marland's jurisdiction. The report on Title IV of the National Defense Act of 1958 which Mr. Marland just released a few months ago, contains the legislative history of that Title of the NDEA Act and this report, in my opinion, is the kind of model for the history of all the other educational programs in the Johnson administration to be supplemented, of course, by other materials from participants in the program.

Fourth, role participation. There are many actors with different roles in the decision making process in national legislation. Each participant in the process tries to leave his own personal thumbprint on the final document. President Johnson has included some observations on educational legislation in his book but they're necessarily brief. So far as I know, none of the seven Secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare in the Eisenhower, Kenndy and Johnson administrations have published their views on their role in educational legislation or administration. Nor have the three Commissioners of Education in the Kennedy-Johnson administration. This seems to me like a slight oversight which ought to be remedied and I believe that it might well be as these papers are made public.

Doug Cater, for instance, who played a very remarkable role in this, after he left office has written a novel but so far as I know he has not written anything on the development of education or health legislation during his years in the White House and his role was unique. I don't know of any other President of the United States who had a Staff Assistant solely concerned with education and health. Mike Feldman in the Kennedy administration came close but he had many other assignments, too; and Ted Sorenson played a very significant role in designing the Kennedy education legislation but no other President had a man specially devoted to these two areas. It will be interesting to evaluate the unusual and significant contribution made by Doug Cater and the relationships to the Budget Bureau, the Congress, the Commissioners of Education, the Secretaries and the Washington education lobby. There is always a lot of speculation on the role of Presidential Assistants ever since Colonel House worked for President Wilson. Here is an opportunity to study the special role in the White House and to compare it with the roles of other past and present White House Assistants.

The memos from the Bureau of the Budget on each of the Task Force reports are also being opened today and they should open an avenue of exploration which has long been neglected due to lack of available information. Anyone who's been in Washington for any period of time knows of the great program contributions made by the excellent staff of the Bureau of the Budget but also knows of their nuisance value. (Laughter) Someone can now sort out these in relation to specific reports, laws and programs. The contribution of several able persons who came from higher education to be Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, such as Kermit Gordon, Charles Schulze, Charles Zwick and others should be especially analyzed in relation to educational policy, personnel and appropriations.

It is apparent to me that one of the possible unintended spin-offs which President Johnson did not realize when he appointed all these Task Forces was the opportunity to discover new faces for recruitment in administering Federal programs. Undoubtedly, John Gardner's effective contribution to both the 1960 Kennedy Task Force and 1964 Johnson Task Force brought him to the attenton of the President and helped to make his appointment as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare a very natural one when Secretary Celebrezze was appointed to the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Similarly, Doc Howe's participation on the International Education Task Force in 1965 may have been an element in his selection as Commissioner of Education when Frank Keppel resigned.

It should also be noted, as I said, that Jim Allen, Sid Marland, Lee DuBridge and even George Schultze was the chairman of one of the Johnson Task Forces on manpower and education. Their experience in this Task Force process may be viewed as one of the fringe benefits donated to the Nixon administration. (Laughter)

Educational programs and policies are changing, of course, from what they were in the 60's and still more in the future. The papers being made available here today should contribute, in my opinion, to a better understanding of the dynamics of educational change. The great movement of educational ideas do not evolve in isolation but are related to many other social and economic and intellectual movements. We may be able to see and know about the changes better than ever before, or at least sooner.

I recall once that when I was sent to testify before one of the Committees on Medical Education, I was rather vigorously attacked and criticized by a member of the other political party on the grounds that I was advocating large expenditures of Federal funds for the training of physicians. And I was asked by the Congressman how I could justify Federal funds being used to produce physicians which, at that time, were earning a median income of $25,000, by taxing the American taxpayer whose average income was $5,000. And he said to me, "Secretary Cohen, isn't that a rather curious redistribution of income from the poor to the rich?" And I said, "Well, Congressman, you don't quite understand that what this administration is trying to do is to try to develop excellence in all aspects of education and professional development. What we are looking to do is to get all the bright young men and women and see that they go on to college and see that they can make their contribution for the society in the economy." And I could see that my argument wasn't getting anywhere, especially with the final comment of the Congressman. He said, "What are you doing though for us C plus students who really run the country?" (Laughter)

I think as my friends here from Congress will note that you discover many illuminating ideas in the Congressional discussion in the Committees when you're on the witness stand.

There have been many strong advocates in the education community to establish a separate Department of Education and a separate Department of Health. I have not been among those who have made this appeal. Among the various Task Force reports will be found recurrent recommendations for a separate Cabinet Department of Education, and perhaps, someday there will be a separate Department of Education. But I believe that anyone who looks at the written record and looks at the material that is being made public today, will show not that education prospers or falls in the priorities of the Education Branch or of the Congress, depending on whether education has a separate Cabinet status or not, but whether there is in office a President who believes in education and is willing to support his Secretary and his staff in that objective. (Applause)

The education record of the years 1963 and 1968 cannot yet be viewed in any final sense. A true perspective, in my opinion, probably can only be achieved somewhat by the suggestion that Henry Adams made many years ago of drawing a line through several points in history. And I would suggest, in drawing that line, that we start with the period of 1859, when President Buchanan first vetoed the original Morrill Act, and then, taking a second point in history, 1958 when the National Defense Education Act was enacted. And then third, a date like 1978 when the present process of educational legislation may have been developed much more fully. And then, Mr. President, what I'd like to suggest is that we all come back in 1982 when we could discuss the results of a scholarly review of all of these papers that are being made public today. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON. Some of you have found in your envelopes invitations to lunch in the Thompson Conference Center. For those of you who did not find such invitations, let me explain with a note of apology, that the facilities at the Conference Center are limited and cannot accommodate all of us in this auditorium much as we would like to have it otherwise. So, invitations have had to go to our out-of-town guests who otherwise, not knowing their way around Austin, might go hungry. (Laughter)

Those of you who do have invitations, when you leave the auditorium through those doors to the rear, turn to your right through the glass doors leading outside. There are signs and guides that will lead you to the Conference Center. Those in the front rows who came from the Green Room, if you'll go back to the Green Room with Mr. Hardesty, he'll show you the way. We will reassemble here at 1:00 o'clock. We'll have an hour and a half lunch break and we'll reassemble at 1:00 o'clock for the afternoon session. Thank you very much.

JANUARY 24, 1972—AFTERNOON SESSION

(The Symposium reconvened at 1:10 p.m., pursuant to the luncheon recess.)

Mr. MIDDLETON. In the 1960's, when the break-throughs and advances in education were made, important roles were played not only by men and women whose names stand out, but also by organizations whose abiding and continuing concern for the cause of education was part of their reason for being and part of their passion.

One such group was the National Education Association whose members have been in the front ranks of many a bout for the cause of better education.

To introduce our speaker this afternoon, I'm going to call on the President of the National Education Association, Mr. Donald Morrison. (Applause)

Mr. MORRISON. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen. It gives me great pleasure indeed to represent the one million members of the National Education Association at this historic opening of the education papers in the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library.

The 36th President of the United States is known throughout the profession as the teacher in the White House. That title was well earned for we recall that in 1928 the future President embarked on a teaching career in the public schools of Texas. During these early years in adult life, Lyndon Johnson developed a deep sensitivity to the needs and aspirations of young people, especially those whose backgrounds inhibited their opportunities for success.

The term "teacher" in the White House has an even deeper meaning for the teaching profession which has worked with the Federal Government for more than a century in efforts to improve the American education system.

Some of our greatest successes were achieved during the presidency of Lyndon Johnson who declared education to be first

in the nation's hopes and dreams. His administration was unique in the scope, variety and long-range importance of education legislation.

During the '60's, the nation faced unprecedented domestic crises and difficult problems abroad. From the sole-searching of this troubled period immerged a new national prospective on the social and economic well-being citizen and a new awareness of the critical importance of providing truly equal educational opportunities for all.

We are still far from obtaining the goals that were articulated during that stormy decade, but we can be proud that the laws enacted and applied under President Johnson's leadership increased opportunities for all persons ranging from the least privileged preschool child in the Head Start Program through the elementary and secondary schools to youths and adults seeking vocational training and to graduate students in the professions and the arts.

With the full support of the nation's teachers the Federal Government expanded the manpower development and training program, provided massive programs for improving the education of impoverished children and youth, strengthened Federal support for new and established colleges and universities, especially community colleges, recognized the special problems of the handicapped child and provided financial assistance to schools and institutions working in those problems, and passed significant new programs for college student assistance.

The major break-through for these massive programs came with the enactment of the elementary and secondary education act and the higher education act of 1965 and their subsequent amendments. The record of the education achievements of Lyndon Baines Johnson may now be examined in this magnificent new library. That record reflects vividly the profound concern for education that developed in the mind of that young teacher in Texas and the making of public papers—and making public the papers in this collection which will provide chroniclers of our times a rich treasure.

Our luncheon speaker at today's session is the man who shouldered the responsibility for administering the chief education assistance programs of the Federal Government. His job would be much simpler and less demanding had Congress failed to heed the ambitions of the teacher in the White House.

Sidney P. Marland, Jr., the U.S. Commissioner of Education, oversees the implementation of literally dozens of Federal programs designed to cope with the problems in education, and I am happy to say that he has worked with the profession closely in his difficult assignments.

Dr. Marland obtained nationwide recognition during his years as Superintendent of Schools in Darian, Connecticut, Winnetka, Illinois, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In Pittsburgh he was responsible for the development of many educational innovations, including team teaching, pre-primary programs, services for the academically talented, compensatory programs and many new developments in vocation technical education.

He asserted aggressive leadership in the sensitive area of racial equality during his years in Pittsburgh. He served on the Gardner Task Force in 1964 which helped shape the innovative provisions of the elementary and secondary education act. He has served on many important public policy committees including the Board of Directors of National Educational Television, the National Merit Scholarship Corporation and the Joint Council on Economic Education.

He also served on the Presidential Advisory Councils on the education of disadvantaged children and the Office of Economic Opportunity. NEA is particularly gratified that Dr. Marland is an advocate of the teaching profession in his proper role of decision making. I am pleased and honored to introduce to you the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. (Applause)

Address: Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner of Education

Dr. MARLAND. Thank you, Don. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, esteemed companions on the stage and fellow teachers and learners. I consider it a great privilege and honor to be in this assembly and to honor the man whose name it bears.

In keeping with the nonpartisan spirit of this occasion, The White House instructed me to dispense with the usual partisan comments about another Administration.

Yet candor as well as loyalty compel me to observe that, in one conspicuous area, President Nixon inherited a serious problem caused by years of inattention to detail, misdirection of resources, and ineffective leadership. It has not been easy for the President to solve this problem in three short years, but he has done so.

I refer, of course, to the Washington Redskins, which—thanks to the President's mastery of third-and-long-yardage situations—have just compiled their best record in 25 years. There are other problems, to be sure—a sluggish economy, racial tensions, and a badly bent budget, just to name a few—but we expect to clear up those in short order. The specific problem that I have been asked to discuss this afternoon is the future of American education, from preschool through secondary. What's wrong with it, and what specific actions are required to correct it?

Let me say first that American education has a much greater capacity to deal with its problems today than it did before Lyndon Johnson became President. In my own viewpoint, President Johnson's achievements in education can be broadly classified under two headings: first, political; second, philosophical.

Politically, President Johnson sensed a great, popular willingness compatible with his personal commitments to move ahead on educational problems and channeled that popular energy into the making of law. His election in 1964 was the most resounding victory in the annals of American politics. Not only did it give him an unquestionable mandate, but it brought in a large number of freshmen Congressmen who owed their elections to him. In political terms, this translates into muscle—and President Johnson used that muscle to advocate, and to have passed, the greatest array of education legislation this country has ever had on its books.

Philosophically, President Johnson directed a subtle but nonetheless significant change in the thrust of *Federal* educational initiative. In 1958, President Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act, which was designed to ensure that American students with aptitude in science and technology should have the curriculum, the equipment, and the teachers they needed to translate their aptitude into proven ability. Restricted as it was to the technological areas, NDEA nevertheless represented an important social breakthrough in that it brought the Federal Government to the assistance of State and local educational agencies in a broad curricular area for the first time. Until NDEA was passed, any Federal role in education was highly suspect and limited to specialized, often war-induced needs, such as technical education.

Striking as NDEA was as an index of our political evolution, however, it was largely aimed at our best students. Over the years, from the end of the Eisenhower Administration to the beginning of the Johnson Administration, it was broadened to include virtually every subject in the curriculum—the arts and humanities as well as the sciences. Nevertheless, its initial emphasis on assuring future intellectual leadership in the face of a Russian threat remained. Considering the temper of those times and their well-founded concern for developing excellence, this emphasis was not only understandable but desirable.

By the early 1960's, however, other social concerns had surfaced. The most important of these was the civil rights movement, which sought for black citizens the equality of opportunity which our Nation had so long promised for all. Many Americans continued to maintain that this was the land of opportunity, and that anyone willing to work hard could accomplish as much as he chose—but a growing number of us came to believe that this was a fiction. A growing number of us came to see that providing language laboratories and Bunsen burners, "new" physics and biology and English curricula, and more teacher-institutes directed at developing the abilities of our most able students, was beside the point for millions of our children. Millions of them—white as well as black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and Indian—never benefited from a host of valuable innovations for the simple reason that they did not survive in school long enough to encounter them. Most of the curricular improvements of the late 50's and early 60's worked from the top down; they began with the senior high school and, as curricular development proceeded, were introduced at lower grade-levels.

In the meantime, however, millions of boys and girls were simply not learning to read or write or count. President Johnson's philosophical achievement was that he perceived the need for improving education from the bottom up while continuing the drive to introduce a new excellence from the top down. More than perceive it, he *acted* on his perception, and gave to American educators such valuable tools as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Head Start program. These are only two of the best-known acts of an Administration that passed approximately 60 laws for education. President Johnson has often taken satisfaction in the title that some have applied to him—"the Education President"—and he fully deserves it.

After that look at background, it seems time to ask, where are we now in education?

In the midst, I believe, of a somewhat puzzled, self-doubting, and perhaps self-correcting period of education. The clearest symptom of public discontent with the schools is the record of the past few years on local school-bond elections. In 1965, a year in which some of the most important Federal laws for education were passed, popular support of the schools at the national level was matched at the local level. In terms of dollar-value, 79 percent of the bonds submitted to the voters in 1965 were approved.

In 1966, the approval rate declined almost five points to 75.5 percent—and it has dropped every year since. Today it's down to about 43 percent.

It is easy to read this rate of rejection as evidence of a widespread "taxpayer's revolt"—and I think that explanation has some merit. But it is more likely a reflection of the proposition that the ancient local tax base is now super-saturated, and no longer able to sustain the lion's share of education's cost.

It is also tempting to read school-bond failures as proof of a public loss of confidence in education. Again, I think there is some validity to this explanation—but only some. The drop in school-bond approval rates and other indications of a malaise in education have to be seen against the backdrop of the entire 1960's, a period of great trial for the American people. The dominant reality overseas was, of course, the Vietnam war, which not only consumed an enormous part of our substance, but also

divided our citizens about the essential rightness of what we are doing more than any other conflict since the Civil War.

The dominant reality at home, by contrast, was an almost unparalleled idealism. Dramatic as our financial investments in various social programs because, I think the more crucial investment was psychological and emotional: We turned our sense of social justice into massive Federal funding and corresponding law. Americans invested an unaccustomed amount of faith in the belief that, by great and concentrated efforts, we could lick some ancient enemies of man: not only ignorance, but also intolerance, injustice, and poverty.

We have not done so, of course, and our apparent failure has induced a kind of social-emotional hangover, a reaction to the excessive enthusiasm of an earlier time. We look back now from the vantage point of a somewhat wounded skepticism and regard our high hopes of the 1960's as naive.

The danger, here, is that in our disappointment, we might overlook some of the genuine social gains we made, repudiate some of the undeniably major educational advances we made, and thus fail to build on the substantial foundation that Lyndon Johnson and the Congress, plus their counterparts in State and local governments, laid for improved schools during the 1960's.

To my mind, this is the crucial task facing educators in the 1970's. The 1960's were a time when the American people, through their political leaders, gave educators the Federal attention they had been seeking for nearly 30 years. It appears now that last season's blind faith in the proposition that the schools could solve most of our growing social problems has now turned from simple trust to a calling to account. And it seems clear that we educators will have to do a more impressive job with our new resources than we have so far.

By a dozen statistical measurements, the state of American education is better than it ever was. In the 1960's, the taxpayers boosted spending for public elementary and secondary schools from $16 billion to $40 billion annually. This increased spending made a big difference. It made new curricula available to schools that could not otherwise have afforded them. It boosted teachers' salaries, brought in paraprofessionals, and in other ways made the teaching profession more attractive. It brought the new technology into the schools, supplementing the traditional textbooks with films, audiovisual cassettes, programmed readers and other materials designed to give children a much wider range of learning options. It greatly increased the span of education from early childhood to graduate school for literally millions of people. In all these ways, the great investments in education of the 1960's have accomplished much.

But these are all quantitative measurements, proving that we did more for education. What remains to be proved is whether, with these new resources at their disposal, educators did better. While I believe that the schools and colleges of this Nation are doing a better job for the vast majority of learners, I think educators would be hardpressed to prove that the very substantial *quantitative* improvements voted by the American people for the disadvantaged have been matched by scientifically provable *qualitative* improvement.

Learning is, of course, a difficult matter to measure, bound up as it is with so many variables that affect the educational experience. The complexity of pairing off unique human beings into control and experimental groups so that valid comparisons can be made and the extreme decentralization of American education complicate the process of data-gathering. Despite the difficulties, however, we have some tentative evaluations that suggest we have not made much progress in basic educational strategies.

The best example is in educating disadvantaged children. To my mind, as I suggested earlier, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was a great philosophical achievement for the Federal Government. It looked around for the wisest use it could make of limited funds and decided that fully $1 billion and more a year ought to be earmarked for children from low-income families.

That money has done a lot of good even though it does not add up to measurable scores. Thanks to Title I, a lot of children who never had eye-glasses before have them today. Thanks to Title I, a lot of children who used to come to school in the morning cold and hungry come to school with a breakfast under their belts and a coat on their backs. Thanks to Title I, a lot of children who in another day would have been written off as dull or uneducable, have been diagnosed as having medical problems that are susceptible to treatment. And perhaps most promising of all, the parents of the disadvantaged child are now being drawn into the activities of the schools and the education process. Title I has forced us as educators to face issues that were formerly set aside.

All these are real gains of the last few years. But neither Title I nor any other major program of compensatory education has demonstrated its ability to overcome the learning disadvantages that seem to flow from certain kinds of socioeconomic backgrounds. In 1969, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission concluded that, of the major compensatory education programs it had studied—some dating back as far as 1957—"none . . . appear to have raised significantly the achievement of participating pupils."

This, it seems to me, is the major educational problem facing the 1970's: to put together the legislative authorities, the money, and the ideas—not only Federal, but from State and local as well as private and even individual sources—for qualitative improvement before the popular mandate for improved education loses momentum. And this, I think, is the basic theme behind President Nixon's call for educational reform: to sustain the momentum of a great educational initiative before it is blunted by public disappointment at unfulfilled expectations.

In sum, regardless of political genealogy, the great legislation of the 60's was a product of great bipartisan support orchestrated by my distinguished predecessors here today. Some items of educational policy making news today have been debated back to the Truman Administration and earlier; the problem, often, was not which idea was best, but which was most politically and economically feasible at one moment or another. In talking, therefore, about President Nixon's educational program in comparison with President Johnson's, I am not talking about good *versus* bad, or about Republican *versus* Democratic; I am talking about one President's trying to make sure that the good things another President did will live on and come to fruition. I am not talking about a *competitive* matter; I am talking about a *cumulative* national leadership.

The heart of President Nixon's educational program is one of reform—one of consolidating the gains from President Johnson's Administration, cutting the losses, and of making further progress deliberately and in a spirit of continuing renewal. We proceed in the philosophy, long held in education, and implicit in education revenue sharing, that places decision-making as close as possible to the people.

We do not need more categorical education law at this time. We have a collection of legal authorities that can be used to tackle almost any schooling problem, from education of the handicapped to education of the Spanish-speaking; from education of the brilliant to education of the slow; from the provision of extremely traditional modes of education to provision of radical, adventurous kinds of learning. Drug abuse education, environmental education, services to unwed mothers in school, and certainly career education are examples of current thrusts of educational priority.

But there is also the demonstrated reality that the American willingness to *support* improved education exceeds our knowledge about *how* to improve education, and that money is no substitute for scholarship and imagination. There is also the recognition that unless American educators during this decade prove their right to further trust by the American public, they will jeopardize the high place in the American value system they have historically enjoyed.

We make haste slowly, then, basically by improving what we've been given before asking for more. For openers, that means research—more of it, and more closely focused on such nagging, perennial learning problems as reading. While the U.S. devotes about 5 percent of its health budget to research, and 10 percent of its defense budget, we spend only about one-half of one percent of the education budget on research. Any successful industry in America would view this as very foolhardy.

To guide the needed increase in educational research, the President has proposed the National Institute of Education. Presuming the NIE receives Congressional approval this winter or early spring, the Institute can begin this July to bring top scholars and practitioners together to devise research and development strategies for our most urgent educational needs. We envision NIE as eventually possessing influence and resources comparable to NIH or NIMH.

But research aims at the future, short- or long-range—and tempting as it is to want to have all the answers in hand before gambling scarce funds on chancy programs, we simply cannot wait for all the answers. There are too many young people in the schools who are being ineffectively taught now; they cannot go back and repeat their schooling in a few years when we have the better answers we want. Hence in certain circumstances, we must proceed on the best information we have now, and mount some limited experiments designed to test promising strategies for putting Federal funds to work.

The strategy that we are concentrating on now is what we call a "renewal" strategy. The term is deliberately chosen to balance the research and development connotation of the new NIE. Further it connotes, we hope, a continuing process rather than a short-term burst of innovation. We feel that what American schools need most is to develop the capacity within themselves for *continuing* change and responsiveness. In years of financing hundreds and thousands of experimental projects in the schools, my colleagues and I, past and present, have learned to our sorrow that too often, when the Federal money stops, the experimentation stops. And very often whatever promising practice might have been developed either dissolves or remains a local exercise, failing to generate corresponding impact beyond the district line. We hope that our renewal strategy will help more schools recognize that innovation is not passing educational fashion, a sort of apparel to be changed with each year's changing enthusiasms, but a principle of educational life. Despite the vast and self-evident success of the American elementary and secondary schools, we have still not solved the mystery of the education of the disadvantaged. Renewal will deal head-on with this deficit.

The major components of our renewal strategy are these:

First, site concentration. This, too, is one of the lessons we learned in dealing with the

great variety of legislative authorities won for education under President Johnson. We found that, in their normal desire to serve as many youngsters as possible as well as to deal with the political realities of their jobs, State superintendents and school superintendents tended to spread Federal funds over *all* the eligible children. The problem is that this dilution of funds, while making a little difference in many classrooms, failed to make a major difference in *any* of them. We come back, in sum, to the old necessity for concentrating enough funds on a small enough clientele to compose a "critical mass" of educational resources.

Yet this tactic is hampered by the fact that most Office of Education funds—approximately 87 percent this year—are "formula" funds, awarded to school districts by strict mathematical criteria such as average daily attendance, percentage of families beneath the poverty level, and so on. The other 13 percent, however, are "discretionary" funds—funds that the Office can dispense for sound projects without regard to formulas.

In an effort to assemble a critical mass of educational resources that will give new ideas a real test, we are selecting a limited number of renewal sites around the Nation—clusters of low-income schools in a variety of rural and urban settings—and plan to focus our discretionary funds on them next year, steadily increasing their number in the next few years. Thus, site concentration has two elements: focusing *funds* and focusing on the *problems* of disadvantaged children as viewed by the local responsible people—parents, teachers, board members—supported by nearby university scholars.

The *second* major component of our renewal strategy is the packaging of several Federal program categories. The local systems will develop their own comprehensive attack on local educational problems without the usual red tape that comes as a result of having to submit numerous and often overlapping applications and reports. The Office of Education will, of course, make certain that funds appropriated for each categorical program will be used according to legislative mandate. The idea here, not unlike Revenue Sharing, is to facilitate the concentration of program authority into one simple paperwork process, and still retain the intent of Congress.

Drawing upon the agriculture classic example, we intend to create the new role of Education Extension Agent, locally named and federally supported, to link the Federal funds and programs to local power and creativity. The telescoping of Federal programs into manageable and efficient packages is a continuing delicate process. The 100-odd legislative categories under which Federal funds are currently dispensed by the Office of Education make it extremely difficult for local educators to put together the pieces they need. Further, these categories encourage an unfortunate and often wasteful "grantsmanship" that costs time and money at all levels of government.

As an experiment in testing the validity of broader forms of aid, as well as in the conviction that greater flexibility will enable local educators to devise more effective solutions to down-home problems, we will ask renewal site planning groups to come up with a single, comprehensive plan tying together all the elements they need: teacher-aides, for example, traveling diagnosticians, new curricular materials in a variety of media, perhaps teacher-training institute focused on the single problem of reading disability. Then, rather than asking them to cite the legislative authority for each piece, fill out a different set of forms for each program-component, compete on each application with all other applicants and so forth, we will appraise the validity of the entire package and make a single program grant. The States will participate in the selection process.

Finally, we will tie together all schools in a renewal site through a mechanism we have tentatively called "teacher centers". The idea is to create an informal union among schools of low-income neighborhoods that will enable them to cooperate in solving their common problems, sharing good experience and bad, so that each of them can borrow from the successes of the others rather than having to re-invent the wheel in each classroom.

Linked to this process will be targeted technical assistance from my office, with access to NIE and to other sources of the most promising validated measures for change. The renewal agent will afford counsel, leadership, easy access to Washington, and quick turn-around time for delivery.

I do not cite our renewal strategy as an answer to all school problems in the 1970's. Most especially, I do not offer it as a repudiation of the concepts underlying the great education legislation of the 1960's.

I outline it, rather, as a kind of parable of what we in this Administration conceive to be our job: to recognize, in all humility, the enormous legislative authorities that the earlier Administrations gave us, and to maximize the impact of those resources in increasingly sophisticated ways.

At this height of his Administration, President Johnson declared that education must be "the first work of these times." We have inherited that work, and we are fortunate that we have such a strong base on which to build. President Nixon struck the proper note, I believe, in his March 1970 message on educational reform. He said:

"This Administration is prepared to commit itself to substantial increases in Federal aid to education . . . as we provide some assurances that those funds contribute toward fundamental reform of American education."

Two years have passed since President Nixon challenged education to find better ways. Renewal and reform are now in motion. Career Education is a swiftly rising system, prompting major changes in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education. The Right to Read last week established its first 68 sites throughout the United States. Experimental Schools is a reality with major new modes of teaching, learning, and school organization being tested. The Office of Education's new theme of Education Renewal is moving swiftly toward reality with the cooperation of Chief State School Officers and local districts. Teacher Centers, an essential component of the renewal theme, are being identified. The Emergency School Assistance Program, having completed two years of pilot activities with significant success, now awaits major legislation for continued reform in the correction of racial isolation. The National Institute of Education, also awaiting legislation, is being anticipated with intensive planning in the Office of Education so that the new director may move promptly and efficiently into very significant new dimensions upon passage of enabling law.

Consistent with these and other expressions of reform, the President last week took the next step, declaring: "I particularly hope that 1972 will be a year in which we resolve one of the most critical questions we face in education today—how best to finance our schools."

He went on to describe the Renewal activities now started and declared: "I believe the best new approach is Career Education. I will propose an intensified Federal effort [in Career Education]."

Thanks to the man whose efforts for education we honor today, the first work of these times is well advanced. The foundations for change were built. The readiness for change now permeates the teaching community. The process of change and the installation of change now becomes our first work.

I assure you, in sum, that those of us who inherited this bountiful legacy of political and philosophical advancement of education, including President Nixon, are taking our work very, very seriously.

Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON. To probe further the problems and the solutions of education in the elementary—the preschool through secondary levels—a distinguished panel is assembled on the stage. On the other side of Commissioner Marland, Harold Lowe, former Commissioner of Education, now Vice President, Division of Education and Research for the Ford Foundation. (Applause)

Mr. Patrick Daly, a teacher at Edsel Ford High School in Dearborn, Michigan, and a Vice President of the American Federation of Teachers. (Applause)

Walter E. Washington, Mayor-Commissioner, the District of Columbia. (Applause)

Jerome S. Bruner, Professor, Department of Psychology, Harvard University. (Applause)

And the moderator of the panel, Dr. Jack Davidson, Superintendent of the Austin Independent School District. (Applause)

Dr. Davidson will now explain how this panel works and I'll turn it over to you, Jack.

Panel discussion

Dr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Harry. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, distinguished guests. The mission of this panel this afternoon is to explore the changing commitment to education, changing in many of the ways that Commissioner Marland outlined. This distinguished panel brings a variety of experience and expertise to this topic and I'm going to ask each of them in a moment to make a short presentation dealing with their reactions to the messages they have heard this morning and also Commissioner Marland's address. Following that, I'm sure we will have many reactions from other members of the panel to those that are given first.

We also, this afternoon, want to involve those of you in the audience. We encourage your participation. We would like for you to note any questions you have that you might like to address to the panel at large or to any individual member of the panel. There will be ushers in the aisle with paper and pencil. They will collect your questions and bring them to me and I will address them to the panel. Depending upon the consequence of the answer, I have the authority to determine which one of these gentlemen to address the question to.

The discussion this afternoon, I'm sure, will center in two ways on the changing commitment to education; on the philosophical as well as the practical, on the idealistic approach as well as the day-to-day approach. And there are those on the panel who have had experience in both aspects of this changing commitment to education.

At this point then, I'd like to begin with Mr. Howe, if you please.

Mr. HOWE. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, friends of education. It makes me a little nervous to be here with the President this way. I remember once being in his office in the White House when I came on his T.V. tube, and he said, "Well, let's see how you do."

When I was through on his T.V. tube, he said, "You weren't so hot." (Laughter) And I'm afraid I'll get such a comment from him because one of the dangers in dealing with President Johnson, he's honest in telling you how he feels.

But aside from that, we are restricted here on this panel by each of us only having five minutes. So I will hurry up and say simply that I have three points to make about action that I think is necessary to get at the education problems we have.

The problems, I think, are the same old problems. They stem from poverty and they stem from race and they stem from our lack of capacity to deal with those elements

as they affect our schools. So there's no sense reviewing the problems, they've been already well reviewed for us.

But if I had to select out, for two or three minutes of discussion, three points, I'd pick the first one up out of Sid Marland's remarks and focus on his teacher renewal center. This is the best suggestion around. If I could redo some of the things that I did in the course of my Commissionership, I would be critical of myself for not bringing enough focus into the kinds of things that were done with Title I Elementary-Secondary Education Act money.

One of the things we neglected to do was to bring enough focus on the possibility of using those funds for assisting teachers in schools who are contending with very difficult problems that they really didn't understand.

It's not to blame the teachers, it's not to blame their principals and superintendents. It's to recognize the fact that thousands of minority group people have migrated to our central cities and created situations there that are unique for teachers to contend with and they need assistance with figuring out how to deal constructively with those youngsters in that environment.

The only suggestion I'd add to your teacher renewal centers, Sid, is that you think further about the role of the university in relationship to those centers. I'm sure it should not be what the traditional role of the university has been to teacher training. It ought to be something entirely different. But I think that I'd select out from your remarks, the point that you are offering technical assistance from Washington and add to it the very great need for technical assistance from university sources to those teacher retraining centers or teacher renewal centers, however you describe them.

My second point has to do with the absolute primacy of early childhood years. John Gardner observed on this this morning. And I simply have to say that I was deeply disappointed in the recent veto of a major piece of legislation that had to do with this. I hope and expect that there will be further action by the Congress and action approved by the President that has to do with early childhood years. (Applause)

Other countries of the world in which I've been spending a good deal of time in the two or three years I've now been away from Washington, have advanced further than we have in the United States by a long shot, in their imagination about the constructive use through various types of institutions of those early childhood years for creating leverage on learning and on good citizenship and on normal development of children. I think we need to learn from those countries and I think we have a big job to do in this country that's only been touched by such operations as Head Start.

Thirdly and finally, we've still got before us the tough job of integrating the schools. That's a fact of life. It's not a popular job. One of the great tributes that I would pay to President Johnson is the support he gave for that unpopular job. I can recall when various Congressmen and Senators were advising him to fire me. I always appreciated his not taking that advice. (Laughter)

I appreciated even more his very considerable patience because the business of trying to enforce the provisions of Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act, as they related to the schools, was a totally new exercise. Nobody knew how to go about this. And the President exhibited great patience in dealing with people who were perplexed about meeting these requirements.

But eventually then, he stood for the Law of the Land. And it seemed to me that this was an admirable combination. I just want to use this occasion to thank him for the kind of support that I don't think anybody ever had more strongly than I did in that exercise. I haven't had the chance to do this before, largely because when I talk to the President, I listen. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Howe. Mr. Daly?

Mr. DALY. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson. Mr. Howe mentioned that he felt somewhat nervous on this panel. I would echo that for somewhat different reasons. As you might imagine, this is a somewhat unusual role for a classroom teacher to be playing and in such distinguished company. I feel very much like Commissioner Marland's description of the teacher. I am 40, I have my teaching certificate and there are classes of kids back there wondering what the devil I'm doing in Texas. (Laughter)

Before I say anything, I think I would be remiss if I didn't take at least this opportunity—the only one I'll have—to express the gratitude of millions of teachers in this country who today are better teachers because President Johnson was in the White House. As teachers in an urban area that has a library that now has books that we simply could never have afforded, as a teacher who has access to technology, equipment, machines that simply were beyond the means of my district to buy, and as one who twice took advantage of the institutes under the National Defense Education Act to become a better teacher, as one teacher to another, I do thank you, Mr. President. (Applause)

One particular thing that Mr. Marland came back to a number of times in his speech which impressed me was the recurring theme of the financial plight in which our schools find themselves. Frankly, I find it a little hard to fulfill the charge of the panel. We were told to think to some degree in terms of the future, to project. I find it almost impossible to think of any kind of educational utopias when we're faced with the kinds of problems we face financially, particularly in the large urban schools in this country.

It seems almost unbelievable that as we're talking about wonderful plans for the future, in the city in which I live, the school board faces a deficit in Detroit of $30 million. The only thing that concerns teachers in that school district at the moment is whether or not the schools can remain open past April 30th or past May 10th.

Teachers in Chicago who at the count of ten practically were saved from extending Christmas vacation twelve extra days this year. That was their prime concern. The schools in Portland are going to close one month early this vear.

In the face of these problems, it's very difficult to think about other things. But I realize we must. I was gratified by Commissioner Marland's reaffirmation of the fact that money alone isn't the answer to educational problems. I don't think anyone ever really thought it was and that the total social environment the student goes to school in are certainly factors that must be considered; the unemployment, the segregation, the sheer deterioration of neighborhoods which I think we all know sapped the spirit and the motivation of human beings.

But at the same time, as that's true, I would hope that we don't replace some of the past cliches about education with the new one; namely, money won't solve the problem. I think if we do look at the percentage of our national budget which even now goes to education in comparison to other industrial nations, one might be led to think that perhaps we haven't really fully tried money. (Applause)

Last night in a few spare moments, I sat down to try and jot down what I would like to see over the next decade in American schools and oddly enough—this was before any knowledge of what Commissioner Marland was going to say—the very first thing I put down for myself was the hope that in the next decade we would somehow find the means to utilize the most untapped resource I think we've got in education in this country and that is the hundreds of thousands of teachers, through the kindergarten through twelfth grade level, whose talents and intellect simply have not been tapped.

Sometimes I get the feeling that everyone has had a crack at improving education except the people who are most closely involved with it, in terms of research and planning curriculum and so forth.

It seems ironic too, that the very time when increasing demands are being made upon classroom teachers to improve, to be better, to be more skilled, that as this accelerates the opportunity to have the time, the facilities to renew are decreasing.

For example, to cite only one or two instances, the elimination of sabbatical leave in many areas because of financial reasons. In New York State, I think, as many of you know, these were cancelled last year for all teachers.

Of course, many school districts—I don't know if many university people are aware—sabbatical leave doesn't even exist in most school districts.

The decline in the number of NDEA, National Defense Education Act institutes, which I mentioned a moment ago, which were really one of the most unheralded and I think successful programs that the Federal Government inaugurated. They were really very simple. They gave the teachers $75 a week, plus $15 for each dependent and to thousands upon thousands of especially younger teachers, it made the difference between driving a beer truck or selling shoes or going back and having the stimulation of a university. (Applause)

Those programs are in a state of decline. They still exist, I realize. They are predominant in science and mathematics now. But for thousands of people, it did one other thing besides renewing those individual teachers. It helped to break down the—I think it was the dam which exists between the K through 12 teachers and the university level. The lack of understanding and rapport between these two bodies is phenomenal. I think K–12 teachers frequently view those in the university as those who fled the K–12 system, and those on the university level view those on K–12 as those who couldn't make it to the university level. (Applause)

And there may be a degree of truth to this. But it's minimal. We need one another. And the institutes I mentioned before, other means such as this anything that will break down that gulf, or bridge that gulf I should say, would effectively, I think, aid in the process of renewing education in this country.

In summary—and I'm sure I've gone beyond my five minutes—I hope that we do what was referred to this morning, return to an atmosphere or a climate in this country, and very soon, where education is the primary business of the United States. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Daly.

Mayor Washington?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Thank you. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, friends of education. I find myself in a five to one handicap, as usual; the one mayor—(Laughter and Applause)—with five educators. I know what you were waiting for. It was like someone asked Adam Powell, they asked him whether he was going to run for President. He said, "I don't think this country is ready for a Baptist preacher." (Laughter).

So I'm just appealing for a little more time because I, frankly, am very much concerned about education and I'm here because the President asked me to come. And those of you that know him, in Austin or in Washington, know what I'm talking about. (Laughter.) I don't feel really nervous about

it because he called me and said, "Walt, I'm having something down here. It's a good thing. It's about education and I'd like for you to come down." I'm here. And that was precisely what he did when he asked me to come down from New York to be Mayor. He called about 11:00 o'clock one night and said, "I want you to come down. I want to talk to you about this thing." I said "When?" He said, "Catch the 7:00 o'clock shuttle." That's the first thing going out, you know.

I came because not only my interest in education but of my great love for the President Johnson and Mrs. Johnson as people. (Applause.)

The President has been a great teacher for me, and beyond the fact that he was a great President and a great leader, I came to understand by close proximity to him as a friend and as a leader what I think he was trying to do. I think all that's been said here today is symbolic of his greatness in terms of his dedication to make this nation even greater in his time. I think we all should be proud and happy that he's gone this way.

Moreover, I think beside this great man has lived a great woman, Mrs. Johnson (applause), who I've had the rare opportunity of working with through the streets and alleys of the nation's capital trying to make that better. She, for the most part, was trying to do a thing that bears closely on education, and this is a part of my time I'm seeking beyond the five minutes.

There are many of you who know her as someone who planted trees and flowers. But did you know that what she was talking about is so inherently great and significant in the learning process that she was doing, in fact, in the streets and alleys of our city, something that the President himself was talking about. She was trying to create a situation where a little child could plant a flower or shrub, learn to take care of it and nurture it, learn to see it grow, and out of that process learn something about life, something about respect for others, something about dignity by virtue of the fact that he could put a seed in the ground and see it grow into its ultimate fruition.

Now, if that isn't education and if that isn't the context, in my opinion, of what the President was trying, through the legislation, to do, then I've never heard of it. I just want all of you to know in context what this great First Lady was trying to do, those of you that think, for instance, that she was just beautifying something by planting a flower or a shrub. It seems to me that I come as a rarity in this scene because today in Washington the Executive Committee of the Mayors Groups are meeting and I'm the host. (Laughter) That's why I had to tell you the President had asked me.

What they're talking about there, my friends, is something that's very basic. They're talking about what is happening to the cities. The fact is, the cities are in distress. The fact is, many of the cities are in bankruptcy. My friend was telling you about the great crisis in whether or not a school system can function. The crisis is real and it seems to me that the foundation that was laid by President Johnson has really got to be looked at as something to implement, and we don't have much time to do it.

I mean implementing it with some sense of urgency. I kind of get a little up to my ears with this lip service about what he was talking about. He was talking sense about something that he said was our first priority. That's why he's the education President. The question in my mind as I come here is this. Are we really committed to doing something about what he was talking about or are we coming simply to sit through a symposium and another conference and go home uncommitted to do more than make another speech?

Someone told me that they had a document with us that said everything in education is in three pages. I think, Sid, it's yours; the document. Well, you know, I think that that's the way we've got to get down to this whole problem. If we can understand it in three pages, then we ought to be able to do something about it.

The problem is that we find so many ways to blow this up into many psychological and philosophical and sociological concepts that it's no wonder that we miss the child. I mean, we're trying to sort that out—(Applause)—and as we're sorting that out, the child is grown—he's either grown or he's in jail and we're trying to find some way to rehabilitate him there, not having taken the opportunity to grasp him at a time when we could do something positively with him. We're talking about the great criminal justice system, a system designed to go through the process and ultimately wind up with so many x number in jail and then we're going to heap millions in the corrections area to rehabilitate them there. Now, why don't we really start getting on the ball and listen to what the President was telling us. Listen to what President Johnson said. Listen to what he did to Washington.

For instance, during those days that he labored there in Washington alone, we were able to establish a city college. You can hardly imagine a city without a city college. He was sensitive to this. A new technical institute so that those who had particular needs in the technical area, in the scientific area would have an opportunity. No one thought about that, in what everybody regards as something that ought to be model; a model city, and yet no technical institute.

He saw that we expanded our public school plan and also a time when we had a school board election. Some people are wondering whether that was altogether good, but that's going in the right direction. They had some other problems.

But it seems to me that the recognition at the stage of a city in the urban crisis is important, and I say to you, my friends, that I come from a vantage point where I see the role that the school system must play. The schools are, in my opinion, a source of strength and actually set the hope of fulfillment, and if we're going to be really honest with ourselves, we're going to try to come to grips with this.

I'm not an educator in the professional sense, so the details of whatever dreams I have must be filled by those with special confidence and there are five of them up here. My particular dream, of course, is of schools that serve all the people in the city and provide the stimulation, the cohesive force and the opportunities that inform and give vitality to urban life.

As I sat with President Johnson, I think this is what he was trying to say, from the vantage point that I had to work as a Mayor. I'd like to see the schools open all day and all night, twelve months of every year. I would like to see the schools become the focus for the kind of community activity that strengthen the individual and strengthen the family and build that illusive sense of unity that makes a true community. That's what Mrs. Johnson was trying to prove about President Johnson's program; that if these things happen—

Here we build many programs, Federal grant programs, and we set up new things not realizing that the school itself as a vital unit in the community should be open, should be the cutting edge, the real unifying force for that entire community.

Now, I don't know as an educator how you do this. I do know as a Mayor that if it doesn't happen we're not going to really get the thrust that President Johnson has given us to work on and implement, because the school is the undergirding part of a total community and it must come together, it must come together as something that has that vital force of solidifying or pasting, if you will, a community into its component parts.

The problem, as I've seen it, to the educators is they're prone to remain bureaucratic. I see so many types of education now, and I don't understand them—environmental education—and every new thing that comes along you get an educational tab on it. When are we going to start teaching the children? (Applause).

It seems to me that these are all components to something else. They don't really deal with the whole child and with the whole individual to the extent that he becomes integrated enough to understand what he's talking about.

I mean, I look at the educators and, you know, I learned from President Johnson it's not good to criticize educators and so I didn't for a long time. But I've come to now, because I'm now in my fifth year of office and it's a little different. (Laughter).

I only have a year to go and I'm in my fifth, so I feel this strength about it. I feel that when we begin to fragment the life of individuals, children particularly that we can't expect to build upon it in a fruitful, meaningful way as we look at the community, the total community. I would say to you that whatever bureaucratic compartments we have, we must look at the city and we must see the problems as they unfold on employment, health, transportation, sanitation, nutrition, public safety. Do you mean to say I'm going to have an education component for each one?

I mean, sanitation education. I mean, transportation education. Sure, you can put out a phamplet. I'm talking about bureaucratic compartmentalizing so that in order to understand how you get your trash moved you've got to take a course in sanitation education. I can't see that. I think you just tell the people where to put it in the cans and then ask somebody to pick it up. (Applause).

And I've come to understand these things as a Mayor, because I've not only had to deal with them, I've had to pay for them. And my budget is just about the same as every other city; it's in trouble. The revenue has run out, just like every other city. I must begin, as the educators do, tightening our belts to the point that we make our dollar go, those resources go to the fullest extent possible.

If there was anything I would urge you, it is to look at how you can make those resources go further. I would also like to say to all of you, if you came to Austin, Texas, at this point of time, if you came to see the papers unveiled, if you came to join the President, don't leave without giving the President a commitment to do the kinds of things in education that he was talking about when he forged pretty much alone this undergirding of the total national system of education. Don't leave without a commitment. Don't just come here and take the papers and look at them and file them. Read them and then go back with a commitment to do something about them in your community. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mayor Washington. I think I should point out to you that many others in the country are beginning to follow your lead from the standpoint of it is no longer something to be concerned about in criticizing educators. (Laughter) Professor Bruner?

Dr. BRUNER. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to pick up two themes that have run through the discussion today, one of them has to do with the question of what the problem is; is it a problem of schools or is it a problem more broadly defined as the kind of society that a kid grows up in, about which I think we've learned a little bit during those years when President Johnson made it possible for us to explore the full range of these problems. The second one in brief is how early

do you start and why do you want to start early?

About the first one, I think we started off in the '60's with the idea that if we reformed the schools, we had the problem licked. And as we moved toward the reform of the schools, we found, low and behold, as Sid Marland has pointed out, that many kids were not reached by the school, that indeed they could not be reached by the school because the hidden curriculum of life as they lived it in their neighborhoods, on their streets, in their families—which I want to come to in a moment—in a sense made them almost incapable of responding to what it is that a school had to offer. It gave no inducement to the use of mind, there was no future; that in a sense the provision of jobs, the provision of some kind of economic opportunity, the provision of a way of life that wasn't as alienating as our cities were becoming, that this type of thing also was part of the problem of education, that the problem of education and the problem of schools are not by any means coterminous.

So now, as we have come into the '70's, we realize that education is not a package unto itself, it exists as part of a far deeper and broader problem. We see it in this odd kind of way, for example, a recent study that's been completed of what happens to mother's view of their children when they move from a rural setting or a slightly urban setting, no matter whether it's outside Antebia into Antebia in East Africa or outside of a city in Texas and move into one of the Texas cities. But mother begins to get the feeling that their child is not as competent. Somehow she begins to lose the sense that he can cope with the situation. Under those circumstances, she doesn't offer as many opportunities for the child to go off on his own.

This type of thing comes from urban life and the real question that we face in dealing with these changes is providing a sense of hope in the future that there is something toward which one is going and using education, recapturing a sense of vocation, that school is for something. However much I love the defense of the liberal arts, the liberal arts are not an end in themselves, they're on route toward equipping people to live effectively and to live with the job and to live with the dignities that the job gives.

Now, I could set forth all the details on this type of thing. The one thing I do want to say is that what we have come to recognize, thanks to that vibrant period of years when President Johnson was in the White House what we've come to learn is to look at schools as just the head of the iceberg. that there is a great deal underneath that needs fixing; the thing that I call the hidden curriculum.

Now, the second thing I'd like to come to, and it's a particularly timely one because we're in the middle of brooding over the question of what constitutes a decent child-development act—and I don't want to get into the partisan politics of vetos and the rest of it—has to do with why one starts early.

We used to think again in those innocent days, even back into the '50's, that the main thing that you did was to transmit knowledge to the child in the process of education. But it turns out on closer inspection that what you're doing too, as this child is growing up and very early on, is giving them the things that come to be called nonspecific forms of learning, some hope that he can deal with events, some feeling somehow that there is a point in striving. These things come very early. They come in the family, they come in the kind of situation in which the child lives.

We know perfectly well that we have got to do things much earlier than we've done them now. And indeed, as John Gardner said this morning, we have made some progress. I can remember when a group of us for the first time went to see Sarge Shrieber and proposed that there ought to be some means whereby kids in their second year be given some sort of a head start if they came from disadvantaged backgrounds. And bless his heart—he was able to change his view on this—he said, "That would be one of the most dangerous things the Federal Government could do is start to play with small children."

We've learned a lot since then. We have made progress so we need not be disappointed, and the psychology of disappointment is a very crippling thing. We are making progress. We're making progress and I think we can go on making progress, because if we start thinking of how to cope with the specific facts that exist, the fact for example that there are four and a half million mothers in the United States with children under six who are in the labor force, who are working outside the home, that those four and a half million mothers—the chances, as you move down the economic scale you'll find a far larger representation of them from amongst the poor and those just above the poverty level. They're working because they have to work.

It doesn't do to talk about the fact that we're going to help the family and then not support, in some fashion, the children of these women who have to work. This is again part of the package of thinking of employment security, the home, a good start for the child and not just the provision of school.

I think that what we have learned—if I can go back, and I hope we take this home with us, Mr. Mayor—I think that what we've learned is that to do something for the young, you've got to do something for society in general. The schools reflect the evils of society and there is a deep injustice in not correcting those things in society that warp our schools, and I hope we can carry that commitment with us when we go. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Professor Bruner. At this point, I would encourage those of you who have questions to please distribute those questions to the ushers so they might bring them to me. I know that members of our panel will be happy to react to them.

In the meantime, I would like to pursue some of the questions that were raised during the initial presentations and ask perhaps Commissioner Marland a question.

In the thrust for innovation and experimentation and looking at the renewal project, renewal centers, in what way do you see any problem in distinguishing this push for innovation and experimentation from the concentration that is needed in many of the urban areas on basic skills of learning, if any conflict at all?

Mr. MARLAND. What obstacles do we see?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARLAND. I think, Jack, that one of the obstacles we're undoubtedly going to face is that any kind of a new thrust that comes out of Washington, if it has a change in it, it's very likely to require a trade-off. You have to give up something to get something. And here, where we have been scattering our resources, as I say, very thinly in terms of the discretionary resources that provide the initiative for change, many school systems will no longer receive those scattered thin resources because we'll have to gather them to target them.

That's going to be an obstacle. Somebody has to give up something. We hope that we can move swiftly enough so that there will be enough good practices emerging from the very limited discretionary resources that we have so that those good practices will quickly influence decision-makers in nonfunded sites so that they can transform their local resources as well as the formula Federal resources into the new practices. That is certainly one of our objectives.

There would be no point in having the Office of Education in Washington go out and establish renewal sites if all we were effecting were the limited number of young people in those sites. These are demonstrations, they're models, they're initiatives, they are what I call the rubber tip crowbar to gently make a difference so that other people see that difference and pursue it.

Now, other obstacles, I think, will be the shear amount of money we have. It's not enough and never will be, and we're having to take what monies we have and do this. Another obstacle will be some anxiety in Congress that we may be overstepping the authorities that Congress has vested in the Office of Education through these laws. We're having to go on tiptoe in that direction and doing it not in any way to evade the admonitions of Congress, but to deliberate with Congress so that we don't get out of line.

These are things that are standing in our way at the moment. There's a certain amount of regrouping in the Office of Education which causes a little uneasiness and tension as people change their role, change their actions. The big thing that I see happening is that the Office of Education will become, instead of what is now admittedly—and I think Doc would agree with me—an office principally concerned with managing paper and money to an office concerned with reaching out on call with technical assistance and wisdom to help local and State authorities implement change. That would be the major difference in what we are.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Commissioner. A question from the audience parallels one that I had wanted to ask Dr. Bruner to respond to. As many of you know, Dr. Bruner has spent considerable time having a great deal of thrust in the area of theories of learning and methods of learning. And I wonder, Dr. Bruner, if you would comment upon the emerging ideas, the emerging feelings about theories of learning as they relate to our educational system in the 70's? (Laughter) In the usual five minutes.

Dr. BRUNER. Jerry, you might start with Skinner. (Laughter)

Mr. DAVIDSON. He now has six minutes.

Dr. BRUNER. Starting with Skinner would make it too easy. (Laughter) Well, let me see. I think probably the way to answer that is to note the relatively small number of ways in which we, in fact, learn or facilitate learning, if you will, by arranging things called classes or instruction or what not.

The first one is to provide a situation where somebody can act on their own to solve the problem, and the main thing that you have to do when you give a person an opportunity to solve a problem is to have knowledge of results. It's a curious kind of thing. It's such a simple-minded notion, but when you take a look at a good deal of learning that takes place in the school setting, there isn't knowledge of results. Kids don't have a sense as to whether they succeeded or failed or that they pleased somebody or didn't. That type of thing—Let me just mention that as number one.

Number two, what we do is to provide situations, I think, in which there's a—we arrange the situation so that the kid can have an opportunity to succeed or fail in a very informed way. He can get into the situation and be saved from being overwhelmed by the noise in the situation. It's a simple enough thing so that he can learn it and say, "Uh-huh, I see it."

The third thing, it seems to me, provides not an opportunity to work directly on a problem, but to provide a model of somebody working on a problem, and this model of somebody doing it or somebody valuing something in a certain way is an extraordinarily subtle kind of thing. So that is important.

The fourth type of thing is very, very new, probably, you know, within the last 2,000

years in the evolution of man. It has to do with the technique of informing somebody by telling them. When you tell somebody something, the odd thing is that you rip the knowledge out of context. You don't see the model doing it, you don't see what it's used for, you have no idea about the knowledge of results because there's no result. You just tell in a hope that somehow the person will find a vocation to which he can apply that knowledge. (Laughter) This troubles me very deeply. I don't propose at this point to provide an answer that needs funding by Sid Marland's office, but we will perhaps.

I do want to say just one last thing about this. Now, all these things having to do with learning, I suspect can be summarized by saying that what an individual does when he learns something is to build a model of the world in his head which he can spin just a little bit faster than the world goes so that he can anticipate, extrapolate and so on, and this takes a thin amount of courage. You put the pieces together. You see, the main thing about learning is that you've got to go beyond the information that's been given you. You've got to put it into a structure and extrapolate. You've got to find rules for going beyond that information.

The reason I bring up courage here, and early confidence is that the big difference you find between a kid who's lost his nerve because he thinks he can't get anywhere, as compared to a kid who thinks he's going somewhere, is the way in which they use information to extrapolate, to go beyond, and that's the early motivational type of thing.

Now, it doesn't do simply to talk about the fact that you—how do I say it—you respond, you peck or you solve an arithmetic problem and then there's a reinforcement and all is well. The reinforcements don't work that way because the main source of reinforcement for human beings are other human beings and they're notoriously unreliable. So it's very difficult to get behavior under control and the great fantasy of the Utopia that we all would like to bring to bear situation because it's so chaotic, turns out not to work very well.

This is a very brief lecture on the major obstacles, but I would like to mention one last thing. One of the things that troubles me more than anything, looking at the impact of poverty and the impact also of urbanization around the world, is something that I come increasingly to think of as condition helplessness. The fact, for example, that people begin to get the feeling that because of the complexity of events, they cannot help themselves. And I rather suspect that what we're going to have to do in breaking away from standard formula of the school is to give people opportunities earlier than when they get into real life, which means after medical school age—early in life—to do things where they get some sense of their own competence, where they avoid that feeling of helplessness. For that, you have to start early. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. As you can very easily tell, one would enjoy the opportunity to listen to any one of these individuals for a great length of time.

Let me go from that rather broad scale question to a very specific one which I will address to any member of the panel that would care to tackle it, and the question is this. Do women have any leadership role in education? (Laughter) Whichever is the most courageous can begin.

Mr. HOWE. It seems to me that since Walter Washington's wife is here that he should answer that question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, to be very frank, most of what I know about education I get from my wife. I think this is a fair question. I don't like to really react in a fashion that you just say, "Yeah, that's the case." I think that, as I approach it from the standpoint of Mayor in a city is that women have what I would call a fantastically great opportunity in this area to forge a kind of leadership that is exceedingly meaningful. My concern with it would be that you cut it off at education, because in my opinion, the role of a woman throughout the whole range of municipal affairs as I can identify them, particularly in the human resources area, that deal with health and deal with education and that deal with problems that are related to strengthening the whole person, I think in this area, I wouldn't want to extract it as a woman having a greater opportunity. I think there are fantastic opportunities there and I think they ought to be looked upon as equal to man, not any greater or any less. That's what I come out with.

Mr. DALY. Could I make a comment?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Daly?

Mr. DALY. I think in a very special context, one could say the answer is unfortunately yes, they do have a role. I'm referring specifically to the domination of the elementary school years and junior high years by female teachers in this country, which I think has led to a tremendous distortion of roles and values of men and women. I think one of the most hopeful aspects of the women's lib movement is possibly the liberation of men so that they feel that teaching a first or second grade is not unmasculine. (Applause)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Very good.

Mr. HOWE. Now, just a further comment on that. I do agree that women do tend to dominate elementary schooling, but I don't think they've been very successful at it. By this I mean that, if you look at the typical elementary school materials that present role models for women, you'll find that these are the old traditional nurses, housewives, the kinds of models that show up in the picture books that youngsters see in elementary school about what women do. And therefore, the elementary school tends to perpetuate just the things that the women's lib objects to. So I repeat my point that although women dominate it, they haven't controlled it in the interest of women.

Going beyond this, I think women get short-changed to a high degree, the higher they go in education. Quite a number of people have observed that the colleges and universities in the United States are designed for men and women are allowed to go to them, and that's about right. Particularly when you get to the graduate level, the whole scheme of reform in improving the quality of graduate education has to some degree been against the interest of women. There's been a tendency to feel that high quality graduate education is produced by full time attendance in graduate school, by residence requirements, by lack of flexibility of all kinds, and of course, these work against the life patterns of women who would like to have academic careers and get graduate degrees or whatever other careers may come out of graduate or professional degrees.

So I think there is plenty of room for women both to improve what they do as they dominate the elementary schools and to complain a lot about what goes on in the rest of the establishment. (Applause)

Mr. MARLAND. Do you want a report from Washington, Jack, or have you had enough of that?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Yes, sir. I think that would be most appropriate.

Mr. MARLAND. A very quick one. It may be useful to know that in the Office of Education over the past year, more than 50 per cent of our promotions of the upper grades—that means grade 13 and up to 18—have gone to women and that there are over 50 per cent from a much smaller base of women to make the promotions. And further, that fifteen women are now in policy-making positions that weren't there a year ago.

Mr. HOWE. You have Edith Green to encourage you. (Laughter)

Mr. MARLAND. She's a good model.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Bruner?

Dr. BRUNER. I just want to give a report from the laboratory on this one. (Laughter) We used to have a big thing about differences in learning patterns between boys and girls and how, therefore, we should move them in one direction and another. As we become more varied in our educational technique, it turns out that a great many of those so-called differences in learning were situational. They were things that we trap little boys into doing as masculine and little girls into doing as feminine. Possibly, if we take a long view of how it is that you share this enterprise called education, we might conceivably get to the point where the ladies, even if they are dominating at the elementary school level, would do better by virtue of the fact of being given fuller access to our educational resources.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you. To shift gears—

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, do any ladies want to complain?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Yes, I have a lot of complaints here.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I mean, one of the ladies might want to question further the fact that the answers haven't been adequate.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Well, there's still room for questions, if we can get through this stack of them. Let me move to a little different subject. I think all of us are aware—certainly, those of us in Texas at the moment, are aware of the recent *Surrano vs Priest* case in California, the Rodriguez case in Texas, decisions that have been made in Wyoming and most recently in New Jersey having to do with the property tax and the financial support of education.

The question, of course, is that at the present time there is in Texas a tremendous amount of activity on the part of several committees who are studying this problem and looking at ways to propose some kind of tentative solution.

Undoubtedly, this is going on in other States as well. Even in those States where perhaps decisions have not yet been made. The question and a number of questions relate to this, Mr. Commissioner and others—Is the Office of Education taking any stand at this particular moment in terms of any support or help it might give to states or to State Education Agencies in pursuit of some kind of clarification of these various decisions that are going on across the country?

Mr. MARLAND. Number one, we're taking the position that we—I'm not sure whether it's official Administration policy or not. We haven't had a reading on that. But as far as this Office of Education is concerned, we're applauding the action being taken by courts to find that it is no longer equitable to support schools with differences in dollars per child ranging within a given state from $450 to $1300 and call it equal educational opportunity. (Applause.)

We know this raises enormous problems for our system, enormous problems for our communities and states who reconcile this. The President is very much aware of this. People like Don Morrison and other leaders in education met with the President in early September to talk about this. In fact, the meeting was arranged well before Surrano occurred. By good fortune, Surrano had occurred by the time these leaders came together with the President and he learned more details of the Surrano conditions from their translations and also from the ugly evidence of the disaster of finances in our big cities. It was these things, I believe, that brought him to the position which he took last week in saying that we must change this.

He has set in motion, and my office has been at work now for—well, ever since September on developing alternative systems, and this gets back to the basic question, I believe; are we doing anything to help local communities and states get through this thing?

We had a number of alternative solutions to offer the Administration in terms of new delivery assistance. Our office has not been engaged in the consideration of alternative revenue systems. This rests with Treasury. The President has now invited the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations, a bipartisan group, to come into this whole problem and help look at alternative revenue systems. This is going forward very fast with a sense of urgency about it. My office at this moment stands ready to help in any way it can in terms of those cities that are now under the gun, not because we have any new money solution, but at least we have a variety of alternative theoretical models for consideration in overcoming the inequities of the local tax base.

We are eager champions of the proposition. The President, I believe, is going to move vigorously on it this year, and I think the signs are all good. Those of you who are already under court order, like California, Texas, Minnesota and New Jersey, all we can give at this time is assistance and council; no money. I hope that the money comes soon to get out of this mess.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you. Mr. Howe?

Mr. HOWE. I agree with Sid that the decisions of the California court and of other courts do represent progress even though they leave a completely unresolved situation in some states. In regard to the Federal exploration of alternative revenue systems, the suggestion that has been most widely leaked as a possibility has been the possibility of a value added tax, a Federal value added tax, which would in some fashion I don't think as yet defined, would produce a good deal of money that would then flow into the states and from the states into the local school districts to possibly replace that portion of the property tax that goes to education.

Those mechanisms are complex and will demand the kind of study Sid is talking about. What worries me about that particular suggestion is the nature of the value added tax itself. It's a highly regressive tax. It is in wide use in Europe. It has not been so much in use in this country, and it is, of course, really a sales tax.

To finance or attempt to finance our public schools by a tax which is much more heavily paid by people of modest and poor circumstances seems to me to be poor social policy. (Applause)

I think we need to examine that suggestion as it is refined very carefully.

Mr. MARLAND. Just a quick word, least that rest as the final analysis. The Administration is very much aware of the regressivity of the value added tax and does not at this point imply that it would be a universal application of every product in its developmental process of value added each step of the way, but products selected so as to have the minimal regressive aspect in terms of effecting low-income people.

And I think you should also know that even though Doc is quite right in saying that it has been noted with some affirmation as one of the possibilities to be considered, it is by no means the only possibility. It's one of a variety of alternatives that has not yet been really developed. But the regressive part of it is well known to the Administration and they would contain it in such a way as to try to minimize that feature, Doc.

Mr. HOWE. As long as they put it only on Cadillacs, I'll support it. (Laughter)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Pursuing that question for just a moment. One of the concerns of most local school boards, most local school administrators, has to do with even the possibility of increased Federal funding at a general level without a proportionately increased amount of Federal control and Federal regulation and Federal red tape. And I think those of us who are local administrators would have great concern about this, as we always have had. And I don't know that it calls for an answer. Perhaps it does.

Mr. MARLAND. All I can say is amen. I've been a local administrator 23 years longer than I've been a Federal administrator.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I don't think I made very many points on that. (Laughter).

Mr. MARLAND. The President said the same thing on Thursday that absolutely this must not in any way transgress the authorities and the responsibilities and the power of the local board of education.

Mr. DAVIDSON. All right. Let me shift gears one more time and——

Mr. HOWE. I'd like to make just a comment on that, if I might after Sid's last comment. I'm strongly in favor of local control and at the same time I'm aware that local control has created the right to have very good schools in some places and for other places to choose to have very bad schools at low cost.

That's a real problem. We should not so deify local control that we allow it to subject children to abuses. So I think there are reasonable roles for state government and indeed for Federal government in making sure that pupils at least get their rights and that most get a real opportunity for education. At the same time, I feel that local citizens need a good shot at control of their schools.

So I don't want to have this subject oversimplified in response to that question.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Any other comments on that item?

Mr. DALY. Briefly on the original question on the property tax suits. I think it's very hard for people who live or teach, as many teachers do, in the so-called fat cat districts; the ones who are going to lose by these various suits. But I think a very genuine concern of many of those people is not that they're reluctant to share the wealth of the better tax base that they have, but does it mean in each state that, let's say, the deprived districts are going to be brought up to the level of the best in that state, or does it mean that you're going to take from the wealthy districts, disburse it and create a general level of mediocrity? I think that is a genuine concern of many teachers in better off districts.

I'm very glad to hear Commissioner Marland's statement regarding the awareness of the Administration of the regressive nature of value added tax. I'm quite sure that my own organization would oppose that particular method of continuing to fund schools, because it would hit squarely at the very people we represent.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Since we're on financing, I want to ask the Commissioner if he'd react to what appears to be happening in many of the bond issues. You may have referred to it to a degree in the declining acceptance of bond issues to finance education, all of which is tied into the total financing picture. What do you believe: this is a loss of confidence in education? Do you feel that this is something that local governments themselves ought to take more aggressive posture on, or how do you come out of it?

Mr. MARLAND. I think that it's all of those things probably, Mayor Washington. I think that I would say that it is not a fundamental American mood that says that education can no longer serve and no longer be trusted and is no longer valued. I do not think it's that.

I think that there are many parts of our society who are sick and tired of taxes and about the only tax they can now control is the one they can vote on which is the board of education tax. And they drain off some of their tensions and anxieties and feelings of helplessness about taxes on the one that they can control; that and the sewer tax, generally.

You know, I just don't think that one can simplify it by saying people are tired of supporting education. They're tired of all taxes, and unfortunately, education is immediately within their influence to effect.

I think the larger issue is the one that we've been talking here about in the last few minutes and the one which the President cited last week. That the local property tax is no longer reliable in terms of supporting the needs of education. It's not there. And it has come to the point of confiscating the cost of education in America and has doubled the proportion of fifteen years ago to the gross national product. It moved from four per cent of the gross national product to eight per cent. It cannot go on forever. As much as I as one school teacher would like it to. The issue has to be that something has to stop in terms of the local tax rate. It appears now that it has to stop. It cannot afford any longer to support that from the housing of people. Therefore, a new and more equitable form and more efficiently collected form must be discovered.

I think that's why the bond issues have been steadily eroding in terms of their success.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Pursuing that question, are there any other comments?

Mr. HOWE. I think there's some lack of confidence in schools on the part of the general public that has something to do with this business of bond issues losing. It may not be deserved by the schools, but I believe it's there.

I think it's fashioned of the difficulties we've had in education, partly in colleges and universities, now in high schools, and schools have not conducted what might be called good public relations even though they may have, through these difficulties, learned how to do more for students.

I suspect that the publicity given to the facts of life about our failure with the 20 per cent of students that Sid has been talking about and that John Gardner talked about has not built confidence in the schools on the part of the general public who said, "Why give them more money when they can't teach the kids to read?" So that I guess we have a big job of education of the general public to do about the difficulty of the assignment we've taken on in trying to deal with the disadvantaged, and a confidence rebuilding job that isn't a short-order exercise but that will take some time.

I think we're about it. I think we've hit the bottom in American education and are on the way up.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Perhaps a little response to that. It occurs to me that while we have a great and abiding concern for the deficiencies in American public education, we by that very kind of concern spend a great deal of our time today talking about our own deficiencies, our own ineptitude, our own difficulties. And yet, I maintain at the same time that there is a tremendous amount of good going on in public education and that it probably is not wise strategy for us to constantly talk about our inequities, about our inefficiencies and our problems, that there needs to be a sense of balance between looking at those things we do well and being increasingly concerned about those things we do not do well.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I'd just like to introduce a subject. I alluded to it earlier though. It gnaws at me as a Mayor and I'd like to get a little reaction here. That is this one of using the schools in the afternoon and evening hours for community groups and children—this painful thing that you see of groups of children out in the street. Mrs. Johnson remembers how we moved through Washington trying to find some other things for them to do.

It grows out of this question of whether or not people are losing confidence in the schools and the fact that we're not really using them. Of course, it's even more painful when we realize that there are thousands of

children who are not in school at all or have dropped out for some reason or the other, which compounds the problem. But I wondered if anybody wanted to react to that.

Now, I know what's happening because in some cases and in some cities they're not even able to keep their schools open for the full terms, so you have a budgetary process. But when you go to a State Legislature or to a Congress to talk about more funds, better budgets and the implementation of certain programs, this inevitably gnaws at you. Why don't you really use the school plant to a greater degree? I don't know, maybe nobody else has a problem with it, but it's distressing to me.

Mr. MARLAND. Both as a school administrator, Mr. Mayor, and as a Commissioner of Education, I would say that there is great promise in the direction that you point, and it has many political aspects as well as educational aspects. While the year round school has been tested for at least 100 years here and there in the United States, it has generally collapsed because of lack of popular feeling or physical support.

I think it is now perhaps, and for different reasons, back in motion with some promise of general adoption. I think that your idea of the schools open throughout the evening, the late evening, the year round and open Saturdays and Sundays for a variety of community activities is sound and valid. The schools belong to the people. The uses are there for many, many things, ranging from auditoriums to shops, to laboratories, to the classrooms to everything else. They ought to be used.

But they should be used in what we would call the context of community schools. That's a situation where people like your office and the office of the Superintendent and various other agencies of government could come together and find ways creatively to find the means, including money, staff and leadership to use those schools but not think of them solely as places for formal education, but for concerts, for political meetings, for old folks to get together and meet and renew themselves in an environment beyond physical education and athletic activities.

All of us in education, I would say, have supported this proposition, but we can't go with it in terms of an education budget. It's a community issue and we would be strong companions to go with you on it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Would this be a component in your renewal strategy?

Mr. MARLAND. Yes, it definitely could be. It could be a very lively component of renewal.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Very good. One of the essential ingredients of any kind of changing American commitment in education has to focus, I think, on a changing pattern insofar as the urban areas are concerned. Mayor Washington has certainly alluded to problems that exist in the urban areas. In terms of the thrust of either the United States Office of Education, the thrust of various foundations who might be concerned with this, and for that matter, from the standpoint of teacher and professional organizations, what kinds of special emphasis are going to occur in the decade of the '70's to deal with the specific educational problems that exist in the urban areas? Where are we going on that one, what kinds of specific programs are we getting geared up to bring into being that are going to make a difference in the urban areas?

Mr. HOWE. Since no one seems to be starting, I'll start and speak in part about that. I think the first thing that has to be said is that realistically, you can't expect that the public schools of an urban area are going to do the whole job for that urban area. The urban problem is compounded of housing and transportation and schools and job opportunities and a whole mix of interrelated things, so that the solution to our cities, if there is a solution to make them healthier than they are, is a multi-faceted set of programs rather than a school program.

Within that context, I think that in the 1970's I point to two developments that I think ought to be given priority. One is Sid Marland's view about the need for new programs for the teachers in urban schools to help them get on top of their jobs. They've got the most difficult job in the whole education business, dealing with these concentrations of racial minority and poverty youngsters. They are tough to teach, they are tough to understand, they've got combinations of motivational problems, linguistic problems, deprived backgrounds, from families of various kinds which are complex and, as Sid points out, hunger problems. So that a teacher contending with that mix of difficulty built into a single youngster in a classroom has a need to have the chance to reconsider the tools at his command and learn to change his behavior and to experiment with new behaviors. I'd put that on a priority list as far as the school aspect of the urban problem is concerned.

Secondly, I think that particularly at the secondary school level, the high school level, there's a real need for institutional change. Our city high schools in New York where I happen to live, and also in many other cities, are in deep trouble.

The harassment of teachers, the lack of attention of pupils, the irrelevance of programs to the needs of pupils are all too well known to all of you.

I think the nature of the institution in the secondary school in the city is going to have to change radically, that many youngsters in the course of their secondary school years will have to find jobs, part time, going to school part time, that the school will have to learn to give credit for work on the job that the job will have to produce money in the pocket for the fifteen and sixteen year old youngster, that the rigid institution largely academic in nature insisting on young people being from 9:00 until 5:00 in typical rows in typical classrooms is a dead duck in the city as far as secondary school youngsters is concerned or as far as most of them are concerned.

So I see a real need for institutional change there. I know there are many other comments that could be made, but that would start this question off.

Mr. DAVIDSON. A good start. Mr. Daly?

Mr. DALY. I think one thing—I don't think the problems of the urban areas are going to be solved unless the people in the suburban areas want them to be solved. That's where the money is, that's where the power is. I think one thing that's got to be done is secondary schools, particularly, and I think it has to start in the schools of teacher education. I think you must teach teachers the means by which they can teach pupils why the problems of urban areas are their concern.

Most of the teachers we're turning out of schools of ed—or let's say, a large number of them—are going to teach suburban areas. I think one of the problems they face is that we say vaguely, "Well, yes, the problems of the urban areas of the inter-city are our problems." If you pin those teachers down and say, "Be specific. Why are they our problems?" they can't really sometimes give you a coherent answer.

I think we have to make that a matter of intellectual discipline. It has to be part, I think, a parcel of courses. It has to be something we address ourselves to particularly of being able to teach students why those problems are their problems. The problem we have now is a kind of vague sense that they will be told it's their problem by well-meaning teachers, but it all seems to come out as a kind of wish for brotherly love for their benighted brethren in the inter-city. They don't have any real concrete sense of how it affects them politically, socially and most of all, of course, economically. I think that's what we need is to reach the kids who will be the leaders in the suburban areas and their parents to do something about the problems in the inter-city.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Any other comment on that one?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, I just wanted to add one thing, since I did kick it off. I was referring to the problem in a different context. But I kind of look at this problem differently perhaps than the educator in a sense that ultimately all of the problems, however deficient or however effective they are, ultimately fall in my lap. So I have to look at the real issue which is not simply alone effective education but effective government, and it seems to me that it's our task to see that the education machinery which we have in a municipality or a state, really undergirds its basic purpose in promoting and developing viable educational patterns for children. That's what I want to leave in terms of the way I come out of it.

For instance, if the educational plant is bad, it doesn't matter whether it's in the suburbs or whether it's in the affluent part of town or the intercity. You're going to catch it down the line in terms of the totality of the urban problem and it's going to come out in many different ways, as it does. It can come out with higher delinquency, greater need for larger jails. It can come out 40 other ways, but until it is knit into the total pattern of effective government, I don't think that it can stand isolated and you make a thrust only in that area, except for purposes of analysis. First, as a functioning, it's got to go together.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Very good. Any other comments on that question? All right. Let's move then to one other aspect of the problem dealing with the urban areas, if you will, and that is that—and I think Doc Howe touched on it briefly—the whole question of how it is we go about the process of training teachers not for the future urban conditions, but to retrain those who are involved in the urban situation at the present time, and what kinds of facilities and what kinds of programs are perhaps going to be available in the early years of the '70's to deal with this problem, or is it strictly a local concern?

Mr. MARLAND. We do have something of a track record on this one that's worth taking quick note of. The Teacher Corps has now been in force as a result of the Administration leadership under President Johnson for about four years. The Teacher Corps, just to recall it quickly to you, is an opportunity for young people who have completed their baccalaureate degree in a traditional liberal arts setting to receive two years of intensive training at the cost of the government with a modest stipend during those years to get a Masters Degree but to get an intensive period of actual experience on the job in classrooms, and mostly to get around some of the traditional and not wholly effective, as we see them, conventions of education courses, but rather the reality of actual teaching under supervision and the background that they will have brought to this task in the first place from a liberal arts institution where they have generally excelled.

They discovered very late in their careers in college that they wanted to teach. Well, the Teacher Corps capitalizes upon that will, upon that social concern and upon the competence of such people who have decided they want to turn their energies to the help of the poor, not just to become a teacher in a more secure and perhaps cleaner situation.

Therefore, you have a breed of teachers selecting themselves in a way, having intensive training in institutions that have now been established and I think we have 21 around the country. One of them is headed by your speaker this morning, Secretary

Cohen. There are a number of such institutions training such teachers.

The interesting part of it, according to the reports I get, is not only how these institutions develop these teachers well for the inter-cities where they're now teaching, but the presence of these young people in colleges of education have changed those institutions because of their expectations for those institutions, which is probably good.

I have one final thought. The retention rate in terms of people in the Teachers Corps working in the inter-city is unbelievably high. I wouldn't attempt to give you quick quotes on the figures, but they're something like 85 or 90 per cent, while the typical turnover rate in the first two or three years of teaching at around 50 per cent.

Mr. WASHINGTON. You called on me and my wife for the other question. I want you to know that she inaugurated the first Teacher Corps program in our city at the time, of course that President Johnson was at the White House.

Mr. HOWE. Let me make a brief comment on this question. I think Sid's view is very helpful. I agree with it. I think there's something beyond this.

I was in Israel last week and talking with them about the reform of their education system, and one of the practices of teachers that they were criticizing and looking and seeking to change was what they called frontal teaching. This is what we are doing to you. It's essentially boring. It's an arrangement in which the teacher stands in the front of the room, dominates the situation, tries to capture the interest of the entire class, at the same time the class being seated in neat rows. Frontal teaching is entirely too characteristic of too much teaching that goes on in the schools. I think that the teacher retraining processes that we need to think about will have to help teachers figure out how to get out of that didactic lecturing role that we're in, unfortunately, and get into the posture of being associated with students in exploring learning of being diagnosticians of the student's problem over the learning process.

There are some rather hopeful endeavors in regard to this that are being tried experimentally in the United States now, and I suspect they might be expanded. They do require real changes in the teacher's behavior and this isn't easy for all teachers. I won't try to elaborate on that. But I think that that type of change in behavior that I've outlined is important to try to bring about in these new teacher training processes.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Very good. Thank you, Mr. Howe. Gentlemen, at this time, I think it would be appropriate to bring our panel discussion to a close. I apologize to those in the audience for being unable, of course, to get to all of your questions. I think you can see we did get to a number of them.

If I might take a minute or so to very briefly state two or three trends that seem to run through much of the discussion this afternoon.

One would certainly be the need for a coalition of concerns that seem to involve education in schools at almost every turn, and the merging of the resources of a community and the resources of a city to go with education as you try to find ways to meet a real changing commitment.

And I think it would be appropriate also to express, on the part of all of the audience, our appreciation to this panel for its fine presentation this afternoon. (Applause.)

Mr. MIDDLETON. We do, indeed, thank all of you very much. We will assemble again tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock in this same auditorium. We hope all of you will be with us then. Thank you very much for being with us today.

MORNING SESSION—JANUARY 25, 1972

(The Symposium reconvened, pursuant to recess on January 24, 1972.)

Mr. MIDDLETON. Good morning. We have heard some expressions of disappointment that the panel discussion yesterday had to end before all the questions from the audience could be considered and answered. I share that disappointment.

It is our hope that the proceedings of this Symposium, the prepared papers and the panel discussions will be published and given wide dissemination. I think it would be good to include in that published version, if we can, those questions which did not get a hearing and their answers.

Dr. Davidson, the Moderator of yesterday afternoon's session, is going to compile them, and send them off to the panelists for answers. This will probably come as a surprise to the panelists who thought their work was already done. (Laughter)

We will do the same thing for this morning's panel. If the panel does not have time to consider all the questions from the audience, we will get those answers later and include them in the published report of this Symposium.

The program for this Symposium was planned and organized by a most distinguished committee. It was my privilege to work with that committee. We had the benefit of advice from two former Assistants to President Johnson on the White House Staff, Douglas Cater and Larry Levinson.

On the committee was Mr. Robert Hardesty, also a former White House Staff member and now Special Assistant to the former President.

The other members of the committee are from the University and were appointed by Dr. Spurr. They are Dr. Peter Flawn, Professor of Geological Sciences and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Alexander Clark, Professor of Sociology and Associate Dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs; Dr. James B. Roach, Professor of Government, Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences and Dean of Interdisciplinary Study; Dr. Americo Paredes, Professor of English and Anthropology and Director of the Center for Mexican-American Studies; Dr. Lorrin Kennamer, Dean of the College of Education, who will be part of the proceedings this morning.

This committee was chaired and most effectively chaired by Professor Elspeth Rostow. I'm going to call upon Mrs. Rostow now to introduce this morning's program. (Applause)

Mrs. ELSPETH ROSTOW. President and Mrs. Johnson, colleagues and friends. I'm here at the beginning of the session on higher education and it's appropriate, I think, to consider for a moment what has happened to the role of the college president.

In the time that I have been teaching in universities which is over a third of a century, extraordinary things have happened, for example, to the names of college presidents. I grew up in the shadow of a man who rejoiced in the name of Nicholas Murray Butler. Nowadays, college presidents sometimes don't last long enough in office to say Nicholas Murray Butler. (Laughter)

Instead of having such a resumate title, we now have presidents with names like Bach and Spurr and Yitch. (Laughter) This is obviously a movement in the direction of functionalism and I think we can all applaud it. In fact, I would go a bit further and say a word about the functional approach to college presidents.

In the past, we could have ministers and these indeed, in early America, were the prototype college president. We could have philosophers. Nowadays, both Harvard and Yale have lawyers—and they need them. In other areas, we have as we have here an ecologist and we're delighted to have him. But it is inevitable that a psychologist should be named as a president of a college because what other talents are needed but those of the trained, clinical, experimental what-have-you psychologist.

So the change in name, the change in function brings us to our main speaker this morning, who was once a colleague of mine at MIT when we were both junior members of the faculty—he is an old friend—and who has a career which is symptomatic of the upward trend, I would say, in college presidents.

Trained first at Fordham where he received his degree in 1947 and then receiving both the A.M. and the Ph. D at Harvard in psychology, he worked within the Lincoln Lab in Cambridge. He also was at Harvard and at MIT in the Psychology Department there learning the interdisciplinary lessons that a psychologist learns in an institute of technology.

MIT, by the way, in terms of names, chose a while back a president with the name of Howard Johnson. It turned out to be the wrong Johnson. (Laughter) But the change within both these major universities is admirably summarized in the emerging significance of what he has referred to as the "new breed of college administrators," of which President William McGill is so admirable an illustration.

Having served in the Cambridge community down to the period in which he was a full professor, he moved to Columbia where in time he headed the Department of Psychology in that institution.

So then, Professor McGill learned from the point of view of a member of the faculty the problems that a college administrator must know.

Moving to California in 1965, he was just in time for the troubles of the West Coast. And able to cope with the variety of problems and the variety of encounter that the modern university exhibits, he early earned the reputation of not only a man who could listen, which is one of the essentials of a college administrator, who could talk effectively and who could deal with the varieties of colleagues with whom he must associate; the student population, the faculty, the external boards that relate to universities, the general public. And as Chancellor in the campus at La Jolla, he earned a national reputation of a new soft-spoken, tough, competent and highly effective administrator.

It was no accident then, that when Columbia needed the very best direction that it could have, it turned to its own former professor, its own now tested administrator, its own—if you will, its own in-house expert and brought him back from the West Coast to be president of that remarkable institution, Columbia University.

So we are indeed privileged this morning to have with us and to open our discussion of higher education, Professor at one time, now President, earlier Chancellor William McGill of Columbia University. (Applause.)

Educating a nation: The changing American commitment

Mr. WILLIAM J. MCGILL. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, distinguished colleagues on the panel, fellow academics. This is an interesting experience for me. As you can see, I was once an honest academic. This is my first opportunity to return to Austin in the role of academic statesman. I think it was Mr. Truman who defined the statesman as a "dead politician." (Laughter.)

My friends on the faculty here told me yesterday that an academic statesman is a dead duck in this generation.

The view of American higher education from the ramparts on Morningside Heights in New York City is understandably limited. We find ourselves so totally preoccupied with Columbia's manifold and near-at-hand concerns that our vision of the processes at work in the larger society might be said to be defective.

We are, after all, a large, ancient, eminent,

and rather cantankerous private educational institution set down in the midst of a large, ancient, eminent and very cantankerous American city at a difficult time in history. Perhaps our problems reflect too much of the inner life of Columbia University in unique and special ways not applicable elsewhere.

I do not believe it. Our tensions may be more pressing and perhaps more complex than those felt at other American universities, but they appear to me to be no different. We are confronted by an array of powerful concern reflecting, we think, nothing less than the nature of American life in this generation.

As we address ourselves to the realities of our operation and seek to master our difficulties, we are undergoing an experience that is probably prototypical of university life elsewhere in the country.

Whereas critics, viewing us from a safe distance, were prone once to say, "It can't happen here," all such naivete is behind us now. The perils and ordeals of Columbia University are seen increasingly to be rather faithful reflections of profound tensions in American society itself.

I want to talk about these matters this morning, about the problems facing Columbia University, about the challenges posed by American life in the 1970's. It is perhaps strange that I should want to do this. College presidents are notorious oil merchants. Ordinarily they seek to spread a soft, lubricating ooze over every controversial topic they address.

Moreover, in the years before 1968, Columbia considered itself to be a creature apart from the special problems of our city and our society. The University's special vantage point was the world itself.

Parochial accidents of time and geography were not viewed as central to our affairs. If I were to come before you now in that ancient Columbia presidential style, I would observe that while other universities might conceivably be filled with conflict generated by claims that they are racist and sexist, dominated by the military and dabbling in the irrelevant pursuits of an elite privileged class, we at Columbia are quite unaffected by such ferment. I would say that Columbia tries to stand above trivial conflict and that our primary concern must be the future of NATO in relation to the Soviet power block.

It seems to me that the President of Columbia used to talk like that. I shall attempt this morning to spare you such imitations of the grand Butler style. He could do it majestically and I cannot.

Instead I shall dwell on what I take to be the central problems of our times as viewed from Columbia's peculiar academic perspective.

I shall also try to do you the courtesy of a straightforward and realistic analysis of what we seem now to be confronting at Columbia. Out of this analysis will come a set of basic questions about the future of universities. Finally, I shall try to make a number of suggestions as to procedures or mechanisms for dealing with these questions.

I will offer no solutions. Our problems are much too complex to tolerate simplistic answers. What we need most of all in this troublesome time is an adequate formulation of the critical issues facing us so that we can begin to determine what we need to know and what we need to do in order to be able to propose solutions.

There was a time less than 25 years ago when Columbia University did not need to speak about its problems. We had our splendid endowment for cushioning most of our financial needs. We also possessed our location in New York City with all its literary, intellectual and cultural attractions.

This made it easy for us to attract a student body and a faculty of the highest order of excellence simply because they wanted to breathe the bracing air of the big league metropolis.

I do not need to detail the transformations that have occurred in this rosy picture during the last two and a half decades. The rigors of modern American life in the urban setting are now quite familiar, and New York seems to suffer from a concentration of all of the afflictions of urban America.

Students and faculty live around the campus in buildings that are old and run down. Our circumstances are somewhat, I think, reflective of a new form of America's pioneer spirit. And, of course, everywhere around us there is a pervasive fear for physical safety.

Such difficulties have hurt the University, but strangely enough that hurt seems not to be critical. The human spirit adjusts very quickly to the governing requirements of nearly any environment. Moreover, our new life style has proved to be selectively attractive to extremely fine and idealistically motivated young people who want to understand the problems of America and who come to us to learn what it is all about. New York is no longer the golden city it was a quarter century ago, but it is still pulsing with all of the energy of life itself, and it is still the place where the cross currents of America flow together and boil. Students continue to come to Columbia because the Columbia education still stands for something and still opens countless doors.

Our once comfortable endowment is another matter. Two decades of inflation and technological growth have put Columbia in a situation in which for the last six years and for at least another year immediately ahead of us, we have had to face and will face large annual operating deficits.

No institution is sufficiently well endowed to stand up against that kind of strain indefinitely. What concerns us most is the growing body of evidence suggesting that not just Columbia but many large universities, private and public, may now have moved beyond the traditional mechanisms which society has used heretofore to finance them.

It is not yet unambiguously clear that this conclusion follows, but much of the available evidence suggests it. Since 1965 Columbia has been increasing its tuition regularly and has been increasingly effective in raising both private and public funds. Yet during this period we have found ourselves sinking more and more deeply into fiscal trouble.

We are, to put the mater in simple terms, living in austerity and attempting to develop better management. Using the methods currently available to us, we have a very good chance of achieving a short-term recovery in easy stages before 1975.

But the impression grows upon us that we shall soon be confronted again with a renewed drift into operating deficit. As it now appears to us, the problems that we are experiencing pervade all of American higher education and must be solved eventually by discovering new ways to finance universities. Inflation and technological growth seem to have bypassed and outmoded the traditional methods devised for the support of large universities.

Columbia is fortunate enough to have substantial resources and we appear to have enough time to be able to work out solutions. Regretfully, many other private colleges and universities will not have enough time, and a period of intense travail just ahead of us may produce changes of the most serious sort in the private sector of American higher education.

It is perhaps fitting that we begin our analysis of the problems of higher education by stressing financial difficulties. We have also been living through an era of intense world-wide social unrest. In the 1960's a new and powerful indigenous American radicalism began to grow among students on our university campuses. University administrators of my generation might thus be expected to stress the relation between this era of student unrest and our growing financial difficulties. The temporal linkage between unrest and fiscal crisis leads immediately to the speculation that these problems are somehow casually related.

Many of our critics have concluded that support for public and private institutions is diminishing as society at large reacts to political and emotional excesses visible on campus during the last decade. There is no doubt that some kind of public reactivity to campus disorders exists, but it appears to me that our financial difficulties are far more serious and far more deeply rooted.

The root of Columbia's troubles seems to be the large scale and rapid expansion stimulated by Federal policy in the middle 1950's in response to Soviet technological advances. Vast resources were poured into universities for the development of graduate and professional programs and for the physical facilities necessary to support such expansion.

In theory, the expansion was intended to be self-supporting, but new buildings, research centers, computer facilities and a variety of other modes of physical expansion have produced requirements for support and maintenance that have continuously inflated our operating costs.

By 1970, Columbia had expanded in this fashion for more than two decades and we were obliged to do it. Any other course would have quickly relegated us to the status of a second class university because the influx of Federal funds immediately set off competition for top quality faculty and students.

There is a simple economic law governing academic excellence and the operation of the law decrees that the best faculty and students go where the resources are available. The rapid growth in size and prestige of several large public universities during the last fifteen years illustrates this law in operation. Columbia could no more shut itself off from Federally stimulated growth in graduate and professional education than it could consider shutting itself away from the possibility of continuing as a major force in higher education.

Beginning approximately in 1968, the pressure for such Federal growth began to level off and then to decline. In the meantime, inflation of our operating costs had begun to force us into the red. The Federal pullback left us with a variety of programs in science. engineering, medicine, social science and language training which we had started with Federal aid and were now obliged to fund from our own resources.

Accordingly, by 1969, Columbia had slipped heavily into the red and was seeking urgently to devise ways to contract the University while dealing simultaneously with pressures coming from a powerful and widespread academic unrest.

Many of the pressures that our students felt less than five years ago seem now to have been translated successfully into society at large. Ferment and social change are enveloping the entire Western world. Problems first encountered on American university campuses have found their way into such orderly and hierarchical institutions as the United States Army, the Federal bureaucracy and the Catholic Church. As turmoil has grown in these institutions it has appeared to diminish on campus. Students seem once more to be intellectualizing the inadequacies of universities, seeing our problems in less parochial and less personal terms. There is no easy explanation for this phenomenon. Perhaps as society itself has become more troubled, students have seen the campus as less involved in the substance of social change and thus less relevant as a testing ground.

I'm seeking to make the argument that Columbia's current fiscal problems do not derive substantially from student activism

or unrest. Instead it seems to me that financial difficulty and student unrest are both consequences of the great expansion of universities with the growth of mass technology in the USA. We have been forced by the nature of our lives to keep pace with the growth of technological societies elsewhere in the world in order to insure our national survival.

The stimulation of academic growth was clear public policy during the decade prior to 1968. Now we are trying to deal with the aftermath of that expansion and it is not clear to us at this time what our public policy is or what it ought to be. There is a feeling among businessmen and legislators that education has been allowed to expand on too broad a basis and that the nation is no longer willing to foot the bill.

In 1970, it was apparent that Columbia was overexpanded and that a combination of new resources and expenditure cut-backs would be necessary to deal with our fiscal woes. Although Columbia had grown for two decades, we were unable to devise a simple strategy for contraction that would bring us back quickly to stability.

Certainly it cannot be achieved by spinning off one or more schools or divisions of the University. Savings generated from such a contemplated spin-off would be largely negated by attendant loss of income and by legal and other complications involved in reaching agreeable settlements with the faculty of schools marked for discontinuance.

What little experience we had had with such problems suggests that they solidify the entire faculty in opposition to proposed moves and they generate a spirit typical of labor-management conflict rather than the cooperative form of governance that we have tried to develop in universities.

Real savings, our analysis showed, could be achieved at Columbia only by shutting down large physical facilities, which in view of the space limitations already imposed by our urban location, would make it virtually impossible for us to operate. Even more important in our analysis was the fact that while several of the university's academic subdivisions were operating in the red, those generating our most serious money problems were absolutely central to the university's intellectual activities. Their plight seemed to reflect the fact that we had made major commitments to student financial aid just as Federal agencies began to withdraw from underwriting such aid.

All signs pointed to the conclusion that the major portion of the University's deficit was concentrated in its central operating costs. In 1965 when Columbia's budget was last in balance, central costs—those are costs of administration, the operation of libraries, student aid, the operation of the computer center, buildings and grounds costs—were approximately $15 million. Our endowment and other income earmarked for such general purposes was very nearly the same and the budget was in balance.

By 1970, Columbia's central costs had climbed to $31 million while the general purpose income available to meet these needs was very close still to $15 million. Thus the origin of our 1970–71 operating deficit of $16 million is really not difficult to identify.

The interesting point in these findings is that they pinpoint the University's central operating costs as critically involved in the deficits we have been experiencing in recent years.

Many observers seem to believe that high faculty salaries form the root of our money problems. It is certainly true that faculty salaries are seriously implicated in our costs. Full time faculty compensation accounts for over 70 percent of our tuition income and rising salary costs have been counterbalanced at Columbia by rising tuition charges.

In 1965, tuition at Columbia College was $1,900. Today it is $2,800 per year. It is apparent that we are now approaching a decisive stage in this sensitive area. It is a stage that will certainly place great stress upon families supporting students at Columbia University and may possibly even lead to serious resistance. It seems clear that our annual tuition charges are now already so high that they cannot be raised much further without making the College inaccessible to all but the very rich and the very poor.

Accordingly, we cannot look forward to the prospect of continuing to finance additional increases in faculty compensation as we have in the past. This opens the possibility that I cited earlier that whatever the potential success of our current efforts at controlling costs, we are likely to drift back into even more serious money problems in the years immediately ahead as inflationary pressures generated by an expanding economy force continued escalation of this salary-tuition cycle.

It is very difficult to see how to extract ourselves from the cycle at Columbia because faculty salaries are given for professional services. Increased wages in segments of the economy that are tied to productivity tend to force up compensation for professional services without attendant increases in productivity. If you don't believe me, just look at your own medical bills.

The same processes seem to be at work in public universities. In the latter, of course, the actual cost of education is borne by state tax revenues rather than by tuition, but the pattern of rising costs described as characteristic of Columbia seems to me to be equally applicable to the University of California, to SUNY, CUNY and other state universities.

Public universities are adjuncts of state educational systems and are required to pass the annual scrutiny of state legislatures; hence, such universities are much better managed than Columbia. Despite their good management, they are nevertheless afflicted with the same pattern of problems that we see.

I am sure that during the next several years you will see widespread efforts among private universities to develop extended payment tuition plans in which students will borrow the money necessary to pay education costs by mortgaging their future income over a 20 to 30 year period.

If fixed loan obligations are involved, such repayment plans would not be difficult to develop in a form attractive to third party lenders. Up to this point, the schemes have not been especially attractive to students, but many signs now indicate that attitudes are changing, at least among students in our professional schools.

We might then look for increases in the dollar value of education as borne by our students. The idea of annual tuition may gradually disappear and be replaced by alumni-taxation schemes in which university alumni repay their alma mater over a 20 to 30 year period for the costs of educational benefits received during a concentrated experience early in life.

There is an evident need for serious and immediate experimentation with such long-term repayment plans. They will have a profound impact on university fund raising and alumni relations. They will also obviously have a very serious impact on the funding of public universities.

We ought to begin to face it and discuss it. Patterns of philanthropy supporting private institutions are clearly changing with changes in society and in the tax laws. It is not at all obvious that young alumni will want to continue to support alma mater in the style established by earlier generations. Even these generations have never been especially successful in establishing voluntary giving as a vehicle for support of private universities. There are some notable exceptions, but national experience indicates that only about 20 per cent of university alumni now participate in such efforts. We need new principles and we need them in a hurry.

Even with the potential development of long-term repayment formulas, it appears to me that sensible long-term solutions for Columbia must also involve new forms of Federal and state subsidy assisting us in defraying our heavy central costs and simultaneously meeting the expensive requirements of technological education serving the public interest.

Some states are now beginning to take over the full cost of medical, dental, nursing and public health education in private institutions. There are increasing signs that we are also moving toward a new era of Federal institutional aid.

Columbia has, of course, been receiving substantial amounts of Federal money for at least the last two decades. Such support has been concentrated primarily on the funding of individual or departmental research programs and on student aid.

These earlier Federal policies have the effect of greatly enhancing the quality of American graduate education and skills of American scientists. There is, in fact, no higher standard of quality anywhere in the world. But seen from the vantage point of the central administration of Columbia University, such public policies have had the effect of systematically expanding our university and increasing the burden of central costs which the administration must bear.

Recent efforts in the Congress have been directed at providing new programs of institutional aid for universities to help us with our central costs. The Higher Education Act is now pending before both the Senate and the House have slightly divergent thrusts, but each envisions a new form of Federal aid to universities carried piggyback on grants to needy or disadvantaged students. It is not pleasant for me to acknowledge that with such prospects Columbia University is no longer, in all respects, an independent private university. Our access to Federal and state resources depends on our willingness to comply with public policy and to provide a level of accountability not practiced or even envisoned heretofore at Columbia.

It will force administrative growth when most of us are seeking administration contraction. We must somehow find the right nature of Columbia's traditional excellence with a new found responsiveness to public need and public service that will qualify us for new forms of Federal aid on which our survival depends.

The foregoing is an effort to provide—it's to provide a simple accounting of the depth and character of the financial problems at Columbia and to relate them to the problems of American society. It seems clear that our problems are far too complex to be consistent with the theory of public disavowal due to student unrest or with the view that Columbia's deficits are due to local and parochial mismanagement. Elements of both theories are obviously applicable to us, but it seems evident that at Columbia as elsewhere, the growing financial dilemma reflects the growing complexity of our American society in an era of mass technology and that it will not go away.

Our burdens have increased as it has become clear that educational status and earned degrees are linked with status in society. During the last 25 years, knowledge has grown and compartmentalized at an almost terrifying rate. Moreover, we are a society unusually taken up with credentials, in many respects less interested in real achievement than in pieces of paper certifying achievement.

American education now offers more than 1500 different degrees. A good many of these are incorporated into state certification programs and as such provide avenues of occupational entry jealously guarded by the professionals.

Students who want to succeed in the complex society we have built feel that they must go to college whether they want to or not. Many of these young people have no particular interest or drive toward learning. It is estimated that perhaps as many as one fifth to one quarter of our undergraduate students are enrolled in college as a grudging concession to expectations of parents and the demands of a system which they resent. Nearly half the students who enroll in colleges drop out before they earn a degree.

It is also apparent that the difficulty of graduate and professional education has gradually lengthened the time necessarily spent in schooling. That time increases remorselessly decade by decade. Our colleges adapt very slowly to the accumulation of knowledge, tending to pyramid requirements rather than to rethink the entire educational process.

Moreover, businesses and professions have themselves solidified the credentialing system by the insisting on degrees as job qualifications. This practice is not necessarily justified by the nature of modern business and modern professional activities. Indeed, it seems plain that much of the required basic skills and knowledge can be acquired more readily through on-the-job training.

Thus what is involved is the acquisition of a credential qualifying a young man for entry into an occupation rather than a skill necessary for performance. Our society has come to expect its colleges and universities to perform such screening.

I'm speaking of the well known rat race for grades and degrees which has shorn away much of the attractiveness that once surrounded the intellectual life. A good deal of the unrest that we have been encountering during the last decade seems to me to be traceable to this unnecessarily complex and overly professionalized educational system. American students have tended to blame their frustrations on racism and war, but the same dissatisfaction exists in Japan where there is no Vietnamese agony and where very little racial tension affects the life of the university. There is, however, the same explosion of knowledge and the same competitive struggle for careers.

It seems to me that these problems, whatever the students might now be saying about them, derive from the sheer weight of higher education in a mass technology. The signs of strain on our student body are clear enough.

During the last decade we have witnessed the growth of a campus-based counter culture whose life style and values are placed in romantic and mystical opposition to the evils of the system. Somehow America's occupational credentialing system and the counter culture must be seen as standing in simple relation to one another.

As knowledge continues to grow at a dizzing pace, it seems clear to me that the next decade will be a critical one. We must find ways to crack tradition-bound undergraduate curricula and to discover new ways of interesting new generations of students in the beauties of reason.

We have not yet found practical ways to formulate a college education that is shorter in duration, more relevant to modern society and at the same time reflective of Columbia's high standards of excellence. Effective new methods are hard to find and short cuts are not easy; hence, as knowledge grows education is bound to become more difficult unless we are willing to sacrifice excellence and we are not.

With these major educational difficulties posed by the relentless expansion of knowledge, it is clear that we are desperately in need of educational reform. What is not clear to us at present is the form and character of the changes we should be introducing. If such problems are serious for typical undergraduates, consider how monumental they are for economically and educationally disadvantaged minorities who come to us with the need to surmount not only our inadequacies but also the effects of extremely weak primary and secondary educations in ghetto schools.

As I have indicated, Columbia is struggling and has been struggling during recent years to preserve its standards of excellence in mounting austerity and budgetary deficits while searching for a solution for such problems. Under these conditions it is difficult to develop either the time or the resources necessary to plan experimental programs or innovative efforts.

At Columbia much of the support in such areas of searching has come from foundations and we have experienced only marginal success. Foundations are typically and understandably mindful of the limitations on their own resources. Funds are given to us as seed money in order to test new ideas and to get new educational projects started, but we are expected to absorb and eventually sustain such programs with our own resources.

The approach served us well during two decades of academic expansion, but as we have begun to contract, seed money is no longer useful to us. The highly competitive style of a large and diverse educational institution like Columbia cannot easily foster educational innovations during times of budgetary stress. There is too much risk of dribbling away the central core of our excellence. So we must make decisions on priorities, what is new, what is innovative, what is experimental tends to be postponed.

It is becoming clear to me that we must begin to look to the Federal Government for new funds supporting undergraduate teaching and curriculum innovation.

In all my recent talks with administrative officials in Washington, I find increasing stress on the need to innovate, to abandon traditional educational programs and ritualistic course requirements. I am told that the educational establishment has become overcomplicated and bogged down in poor management.

Federal money will be going to those who are willing to change. It thus appears to me that we are in danger of slipping into an era in which there is diminishing effective contact between universities and the Federal Government in the development of enlightened educational policy. As a consequence, we face what might be called coercive reform in which policies are imposed upon us under threat of loss of Federal support.

I realize that Washington has its own money problems and its own funding priorities, but in all honesty, I do not know how to achieve effective educational reform at Columbia where every professor is and should be a little principality, unless we can experiment with a variety of ideas and discard what is worthless.

Demands for large scale change in universities without providing the practical means for accomplishing such change can easily degenerate into useless bickering in which achievable reforms are deemed insufficiently radical to merit Federal support. We must not allow this to happen. Our situation is too precarious.

I have been stressing the array of critical financial and academic problems confronting Columbia. In so doing, I am working from the conviction that our difficulties are rather typical of the state of American higher education in this troubled era.

I stress problems rather than achievements because our problems are not especially remarkable, but they help to point the directions of the future. Many of our problems seem to derive from contradictory trends in our national life which now have placed exceptional stress on universities.

Contradictory tendencies are characteristic of any diverse and complex social order whose orientation is pragmatic rather than ideologically rigorous, and we experience such contradictions everywhere in America today. They are part of the vitality and strength of our society.

Thus conflict btween specialization and innovation, between traditional excellence and broadened educational opportunity, between pressures for continued growth and pressures for survival should not be viewed at all as signs of educational decline, but as the problems we have to solve in our generation. One of the most important consequences of our growing fiscal and academic dilemmas is that we are now seeking solutions via new organizational forms.

In one sense Columbia University is too large and in a different sense it is too small. We constitute some sixteen different and partially overlapping schools. Each one of these schools has its own history, its traditions, its problems and its unique relations to the rest of the University.

The task of administering Columbia inevitably produces a severe case of information overload in the President's office. The requirements of modern operation generated by tight budgets and increased demand for management data enforce a much greater degree of centralization in administration than suits the taste of an academic community. An action which seems perfectly reasonable at the level of one of Columbia's schools now needs to be cleared with the central administration and such clearance results in delay and frustration. In this sense, Columbia is too large.

On the other hand, the extraordinary growth of knowledge during the last 25 years has produced powerful pressures for further growth within the University. Academic disciplines such as molecular biology, solid state physics and information science were virtually nonexistent 25 years ago.

Now, no university can call itself competent unless some of these activities are represented in strength. But neither can any university hope to address itself to the full range of human knowledge in the 1970's. In this sense, Columbia University is too small.

What pattern or distribution of department sizes should Columbia seek to achieve in order to maintain its level of excellence within the constraints now posed by our budgetary and physical resources? Shall we follow the model of superscale academic departments as set down by Berkeley, or shall we have small elite departments as at Johns Hopkins, or perhaps something in between?

We need to decide because there is no other way to prevent the University from growing continuously in scale. We need to make such decisions with extraordinary wisdom because it is now clear that our potential for growth has far outstripped our resources. It will force us occasionally to gamble on the future and to rely much more heavily than before on the resources of nearby institutions.

I see such limitations, as I said, of new constraints that will force most of us into regional planning simply because no university can hope or afford to deal simultaneously with the full scope of modern knowledge and equally with all the rigors posed by the financial consequences of modern operation.

Such conflicting constraints are driving both public and private universities in the Greater New York area into regional cooperation. The City University, having undertaken its courageous step toward open admissions, now has many more students and no place to put them. Private universities in the New York area, on the other hand, have seen their student population dropping off with open admissions in the City University, thus they have space and need students. Isn't there some way in which we can all get together?

Columbia, at least for the present, has not

experienced the dropoff in its student enrollment. Because of the unique urban pressures having to do with our location on the upper West Side of Manhattan, we are still very overcrowded. Thus, we are unlikely to be able to participate in the prospective benefits of a space-student exchange.

On the other hand, we maintain a large number of major professional schools. Evidently, they operate in the public interest and we are deeply concerned about the plans of city and state universities for construction of schools in the same professional areas in nearby locations. We are thus driven into regional planning by the need to protect Columbia's professional activities from competitive pressure developing in the public sector.

Whatever the reason, regional planning is now going on vigorously in New York under the direction of the State Education Department. I have also approached a number of my colleagues in the Ivy League looking for interest in a cooperative library policy. Why should every library stock every journal if we can develop an interuniversity borrowing system?

I am equally anxious to see whether a group of institutions of comparable quality might be able to help one another in adjusting to new limitations on the size of departments and schools posed by our fiscal and physical constraints. Might it not be possible to construct patterns of professional schools and patterns of graduate specialties so that they compliment one another rather than compete with one another?

It is conceivable that we are moving towards a super university called "Ivy," one or two decades in the future. We at Columbia are attempting to develop and encourage ideas directed toward studying such future forms of organization. We have found our sister institutions both in the New York area and in the Ivy League extremely receptive to such probes. It is a remarkable departure from the climate of cutthroat competition experienced only a little more than a decade ago.

There is no history of prior success in regional planning on which to draw at the present time. We have not yet developed sufficient experience to enable us to identify the incentive that will make such programs work. Large state university systems such as California, Wisconsin and New York offer the most obvious vehicle for regional planning, but to the best of my knowledge they have not done very well either.

Evidently much important work lies ahead of us. Thus we move into the 1970's with great financial and academic problems and with only the rudiments of newly devised organizational efforts to guide us.

Pressures for growth and powerful national currents of social change continuously add to our burdens. How then do we find our way in this decade which promises to be so decisive for determining the future of higher education in this country?

One of the major lessons to be derived from the formidable problems confronting Columbia and indeed all of us is that we must begin to construct new ways to plan our future. We seem now to be operating in a planning vacuum. At Columbia the onslaught of contemporary events and of overpowering fiscal problems have so preoccupied our academic community with fending off disaster day by day that we have had very little time to discuss serious problems at leisure or to plan our future.

It once was the case that the president of the University spent all of his time on planning. Now I deal daily with conflicts between the University and its surrounding community, with disputes over space and next year's budget, with minority students, with powerful pressures from women's groups, with worried and turned off alumni. There is scarcely any time left over to answer my mail, much less to plan the future.

The problem is not just Columbia's. The national Administration has told us all to reform and has set up its own budgetary planning so as to press for change, but there is no current vehicle of intimate contact between the Administration and universities that will enable us to work out commonly accepted plans and guidelines so desperately needed to develop the new modes of Federal support for higher education.

The growing economic competition, even from friendly nations tells us clearly what is in prospect for America if our once eminent technological and scientific educational establishment is allowed to languish for lack of support.

Similarly, my own sober analysis of Columbia's future shows that we have no alternative but to seek increased Federal and state help in sharing the soaring costs of higher education in a technological age.

Ways of insuring our continued autonomy must be devised within the context of such vitally needed cost-sharing. New forms of cooperative planning between private universities and government must be discovered and tested. We have perhaps a decade in which to begin to solve these problems. None of this is simple. We share a great deal of the responsibility for our current communication gap with government.

Legislators and Federal administrators complain to us regularly that universities do not come to Washington with common policies. Our representational associations in Washington frequently work and talk at cross purposes, seeming to be more interested in immediate political advantage than in the long-range governmental planning which, in the long run, is going to save all our necks.

All these problems, all these portents of a dangerous and uncertain future mean that higher education no longer offers a safe haven for gentle souls. We are now engaged in a classic form of struggle to find safe avenues into the future through a web of problems, conflicts and contradictions. None of it offers a pleasant or an easy prospect, but perhaps we may all derive a measure of satisfaction in a recognizing that we are grappling with problems so vital that the future directions of American life depend in large degree on what we are able to do and whether we are able to achieve solutions.

I submit to you that we have many problems, but generations of the unborn are dependent on our ability to solve them. Let us begin to work together in that cause. It is worthy enough to warrant the expenditure of all of our energies and we have today also the thought of a great figure in American life who helped to point the way for us and who has a right to ask us what we're doing in our generation.

Thank you. (Applause)

Mrs. ROSTOW. Dr. McGill, you have heard how much we appreciate the words that you have brought to us. The problems that you have put before us are not easy and the best that we can do to answer your last charge upon us is to proceed to a discussion with an able panel of the points that you have raised.

I did not say ahead of time, and I intentionally omitted it, but shall now mention the fact that President McGill studied psychology at Harvard with Professor Jerome Bruner whom we were privileged to hear yesterday. I think you can understand that not only is Professor Bruner an eloquent member of a panel, but also obviously an extremely good teacher.

I am happy to introduce to you an able and remarkably varied panel to take up the issues raised in President McGill's presentation.

Starting at this end, next to President McGill himself, is Francis Keppel, one time Dean of the School of Higher Education at Harvard, later Commissioner of Education in the 1960's in Washington and now Chairman of the Board of the General Learning Corporation, and a man whose multi-faceted preparation for this panel is obvious in these facts and in others I have not time to tell.

Next to him is Mrs. Paul Wexler, Jacqueline Grinnen Wexler, now President of Hunter College in New York, whose tasks, I'm sure, President McGill would agree at least match the complexities of Columbia, and I think in some ways surpass them.

Next to Mrs. Wexler, Rosemary Park, now Professor of Higher Education, The University of California in Los Angeles and earlier President of Connecticut College and later of Barnard College, component of Columbia University, and a woman whose competence not only span the continent, but again whose range of preparation, as you will see, is outstanding.

Next is Frank Newman whose name has been much in the public eye because of the remarkable Newman Report which he was in charge of, who is also Associate Director of University Relations at Sanford and who courageously flew in this morning to arrive in a cliff-hanging appearance to be on the panel, and we welcome him.

Next, the able and, as you will hear, articulate President of the University of Texas at Austin, Bob Binder, who was telling me earlier that the full time job of being a student government president now makes the casual pursuit of the law or any other field in which the president of such an organization is involved, an extremely difficult task, which he handles ably, but as you will see, it is no mean achievement.

And sharing the panel and your Moderator for the morning, Dean Lorrin Kennamer of the College of Education of the University of Texas at Austin. (Applause)

Panel discussion

Dr. LORRIN G. KENNAMER. President Johnson, Mrs. Johnson, fellow panelists and Symposium participants. Being the Moderator of such a distinguished panel places me exactly in the same situation that the rooster was in when trapped in the stable with a horse. The rooster looked at the horse and stated, "Let's make a deal. I won't step on you if you won't step on me." (Laughter)

Our procedure this morning will be similar to yesterday. We have ushers available to give you pad and pencil to write questions that you would like to direct to the panel and they will pick up the questions as you hold them up. And if we do not have time to consider all the questions, we will seek answers to them and make them part of the proceedings as Mr. Middleton announced.

As you recall, the 1960's were years of unprecedented development and remarkable accomplishment in American higher education. There was vast growth in numbers of students, numbers of faculty, additional new facilities. Access to college widened greatly. Inequality of opportunity among economic classes and ethnic groups was, at last, recognized as a national concern and steps were taken to meet this problem. Greater opportunity was accorded each undergraduate to have more control over his undergraduate program. Graduate education developed at a level of excellence that made it the envy of the world.

The success of American higher education in the 1960's was unparalleled. Yet, we are troubled and we have heard from the presentation this morning, some of the sources of our concern.

Dr. McGill's comments affirm this achievement in higher education and yet, at the same time, he points out that our current problems have their origins within the successes we've had in the 60's.

I, therefore, ask our panel, what do you see to be the main problems in higher education

today and what action would you suggest needs to be taken in this decade of the 1970's.

And first, I would start, then, with Mr. Keppel.

Dr. FRANCIS KEPPEL. President and Mrs. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen.

It'll become obvious that I'm prepared. The chairman told me I was the first horse to whinny. (Laughter)

As Mrs. Rostow pointed out, I was once the Dean of a university faculty and that makes me, Mr. President, profoundly suspicious of university presidents. It's a fundamental habit of my life.

I, therefore, followed his manuscript very carefully because I'd read it before and as he spoke, I wanted to be quite sure that he was going to say the following words. He did, I'm glad to say. He didn't cut them out, which I thought he might have, because I want to disagree with them, which is an ancient custom of university deans.

Let me quote him. You said 'em, Bill. "One of the major lessons to be derived is that we must begin to construct new ways to plan our future." I can't disagree. "We seem now to be operating—" "We seem now," the President said, "to be operating in a planning vacuum. There is," I'm going on, "no current vehicle of intimate contact between the administration and universities enabling us to work out commonly accepted plans and guidelines."

And then, as you will recall, President McGill went on to point to the need of Federal and State help. And he said, you may recall, at the end, "We have perhaps a decade in which to begin to solve these problems." I think I've got that right, Bill.

These words, naturally, force me to think back a decade ago to the late 50's, early 60's. And to ask myself whether we might not have said something like that then about both the schools and the colleges and universities. And then to ask myself the question, is the situation really so unchanged between the late 50's and early 60's and today? And here, I think, is where there may be the beginning of a disagreement between President McGill and myself; I'm not sure.

Because I do not think that the situation is comparable to the late 50's and early 60's with regard to the national planning system for schools or colleges. Since then, and I personally view it as very largely as the result of the accomplishment of President Johnson's administration. It seems to me that the part of the Federal Government in all of education, including higher education, has been more clearly defined and that the planning process is, therefore, less difficult, considerably less difficult, than it was a decade ago. Though, heaven knows, it's going to be hard.

Just roughly speaking, in response to your question, I would suggest that there's now a good deal of agreement, a concensus, Mr. President, if I may use the word, that the Federal Government has shown that it both should and can do three things.

Number one, provide funds for the schools and the support of students of research and scholarship and of institutional programs using Federal-State structures and relationships. And that it has shown it can do it without endangering local individuality and management in colleges. Frankly, I think that's an enormous accomplishment in only a decade.

Second, that the Federal Government should and can provide research and development support to make education more effective and, I presume, Frank Newman will speak to that one.

Third, that the Federal Government should and can support programs to solve national programs by categorical grants or policies. To solve nationwide, cross-state programs. We've had lots of examples given to us by Mr. Cohen and others in the course of the last day.

Now, in doing so, I also would submit that the administration has shown that the Federal Government can deal fairly with both public and private institutions. They're a great problem in our national life. In fact, you have only, I believe, to look at the record to see that a substantial part of the more than doubling of higher education in the last decade was done with Federal intervention and support. And note that during that period in the middle 60's, there was hidden, I must say I don't mean hidden, but just not generally noticed, in the President's Higher Education Bills, a provision to establish in each state, advisory groups to set policy on the allocation of expansion funds for both public and private institutions within the state.

This seems to me a very important development. And that we're, in effect, now, which is the point I'm trying to hit hard, is that we are constantly working on the operating agreements between the Federal Government and the state governments with a regard to higher education on the one side, through this machinery.

And second, and sometimes confusingly, the relation between the Federal Government and the individual great university; particularly with a regard to research. There's a cross factor there that we're just going to have to deal with and I think it's a fundamental question.

But I'm not sure that we should say that we're not better off than we were a decade ago. For example, sir. This is something that staggers me.

The next eight or nine years will show in the elementary schools of the United States, according to Office of Education statistics, Mr. President. They must be true, they're Office of Education statistics. (Laughter) That we're going to have a reduction of six per cent in the elementary schools. There'll be a lower rate of growth in higher education. The next decade may then require, it seems to me, to go back to your question, the preparation for a shift not to support more growth, which is what was necessary in the Johnson years of the 60's, but to change the emphasis, as is true in the elementary-secondary schools, from growth in numbers to the emphasis, also in the mid-60's, on equity and quality.

Now the question is, is the machinery here? Bill McGill has understandably, and I don't blame him, said he doubts it. I would tend to argue that the machinery is there and can be flexibly used. Undoubtedly, enormously improved. But it can be built on. Let me see if I can give one example then, boy, I'm over my time. I'm sorry. Give an example of the kind of thing that seems to me so necessary in improving the relation between the Federal machinery and the State machinery on higher education.

I think it's clear that the financial problems for example, of the great state universities are such that they are having the effect of both raising tuition rates for out-of-state students and, in some cases, putting quotas on the numbers of out-of-state students that are permitted to come in and attend state institutions.

In the case of private institutions, just the sheer costs may have the effect, with travel and other things, of restricting the flow. In effect, perhaps, barriers are being erected and perhaps, and this is a frightening thought, only the rich will be able to cross those barriers between states.

Surely, none of us want this. President Johnson will recall that this was a matter of the relations between the young men of each generation so important in President Washington's mind that he left a substantial amount of money in order to bring about a national university. I don't know what happened to the money, sir. I'm delighted to see that this wonderful thing will continue and I hope that we will be sure, as we plan in the future, on the points that Bill was making, that a building like this so properly associated with a man who was, most certainly, the education President but who was, most certainly, also, the President of all the states and the people.

That ire will stand to remind us that education is an instrument of the national policy, not to separate us by putting us into educational protectionism; but to unite us. That's the kind of policy thing, sir, that I believe we're going to have to fight hard on the next decade. Thank you. (Applause)

Dr. KENNAMER. Mrs. Wexler?

Mrs. JACQUELINE WEXLER. President Johnson. Mrs. Johnson. And I guess I want to say, fellow Trustees of the generations of unborn who are dependent on our ability to solve our problems.

I am a President at a different part of New York City, on the richest land, probably, in the United States, at Park Avenue and 68th Street, at a subway stop; and that is where Hunter College is.

I have been asked by my respected colleague—we have all been asked—isn't there some way that we can get together? And then he tells us that they at Columbia are seriously overcrowded.

I came upon some statistics last week in preparation for the budget battle in New York City. The statistics say the following. Columbia University and the private universities in New York State have approximately 400 square feet per student of academic space for each of their students. And President McGill confirmed that for me in the Dallas Airport. (Laughter)

SUNY, which is President Rockefeller's monument, created predominantly since 1958, has 258 square feet per student for each of its citizens of the human race.

CUNY, a long, old established institution, beginning with CCNY and Hunter both over a hundred years old. SUNY and CUNY last year were down to 71 square feet per student.

I came to Hunter, I came to realize in the last day here in Austin, I suppose for a reason very, very tied to the Johnson administration and particularly to an experience I shared with the First Lady, for whom I have extraordinary respect, on the Steering Committee of Headstart.

I think it was there that I became utterly convinced that equity, equity and quality were the name of the day. And though I was not at that time privileged to be the mother of two children, the adopted mother of two childern whom I now share, I even at that time saw myself as a kind of mother, a trustee of the human race. And I am fascinated in these two years of my experience as President of this high property institution, slum institution in another way, of New York City.

With the task of trying to provide equity and quality for 22,000 citizens of New York City who did not, for the most part, have the headstart that we all have tried to find since the Johnson administration. And at the same time, to respect the dignity of being a very, very specific buck-stops-here parent of two privileged children who have been given headstart after headstart, who were given all kinds of opportunities to get them into good institutions, for the kind of support systems of tutoring, for the kind of support system of another start after another start, and to bring these two into balance as I try to understand my too relevant society.

With that in background, President McGill, I'd like to share some of the sentences that give me pause and give me problem.

"A Columbia education still stands for something and still opens uncounted doors."

"The best faculty and the best students go where the best resources are available."

"We must have ways to formulate a college education that is shorter in duration, more relevant to modern society and at the same time, reflected of Columbia's high standards of excellence."

"Educational status and earned degrees have become linked with status in American society."

"Where the professor is and should be his own principality."

You see, fellow citizens, I'm dogged with the problem of what is the purpose of a university or rather, what are the purposes of a university. And I think this is profoundly caught up with what the funding pattern for a university ought to be.

Obviously, a university, a great university, is a resarch institute and must be. Obviously, a great university is the support of graduate work and of scholarly development and should be.

But obviously, a great university system, that is the provision of higher education in our time, as Frank Keppel said in his concluding remarks, ought to be an emphasis, ought to have an emphasis on equality and quality.

I was subject to one of those great uprisings in the first few weeks at Hunter College. Less than six months after that, a very important anecdote happened in the lower halls of my sardine can college at Park Avenue. What I call the ego trip, white radicals who had reved up the machinery in the Spring of 1970 and had jumped on the bandwagon of their black brothers, or got their black brothers to get in their band wagon.

That same small leadership was down in the halls trying to reve up the same kind of group. They went through the halls with their mimeograph rhetoric and they said, "Strike the English Department! Don't let Whitey superimpose upon you his middle-class values! Don't take the English exams!"

Within one hour, the leadership of the blacks at Hunter College, which we have been trying to strengthen very, very quickly and very substantively, that leadership of professors and students was down in that hall, had quelled those students and said, in language that I am not good enough to replicate and, I suppose, should not. They said to them, "Get the blazes out of here. It is one thing for you, with your fathers there to rescue you time after time, to decide that you want to opt out of this system and not have these values. But don't deprive our men, don't deprive our kids of the chance to get into that buying power, of those doors that a Columbia Institution can open for you, interpolating. Don't deprive our citizens of that opportunity until they get in there and decide what they want to do about it.'"

That's my fundamental problem, ladies and gentlemen. I know. I know, that in one sense, a Columbia education costs more than $2,800. I know that a Penn education, for which my husband and I pay, and a Board on which I am a Trustee, I know that education, in one sense, costs more than $3,000. In another sense, it doesn't and every President would agree so.

Not the education of the undergraduate as a freshman. It is the research costs, it is the professional school costs. It is all of the other things that are there involved. And yet, that is what has become known and characteristic of a prestige institution. How are we to solve this dilemma?

I have a very simple one and I return where I started. We've got to face it as parents and we've got to face it as citizens and we've got to face it as educators and we've got to face it as legislators. Namely, until and unless we are willing to multiply and respect the options, we cannot continue to trap a system for the haves and the have-nots. That is, if there is only one dignity for my son and my daughter, if there's only one dignity for the Johnson daughters. Then there's only one dignity for the poor. And we've got them to say we've got to have the survival of the fittest and we have to keep a hierarchalelitest system and the best people have got to go to the best schools with the best resources.

If our answer is a different one and we say there is a pluralism of opportunity and we really respect in our own families the choice of other options, then we can have an open admissions system in which it is perfectly all right for a Wexler to choose not to go. Or for a Johnson to choose not to go or a Keppel to choose not to go. But we cannot talk about a society that must preserve the plumbers if the plumbers are the other people in the lower stratified section.

And the old kind of hierarchal institution and the cynicism bred by the elitest priesthood of our faculties, I believe, has not done a great deal to provide a multiple kind of dignity. I think that is terribly bound up with the problem that we are facing and the funding pattern must follow it. If, indeed, Columbia is willing and able to take a part of the curve, the distribution curve, which Hunter has now tried to embrace, then I believe we all ought to be at the fount of the same funding formula.

But I'm not at all sure that that is even desirable and I do not want us to get caught in a game of saying that we are really out for the children born and unborn, that we are out for that group but what we are really out for is to keep the priesthood of the old university in which the rich get richer intellectually, economically and socially. (Applause)

Dr. KENNAMER. Thank you. Professor Park?

Professor ROSEMARY PARK. We have been choosing sides here, Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, fellow panel members and Mr. Keppel opted for the horse. (Laughter) That leaves me in a role, as you can see, which I'm not, by nature, qualified to discharge but we'll assume just for the minute that I'm going to play the rooster. (Laughter)

Now, the point about the rooster is that he moves quickly. (Laughter) And my career I think, would demonstrate that. I left the East just when it began to boil. I landed into the West Coast when it was boiling and I had the good sense to leave administrative responsibilities when they were mounting and found a marvelously safe haven in a study called Higher Education.

This study has, in my case, at least, meant that I have tried to bring into consciousness, much of what I experienced in my earlier career and I've tried to formulate this in some sense.

And therefore, as I listened to President McGill's remarks and comments on them, I am concerned about the mood; the mood which they establish. And I think I have reason to be since I'm speaking not out of experience of one institution or of one part of the country but a somewhat wider experience.

President McGill's remarks demonstrated clearly that there are problems which have to be solved if American education is to continue to develop. Likewise, problems which have to be solved if the society is to continue to develop.

And all through his remarks there was clear that remarkable kind of what I shall call symbiosis; the living together of education and society. And from a slightly historical point of view, I should like to suggest that there are times when this symbiosis, this living together of higher education and society, results in expansion, in optimism; built on the conviction that education and society grow in understanding of each other and in service to each other.

And we have the records in this library of such a period. A great historical period in American history; in the history of a nation which has cared more about education than any other country in the world.

Those were great times. But this symbiosis also means that there are occasions when education is cast in the role of the scapegoat and is burdened with all the sins of society and sent off into some kind of underfunded desert. I think we're in such a stage right now.

And I hope that there was a degree of bitterness in President McGill's voice and in our hearing, when he used words like contraction, retrenchment, coercive reform; as if what we had previously offered was somehow faulty, was specious, did not need improvement, which I surely agree it does, but rather fundamental correction.

I ask you, how can we talk about retrenchment and contraction when we know today that knowledge increases exponentially. When we know that increasing numbers of students are coming to these institutions, different kinds of students, possibly; minority groups, mature women and other mature members of the society. I do not see how we can serve them if we are talking about retrenchment.

Some people even act as if the college degree was in the nature of a vicious plot which is imposed by the university upon our young people. And I ask you, would they truly be better off if they learned one job on the job, and if they knew nothing about economics or political science or atomic physics, philosophy, you name it, even literature or art. I doubt very much that they would be better off or that our society, indeed, would be better off.

And, therefore, contrary to what some of the panel members may feel, I am glad that the college controls the entrance to the profession. It enables us to put occasionally, at least, the expert in his place. And this is, surely, one of the tremendous problems which this educational world and this society faces; the problem of the authoritarianism of the elite, the elite developing out of their competence in fields of knowledge. This, I think, we can help to balance if we spread higher education more widely.

So, I should like to suggest that the problems President McGill has outlined are, indeed, there and are, indeed, very real. But the mood which I find communicated to me, at least, of a degree of pessimism, I want to reject. I do not think we can talk in terms of retrenchment. And I would like just for a moment to take a quick look back, even beyond Washington, to whom Mr. Keppel has referred, and remind you, or at least, ask this question. Possibly, the fiscal problems which we are faced with today, these fiscal problems may be unique to a very small piece of American educational history. If you will remember that Harvard was financed by the ferry charges from the ferry over to Charleston and that these were accorded by the General Court of Massachusetts in order to keep Harvard going. Or if you will remember that Yale received 2,500 pounds from the General Court in Connecticut in order to be sure that the kind of divinity teaching instruction which was being given there was the highest quality. And if you will remember that Columbia depended for its start on a lottery granted by the Legislature of the city of New York. You will see that the participation of the Government in the support of higher education is a long tradition in this country and I haven't even mentioned them all after things of that sort.

In others words, I think this idea of complete independence was perhaps a necessary period but not one that has characterized the larger portion of the history of American education.

We have in that little, and I'm going to call it a peculiar time, we have been able to straighten out some pretty important ideas that we had on the subject of academic freedom. But I think and I believe the rest of us, perhaps, would agree that we have pretty well succeeded in doing that. We always have to be alert but we have, I think, developed that concept into some kind of liability.

And, therefore, I would urge upon us that

as we attack the problems which President McGill has outlined so well, that we do it with a spirit of confidence and courage and not act as if we were some kind of scapegoat sent out into some kind of desert. (Applause.)

Dr. KENNAMER. Thank you, Professor Park. I would remind you again that if you have written questions, if you will raise your hand, one of the ushers will pick them up. Mr. Newman.

Mr. FRANK NEWMAN. Mr. McGill, as you've probably noted by now, we are all in a conspiracy to attack your speech. And I'm somewhat ambivalent about this because as a graduate of Columbia and being married to a graduate of Columbia, I've always felt that that institution should serve as some sort of an ideal for all the rest of American higher education. I also happen to agree with a number of things you said, so I decided to resolve this ambivalence by continuing our tradition here of attacking your speech while actually agreeing with your ideas. (Laughter.)

There is one point of which, I think, that we must be very careful to distinguish between Columbia and its counterparts and some other parts of American higher education in that Columbia is a very selective university.

The huge growth in American higher education in the 50's and 60's has been in the unselective parts; the newer parts of state colleges and community colleges and less selective parts of the higher education system. These institutions have largely been unaffected by the kind of Federal push of the 50's and 60's that you were describing. And yet, they're in trouble as deep, I believe, as the Columbias and if I may say so, the Stanfords. But they have, in addition, other troubles which, I think, in the longrun are likely to prove even less tractable.

To cite only one. Columbia and the other selective institutions, incidentally, all of us are largely products and representatives of those selective institutions, depend upon a style of teaching and learning; use of the lecture and seminar, modicized classes, heavy use of the library, division into academic disciplines, the use of abstract learning as a basic process, which, by and large, is a good match to the capabilities of the students that we're dealing with, and a modestly good match, not quite as close, but somewhat of a good match to the students' interests.

This is hardly true, though, at selective institutions and yet the same style of learning and the same style of teaching is used. We're now closing in on to two million new entrants to the college system every year. I would argue that substantially over one million of these new entrants every year, first time enrollees, are not academically oriented, do not enjoy and are not well suited to the academic style which we've made so widespread.

And this would argue, as Mrs. Wexler pointed out earlier, that we should have, in my opinion, multiple forms of excellence. I believe in the excellence of Columbia. I believe it is very close to the top in American, among American universities. Naturally, there are a few others. Perhaps one other certainly above it. But for all intents and purposes, it is very close to the top. But there must be other tops.

For all our institutions, public and private, selective and non-selective, ancient and new. There's a problem that I think hangs over all of us and that is the problem that you touched on of credentialism. I raise this because I believe that we are arriving at the point where we're going to seem to default on a terribly important promise inherent in the American dream of increasing egaliterianism that my colleagues have been referring to.

We have a tremendous pressure to credential oneself in American life with a college degree. It is growing. It is going to increase. It is one thing to not go to college when you are in the 95 per cent or 85 per cent or even 80 per cent of the population that does not have a college degree. It's perfectly feasible under such circumstances to work yourself up in the best of American tradition as a self-made man.

But to do this when you're in the 30 per cent and then the 20 per cent that has not gone to college is something else entirely. And in states of this country, New York, California; we have now arrived at in California slightly over 70 per cent of the age group now enters college. For the 30 per cent remaining, the pressure to go to college is indeed increasing and severe. Why should employers look in that 30 per cent for employees for any job?

But this growth of credentialism poses as it's grown and grown and grown, has posed for some very severe new problems. First, there's a growing number of studies that give evidence that, in fact, the credential is not a very valid way of sorting an American life; at least, in terms of careers. If you've been tracking some of these studies, they argue that, in fact, just in terms of performance on the job, which it should not be and I don't propose that it should be, our sole measure of what the college degree is about. In fact, I would argue just the opposite. That having a college education and performance on the job, if anything, may be slightly negatively correlated. And I think we should treat these studies with a great deal of skepticism, but we cannot ignore them. They certainly raise the question, whether, in fact, there is a very strong positive correlation between job performance and a college degree.

They argue, and I think, persuasively, that the main benefit of going to college, is to sort oneself into a place in society.

The second problem that I see in this tremendous credentialism that's growing up is that the drive for upward mobility, despite the discussion earlier about the egalitarian nature of American higher education, and it certainly is. Any experience with any other system of higher education certainly reminds one of the marvelous egalitarianism in this system and certainly that element has been growing in the past 20 years. But it's also to a substantial degree been frustrated by the sense of upward mobility because of greater access to higher education, upward mobility for all parts of the population, by the fact that, as one of my colleagues said earlier, the rich grow richer in the sense that the students from the most intellectual backgrounds and this normally means the most affluent backgrounds, solve their problem of increasing competition from other groups in society who have now gotten a college education as a credential, by going for further credentialing. They simply move up to get another degree. First a Master's Degree, if that's not enough, on to a Ph. D.

And we arrived at the point at Stanford this year, that to our surprise in the applicants for Medical School; as you know, applicants for Medical Schools are going up in sort of a geometric progression. We discovered that we could fill our entering class in the Medical School three times over by selecting only those applicants who already had Ph. D's. Now, if one cannot get an adequate career, incidentally, we did not, of course.

One can see, though, that work—the idea that if you can't insure yourself an adequate role in life and guarantee it by getting a Bachelor's Degree, the obvious answer is to get a Master's Degree and then a Ph.D. and then the combination of the Ph.D. and an M.D. and, I suppose, ultimately a Ph.D. and the Law Degree will take care of—the only other thing left, of course, is to have a rich father. (Laughter)

The third and perhaps most compelling thing that we must be on guard about is that despite the proclamations of people like Mr. Toeffler, the author of *Future Shot*, and a great many other authors who have been talking about the growth of the knowledge economy, where we've been led to assume that all jobs in our society will soon require something on the order of the Ph.D. just for simple functioning. In fact, if one goes back and carefully examines, as several national commissions have now done, carefully examines the shift in the nature of the workforce in this country and I mean by that everybody who has any sort of a career, one finds that, indeed, there is a shift toward a knowledge economy function. Service jobs grow, educated requirement jobs grow, but by and large they're growing at a glacial rate. Whereas, the number of college graduates is growing at an astronomical rate. Not only has college entrance—it was on the order of four per cent in 1900, people that entered college, something on the order of 18 or 19 per cent of the age group entered in 1950—at the present time, nationally, it's slightly over 50 per cent and as I mentioned, in certain states like California, it's over 70 per cent.

Not only that, but the rate of growth among Master's Degrees is faster than the rate of growth among college entrance. Something on the order in 20 years of from 50 to 70, of something in excess of four times the number of Ph.D.'s granted grew something in excess of seven times and so one can see that we are arriving in every field with people who can no longer find jobs of what they consider college level. Particularly when one recognizes that as several commissions have noted, among the fastest growing in the 1970's, the fastest growing job category, out of the five—I've forgotten what the five top are—but three of the top five include clerical workers, skilled craftsmen and other blue collar workers. And it makes us realize that there are going to be a great many skilled craftsmen, clerical workers and other blue collar workers who have college educations.

Now I personally don't see this as a total disadvantage but I do think that we ought to recognize that one of the results of this is to move the requirement for college education to jobs that normally do not have it. I give you one example because it so fascinates me, if you'll pardon my using this particular example. It's from a Chronicle, a San Francisco Chronicle Want Ad. And while I realize that Texas has become the cultural capital of the world, sometimes you miss a great deal by not reading the San Francisco Chronicle. (Laughter).

As part of your education, therefore, I bring you this exact ad as it appeared. "Wanted Topless dancer. Two years of college required." (Laughter)

The fascinating part is the next line. "English or Literature major preferred." (Laughter).

The thing that has always struck me about that is I don't understand those two academic disciplines. I could think of many other disciplines that seem to me far more relevant and I've never understood that. (Laughter).

But one can find many, many pragmatic examples of the same trend taking place. The other day I had an opportunity to meet with a group of forestry students at the University of California; Master's candidates in forestry. And it turned out that all of them are seeking, all of the group that I met, are seeking jobs as Rangers in the Park Service. And I said, "Why are you going to Graduate School?" And they said, "The Park Service now requires a Bachelor's Degree," which is interesting but to get a job because of the competition for them, it's necessary, really, in practical terms, to have a Master's in forestry. Now, I think that it's probably true that a Master's in forestry has a great deal of advantage to many people but we are bound to run into an enormous disillusionment. It's already coming. We see it all over. People who have superb educations or semi-

superb educations find themselves unable to get a job that matches that.

There was a period like this in the 16th and 17th Century, many of you may recall, in which the universities had arrived at the point where they enrolled such a significant part of the population, educating them for certain types of jobs which are traditionally held by university graduates, and then the supply began to grossly exceed the demand of those jobs. The net effect of this was a period of disillusionment and retrenchment where the universities moved into the backwater of life at that point.

I, personally, do not believe that will happen. I do not believe it should happen. But I do believe that we must begin to recognize the potent impact that is just directly ahead of us of these factors. In that sense, working at the margin, for example, reducing the time to get a medical degree, will help and it must occur. But I believe, personally, much more sweeping changes are going to be required.

For example. I think since we can no longer guarantee that going to college means that you will be in the elite, I think we must recognize that that isn't how we choose the elite anymore in this country. That instead of remorselessly increasing the lockstep pattern of education, I think it is going to be mandatory that we encourage students to come to college when they're ready to learn, not to sort themselves completely first. That we're going to have to go to what the Swedes call recurrent education. That is to say that one goes to college when one is ready to learn, that education becomes a vehicle for helping one develop oneself, for becoming a citizen, becoming successful in a job, but it is an assist in that. That one succeeds by succeeding. One does not succeed by getting all the credentials including a Ph. D. and an M.D., and then insisting on a place in life that is represented by those credentials.

The second thing is, I think it's going to be absolutely mandatory we have a new view of jobs. I don't believe we can go on saying that jobs will—we'll all get educated and then sort ourselves and we'll be locked into the enlisted men's ranks if we fail to have the right degree and the officer's ranks as long as we have the right degree. That there must be the opportunity for serious upward mobility. That, in fact, one can go and become a practical nurse, then go back and become a registered nurse, then a Bachelor's Degree in nursing and then ultimately, if one has the skills and is successful and succeeds in providing health care, to go on and become an M.D.

Not that one starts out and takes four years of liberal arts, even at such an excellent institution as Columbia or perhaps even, if one is fortunate, at Stanford and goes on into a medical school and says now I'm ready to practice. In other words, one must succeed in order to succeed and education becomes an assist along the way.

Well, I've often thought that these things have an unfortunate ring of old ancient American concepts; that is to say, one succeeds by success and education becomes an assist and there is an opportunity for upward mobility and if I am inadvertently proposing ancient American concepts, I apologize because I believe that we all view life as only going forward and never backward. I do agree, though, with Mr. Keppel, that reform is the issue of the future, not growth, and that reform ought to include the retention of the great values of the American system; but also, a willingness to open our eyes and to debate honestly the disadvantages and the problems that exist in the American system today. Thank you. (Applause)

Dr. KENNAMER. Thank you. Mr. Binder.

Mr. BOB BINDER. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson. I'd like to take off on a little different tack than the other speakers have.

We've been talking about the fundamental economic problems facing the university from the society's point of view. I'd like to go into a narrow area of that, about the student's relation to the society and how economic problems do work their way down into student problems.

The turmoil has not actually gone away from the campus in the sense that students don't feel as if there are things they're concerned about, they just aren't going out in one large mass to attack one problem at a time. Turmoil is fragmenting, the students are pursuing more constructive means to go about achieving their ends. Students are engaged constantly now in various projects of various kinds, as they always have been, but without the destructive impact and trying to take a more constructive approach to things.

Well, this inherently causes a conflict in the society in which the university sits, because one of the natures of the university is that it is in the forefront of change. Ideas originate, are battered about, go back and forth and then somebody decides we're going to go out and do something. We're going to form a committee or a group to go out and try to put this in effect somewhere. And they do. They go out into the community and try and so forth. The community, on the other hand, where the people are busy all day earning a living in one way or another, may not keep up with what the students are talking about; what the young people and the professors have to discuss in their classes, the new ways of relating to each other, to the society and so forth, and resist these things.

Well, how does this work its way back to the university? Well, depending on what it is, people call up the President, they call up the Chancellor, they call up a Regent, they call up any number of people and say "I'd like to register my complaint," and depending on how political the university is and how influential the person calling is, depends on what action may or may not be taken or none may be taken at all. But I'd like to emphasize to you that this is good. This is a natural state of a university that the students are going out and being involved in society.

There would be a tremendous danger in just apathy. If the students didn't care what happened to the society when they're learning about it and learning things, ways to fit in whether they consciously want to learn a way or not, but learning their own niche. If they don't care about the society, then perhaps in a generation or so, we would have a generation of people that didn't care at all and this could be disastrous for the society as a whole.

The students are now part of the larger society as first class citizens. They've been given the vote. They want to be treated as such. They want to work off-campus, they don't want the rigid formulae of just going to class, taking lectures, taking exams and this is a course. They want to get involved. They want to help in mental hospitals, they want to help in legal aid clinics, they want to help in any way they can. And they'd like to be able to get some credit but this is sometime off for this type of learning because it is just as much, if not more learning than actually goes on in the classroom.

But students are just another—they look at themselves as another cohesive group of citizens. It's not a second class citizenship. As I say, they can vote and they all realize it. They're registering, the politicians are beginning to realize it, the educators are beginning to realize it. This is a group of citizens, not second class in any sense, but perhaps more cohesive than other people in the same age.

So this brings us to the inter-relationship of education and politics. Students will be electing people to public office in the future. In college towns particularly where, in some cases, the students outnumber the local residents, the students can have a controlling effect on the destiny of the town as a community in society. Perhaps in those places there will be less resistance to the change that is being brought about.

But, in any event, the students are going to have their say as well, constructively within the system, and this is good and this is healthy. It's my position that the money has been cut off by legislators as a punishment. It hasn't actually been cut off but it's not coming in the same quantity as it used to be, partially because of economic problems but partially as a punishment to student bodies that didn't act right.

And this is kind of cutting off your nose to spite your face because these people are going to take over society, one way or another. It's going to be handed down to them and with the vote, with the involvement and the interest of students in society, we will see a change in politics, perhaps a healthier attitude toward the student than some state capitals now hold. I think this will all be good.

My basic advice or opinion on it is that society at large should recognize that the university is an agent of change and will consistently cause a little friction with the society in which it sits. It will always be on the limits. If we solved every problem we had today, the colleges would look for what problems were left and would start working on those to solve, and would continually just be delving deeper and deeper on the problems that society has to make it a better society.

Everybody taking potshots at the elite now in trouble. I don't think that that, really, ought to characterize the spirit of these discussions and I don't assert it.

I'd like to make a number of remarks. I tried in my presentation, not to present a mood of pessimism but rather one of analysis, realistic analysis and determination. If we don't begin to face these problems, we're never going to be able to solve them and the problems point the way to the future.

The problem of credentialing is an extraordinarily serious one. Mr. Newman had even better examples than I. I can imagine the cosy intimacy in which experience in English Literature might do well in certain occupations but I won't go into that. (Laughter)

The problem of very rapid technological growth and its effect on our institutions is also a central one. Now, it appears to me that we are well advised not to raise the traditional standards of egalitarianism or eliteism in these times because it is my conviction that we are all in the same kind of problem, that these processes are immense social forces that are at work on us and we're trying to comprehend them at an era which seems to me to be one of profound transition.

The time may be at hand for the construction of new kinds of institutions. That's the central message I got from President Wexler. I think so. I'm very anxious, however, that we proceed to that construction of new institutions in a rational and planned manner and that we do not do it in the fashion in which I see ourselves now drifting into reform. I suspect that we are on the edge of doing very serious damage to our traditional forms of academic life. If you talk to deans of graduate schools today, Mr. Keppel, they will tell you one after another that their graduate schools are being dismantled by the sudden and, I think, unplanned withdrawal of Federal support built up with such care during an earlier and more optimistic era. I don't think that's wise public policy because while it is necessary to construct that great avenue of opportunity for our full society and while it is absolutely necessary to create the new kinds of institutions that will do that, it is also, I think, not a complimentary proposition that

we dismantle intellectual excellence that has been built with such struggle and with such care and that means so much to the future of this country.

I think that there is a vacuum of planning. I sit on the firing line daily. I deal with the problems that are confronting our university and the range of consultations and direct involvement in national planning that characterized an earlier era, seems not to be present at this time and I state that frankly and not invidiously. It is a fact of our lives. We, I think, faced with these situations are regressing into a search for apocalyptic solutions. I kept hearing that from the radical students, I'm now hearing it from businessmen and from legislature.

It is going to be extraordinarily difficult to construct new institutions. We can't do it by dismantling the academic disciplines. That's the whole basis of our intellectual excellence. How then do we go about it? That is the problem I tried to pose and I think that we have to face it.

Dr. KENNAMER. You know, related to this, we hear about universities without walls, new approaches to ways of the student seeking degrees, never being on campus, a lot of innovative programs being suggested. Then, on the other hand, we see that we have existing institutions, the problem of getting institutions to change. And then I hear various members of the panel saying that yet we suspect new types of institutions are on the horizon and I would like to throw that back to the panel. What types of institutions do you see that may take the place of college as we know it in the 70's and 80's? Mrs. Wexler?

Mrs. JACQUELINE WEXLER. Well, I can't answer your last question but I want to speak to what you said first.

I think what Mr. Newman was pointing out in his discussion is central to everything that the rest of us were trying to get at. You see, if an admissions system is self-selecting itself, if the admissions system is, and I think all of us read the history that way, that whether you say the memory genes of intellect or the economic class or whatever it is, is what really statistically has determined the entrance in preponderance into our elite institutions, then you're stratifying society by elite institutions.

I think his is the radical in the sense of cutting in at the roots. I support it strongly, that we in our established institutions, Bill, and I think here even in the departmental structure which I respect very strongly, that at the graduate level we must not dismantle them but we've got to begin to shape the programs to do this. Doc Howe said yesterday, that the foundations had been somewhat guilty of regressing the woman's movement by fostering and reinforcing graduate programs that were very condensed and that must be seen through at a paced level. Now the old notion of the university is you stay with us, you don't get contaminated by a job, you get it as quickly as you can, you live within the ivory tower and so on.

I think in some ways that even Mr. Binder kept talking about students electing, not about young people electing. And I've long supported your notion of credit for work but I'm more and more moving to the direction that Mr. Newman pointed out; that we ought to interrupt the system for more and more people. We ought to have them go to work, get involved and go back in a motivated way and that means the university has got to dismantle its lockstep of one kind of planning. You know, you take my sequence and if you haven't had my English 101, you certainly don't take our English 102. (Laughter) (Applause)

Dr. KENNAMER. Mr. Newman.

Mr. NEWMAN. I agree completely. I wanted to say that it seems to me that that is a central problem. I'm looking for two things.

First, a basis of distinction between the public and private sector in which that eliteism is present in one and not in the other and I don't think it exists.

And second is, the incentive programs that are going to make that happen. I don't think that the demand for change given as a moral imperative for universities is going to be terribly effective in producing change.

Mr. NEWMAN. If I could come in on the question that both Mrs. Wexler and Mr. McGill raised about the relationship of reform and how it comes about and the goal here.

One thing, if I could ask you, Mrs. Wexler. You mentioned that my view being a radical view, coming from the administration of a university that has in recent days been involved in some discussion of radical relationships with faculty members, if you could sign a note for me to that effect, perhaps I could take it back to the students and offer it as some evidence. (Laughter)

The kind of thing that is going to force us, if I could just take one quick example. The kind of thing that is gong to force on us what I think you and I are talking about in terms of multiple levels of excellence, multiple points of excellence, which is going to mean differing institutions. Take the question of practice of medicine. It's an easy one to see. Who gets into medical schools with very, very intense competition?

Well, the answer, of course, is the most intellectual students. And that is to say that unless you have a 3.8, 3.9, why would you even bother to apply at most medical schools.

Now, ask yourself another question. Particularly if you're in the Federal Government, that ogre that was referred to earlier as a coercive agency. Think about who makes the best practioner of medicine and where your problems are. The problems that we all know, we've discussed this widely, occur that people do not want to practice medicine when they come out of medical school and if they do, they don't want to practice it in the areas where there are few doctors, they want to practice it in Palo Alto and Cambridge and a few other places like that including Park Avenue.

Now, who are the people most likely to practice medicine and practice it well? Well, it turns out there's almost no correlation, in fact, there's a negative, a strong negative correlation to very, very high marks and the practice of medicine and particularly the practice of medicine in those areas.

I was in Sweden last week and they're very worried over this. In Sweden they have an even more absurd system. What you have to do to get into medical school—everybody has to apply. You say, "I want to go to the university," and you apply for your discipline. And they have a 5.0 system. If you have a 4.8, you're likely to get into medical school if that's your first choice but your second choice may very well be if you have a 4.75, you may get into your second choice which might be either veterinary medicine or law. So you could prepare all your life to be a doctor and suddenly find yourself out with the horses or perhaps out in the—practicing criminal law somewhere.

It seems to me when one comes to the question of reform in that kind of circumstance, it seems to me a couple of words—you used the words, Mr. McGill, rational and planned. I would use some other words, prudent. Reform ought to be prudent. That is to say that we ought to recognize and have no compunction about recognizing the value of eliteism. There is a great value in eliteism and we should be careful to preserve it. There is a great value in graduate education and we ought to be careful to preserve it and we ought to be prepared to argue for it. There is a great value in liberal education.

Secondly, I would argue that we should be thoughtful and thoughtful to me means we've got to examine the facts. If we don't examine the fact that we are selecting ever more intellectually sophisticated students into the medical schools and this is damaging what we're trying to do, then I don't believe we ought to be charged with the responsibility of doing any of this planning you referred to.

And third, we ought to recognize that most planning of new institutions is going to have to come from the bottom up. Darn few things, where you really establish new and vibrant institutions, come from the top down. And I would argue that the Federal Government is particularly ill suited to plan new colleges and universities.

What they can do, in my opinion, is create incentives that encourage people who will, in fact, come forward with new institutions. But I think for the Federal Government or any other agency to stand on the sideline and anticipate that these reform pressures will come from within, so to speak, particularly from within the well established institutions, I think is foolhardy.

You know, Mr. Gardner, who was here yesterday, I would like to quote because he is a Stanford Trustee. (Laughter) He once said that the priesthood never reforms itself and I believe he's absolutely right. I think what we need is the right kind of reform but we would be damn fools to sit around and wait for it to happen.

Professor PARK. What about the reformation, just to put a footnote in?

Mrs. WEXLER. It left. (Laughter)

Professor PARK. But go ahead.

Mr. NEWMAN. No, I was going to stop. I feel I've gone too far. (Laughter)

Professor PARK. I have one question here. I think we're talking about cooperation and about reform on a horizontal basis as if this is the kind of thing that will happen between universities described as the research-oriented institutions in the system. Possibly some of the problems that Mr. Newman has seen and Mr. McGill is speaking to, will find their solution through a more vertical examination of the higher educational system.

In other words, some of what we're talking about is the definition in preparation of what I'll call power professionals who do not require a full panoply of university research experience, but whose training, it seems to me, ought to be designed in connection with that so that I see a very big role here for what we call the community colleges, the junior colleges in meeting some of these problems of, if I can call it over education.

Now, I'm not willing to accept that because I think I would differ perhaps from Mr. Newman in feeling that a lot of the education that we've been speaking to here is being defined as a job skill, as job oriented, and I think if there's anything that the counter-culture is telling us right now, it is that they are going to move around in the society from one kind of job to another and that the training given them cannot be directed toward one very narrow, possibly obsolescing kind of occupation. So I would urge us to take a look at the vertical possibilities of higher education before we begin to say we've got to cut back on the educational opportunities and retrench.

Mr. NEWMAN. I am not arguing at all that higher education should be solely career-oriented. I think it would be a gross mistake. Nor would I argue that we should view higher education as being so career-oriented that one becomes locked into a career. I would argue the exact opposite; that what is happening, in fact, by encouraging students to go longer and longer periods of time to higher and higher credentials in order to assure themselves of a place in society, we increasingly do lock them in. And when one has to make the choice to be a Ph. D. in English Literature and spends 22 or 23 years of their life finally getting through the system and coming out the other end, it's all well and good for them to talk about changing their career focus at midstream but they've got a tremendous investment in

there and they have no idea whether that's a good or a bad thing for them.

A friend of mine has argued that what we should do is continue the expansion of the lockstep pattern of college; whereas, now the average Ph. D. gets out at age 28 or 30, that if we could continue this on for another ten or so years and begin to also move down the retirement age, we'll solve the whole problem. (Laughter)

Professor PARK. I think it's very important to make that point clear, that you're not talking against the degree as a degree but the time that is spent in it at a young age. And I think this is one of the points we all have to come to grips with. How do we open up the university to different ages and not concentrate it just on the young where they could possibly be overburdened. This, I think, is a problem we all can see.

Dr. KENNAMER. Related to this. We have a question here from the participants in the audience and it's directed specifically at Mrs. Wexler.

"You mention that there are many who are being compelled by parental and social pressure to enter the academic life for which they are not suited and which they're unhappy and unproductive. How do you propose we can achieve a sense of dignity for our tradesmen and craftsmen and make these professions once more attractive and desirable?"

Mrs. WEXLER. Well, one has to really believe that there is a dignity in a craftsman and tradesman. I think I start with that conviction and my topsy involvement in the academic world has not robbed me of it. (Applause)

But I think it's very hard to preserve that kind of dignity in the academic world. That respect for that kind of dignity. I think even when we say we have it, there is a kind of paternalistic, almost priestly tone that we establish. I've extraordinary respect for my colleague, Mr. Newman, and what he said. I've said this earlier but even he has to say, I and my wife went to "the best institutions" as he rationally begins to plead for many tops. And I respect him for that kind of honesty. It is very hard, you know. (Laughter) One really has to believe that and I think that's going to take a radical reappraisal.

I say to affluent groups near New York, who are on the warpath against open admissions, I say, every one of you in this audience believes in open admissions. So does Spiro Agnew with respect to the Agnew girls. You know, we go around knocking on doors to get kids in; we use pressure; we armtwist better than the best legislative aide in the room has ever armtwisted; we armtwist to get that school to open; we plead that if the college doesn't have a program for this, my child, with the 3.70 Board score, as well as for this, my child, with the 7.60 Board score, that they ought to create a different program.

The only question we have as citizens in this country about open admissions is whether or not it's named the American citizenry or whether it bears our familial name, you know. And I think we've got to cope with it both ways. We have to develop somehow at the level of our insides, that we really do respect other dignities for our blood children, for our familial children and I think at the time that we can begin to do this, we will begin then to open up the system in which this elitest one of the survival of the fittest and get my kid into that trap and you get her there early and get her there a long time. is destroying us on both sides.

You know, the cynicism bill to which you reported, the counter-culture, is partially, in my estimation, our young, affluent, semi-affluent kids knowing they didn't earn their own way; knowing this bootstraps game is all rot; knowing that their folks gave them elevator shoes while they talk about bootstraps for the other kids. (Laughter) (Applause)

Dr. KENNAMER. Did you want to comment to this question?

Mr. NEWMAN. Can I just add one comment to that. I think there is one thing you can do that helps add dignity to a sort of a working job and that's to provide an open route upward. If one can be a nurse and ultimately be a doctor, then to be a nurse is not a limiting thing. If one can be a plumber and ultimately become a professional engineer, that is not a limiting thing. But increasingly in the world of egalitarianism, what we've inadvertently done is to put limits on them.

Professor PARK. Of course, I think one could say in answer to your question, that a certain type of taste has developed in this society and we're only beginning to get back to pleasure in really well-made things and this is going to help part of this problem that you're speaking of and I, again, must say I think the counter-culture has done a lot to draw our attention to that.

Dr. KENNAMER. Here are two questions directed to either Mr. McGill or Mr. Keppel.

"Is the panel saying that a society can function without an elite? If not, what sort of elite should we strive to promote, if not intellectual?"

And then the second question that somewhat related but not directly.

"To what extent should we seriously consider the British pattern of university grants committee as a pattern for financing higher education; especially in terms of protecting institutional autonomy?"

These are the two that——

Dr. MCGILL. I'll take the first and let Mr. Keppel take the second. All right? (Laughter)

I think that we have proceeded for perhaps a hundred years in our society with what is a very attractive conception of an elite; namely, emeritocracy. That is, the leadership of those people who are most able, whatever their social background. The difficulty that we have discovered as we have really begun to address our problems is that that beautiful conception is frustrated by events that occur very early in life and very much out of the control of those institutions that seek to develop excellence later.

As we have really been forced to confront the fact that despite our judgment that we judge merit and talent alone, we are also making racial and sexual distinctions. We have been forced to reevaluate the whole process and we have no idea yet where that new evaluation takes us.

Mr. KEPPEL. I think, if I had the second question right, it was could we foresee the possibility of the United States following a pattern somewhat of the British order with regard to the support of the universities; namely, the University Grants Committee.

That pattern, as many of you know better than I, is one in which national funds flow through a commission which is almost wholly staffed by academic representatives including, I believe now, student representatives. The money goes through that source out to the universities.

We don't have it, of course, in this country and I'll have to confess I see a great many difficulties in doing it. Number one. The British are dealing with a far more limited number of institutions. I think we're dealing with 25, 30 or something of that order of magnitude. We are in this country, obviously, dealing with thousands.

Second, as anyone under Mr. Johnson's leadership, President Johnson's leadership, would know, this is a nation, this is a continent as well as a nation. We're immense. We're not manageable in the same sense as the British. Therefore, in my remarks, you'll notice that I hit as hard as I could for the next decade, the importance of using the state machinery for development of plans and to a degree, the allocation of priorities in higher education because that makes the problem very much more manageable.

I think in the British case, there is one thing we might look at and I realize, Bill, what a dreadful thing this would be to say. But in this country, from the point of view of basic research, I'm speaking now of fundamental research in universities, one might make the case that there's a sufficiently limited number of institutions for basic research. That they might be dealt with with the equivalent of a University Grants Committee based in Washington representing the Science Foundation, the Office of Education and others all in one place.

One of our problems, I fear, has been that unwittingly, by having a lot of government agencies at work dealing with basic research, the universities have been torn from limb to limb and were not able to control their growth. I think that was part of your speech, Bill.

Conceivably in that narrow area of basic research, something comparable to the University Grants Committee could be considered. Not, I think, for the carrying out of the basic program.

Dr. KENNAMER. I think we have time for one more question.

"Can educational reform be accomplished without participation of faculties? How can such participation be developed and accomplished?"

It's directed to the panel in general.

Mr. NEWMAN. Can we draw straws? (Laughter.)

Dr. MCGILL. Could I make a comment on that?

Dr. KENNAMER. Please.

Mr. MCGILL. Our second Task Force has been interested in the question of how educational reform comes about and particularly how differing institutions come about. I mean by that, institutions such as the university without walls, the experiment at Green Bay or Evergreen or Johnston College or Many Farms, the community college for the Navajos or the College for Human Services in New York and so on. And we've had a considerable group of researchers examining these and trying to determine the role of these.

I think I would be prepared to argue, though the evidence is very fragmentary and there's not many good studies on it, that most significantly different institutions are the creatures of strongly felt needs by a relatively narrow group of people and that frequently they find it necessary to create and draw on an entirely new faculty.

That where such institutions occur within traditional frameworks, there are very strong pressures to absorb and modify these back to a standard academic pattern. And that the history of a great many institutions, I once used Santa Cruz as an example of this, the University of California at Santa Cruz.

I was at Harvard giving a talk and I used Santa Cruz as an example because it turns out the University of California itself has examined this question and there is a study and they demonstrate fairly conclusively that, in fact, this happened at Santa Cruz.

I got back to my office at Stanford and the next morning the phone rang and it was a man from the Chancellors Office at Santa Cruz saying, "How come you said our institution is falling back to a conventional thing. How come you're saying those things at Harvard," and I thought, "They may have difficulty in terms of creating difference and keeping difference but their intelligence network is fantastic." (Laughter)

So I would argue in answer to the question that there's probably no one way in which reform will come about. That faculty members are, in fact, very often those interested parties who go out and seek new ways of creating institutions but that to expose a new and tender institution at an early stage to heavy pressure from traditional academic forces, both in budgeting and in faculty controls and in accrediting, particularly, one is very likely to see it erode steadily toward a conventional institution.

Professor PARK. Could I comment on that?

I think if you look back at the history of American education, it's relatively clear that the new thrusts have come from people outside the academic profession and I'm thinking here of what the Hollis gift to Harvard meant or the Lawrence one or the Morrill Act itself to which I referred before. But the initial thrust has to be made practical by the faculties and if you take just the Morrill Act, there wasn't a science of agriculture to be taught but Morrill wanted something done about it, so the faculties eventually developed this capability and then it became their thing and they did it better than anybody from the outside could have taught them.

So, if I may go back to my initial word, there is a symbiosis here in higher education between the competence of the educational institution and the needs of society.

Dr. McGILL. If there is one certain way to insure the full participation of faculty in the reform that lies ahead of us and that is our serious effort to create a set of incentives that will make it attractive to do so. If you want to stimulate undergraduate teaching, then the way to do it is not to engage in moral preachments about the nature of American higher education. The way to do it is to fund chairs with resources that will make it a reward for faculty to teach undergraduate courses. It isn't hard to do. We are, I'm principally concerned, drifting away from that classical and perienal human concept which is that you achieve what you are seeking to do by making it attractive for people to do it.

Dr. KENNAMER. Well, I surely wish to thank the panel for their comments and President McGill for his presentation. We know that we have many, many problems. I think that's been illustrated today. We are in a major state of flux in higher education in this decade as we go beyond the great achievements of the 60's, and all in all, academic ferment is considerable and yet I think it is taking place in some ways in the calmest atmosphere compared to a few years ago. And that many of the aspirations are taking on some of the substance of quality and so I thank you very much as a panel and thank the participants. (Applause)

Mr. MIDDLETON. Thank you, Lorrin.

Ladies and gentlemen, the 36th President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson. (Applause)

CONCLUSION OF SYMPOSIUM—REMARKS BY LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Middleton, Dr. McGill, disinguished panelists, ladies and gentlemen. All of us connected with this school and this library are greatly honored by the presence this week of so many distinguished educators and public officials.

It is my conclusion that you've made this Symposium most memorable and I think all will agree it's been a most stimulating two days.

To those of you who have taken time out of your very busy lives and your crowded schedules to come to Austin, some of you from far away with great inconveniences to yourself, we say we thank you very much.

As most of you know, this Symposium was occasioned by the opening of the education papers that are stored here in this library. It's the first group of papers from my Administration that we're making available to scholars and researchers.

So far as the papers are concerned, whatever is there for good or for bad—and I hope it's for good—I believe the papers will prove to be of help in not only placing in perspective our problems, but in giving us some of the answers and the solutions.

In every great fight there are winners and losers, there are proponents and opponents. In every great cause there are achievements and errors. And of course, these papers are going to reflect it all. It is not our purpose to unnecessarily provoke anyone, but to try to show how it really was.

The papers are the raw material of history, and as you all know, historians don't always agree. They don't always see things the same way. They're sometimes like the little boy who opened the kitchen door and saw the family dog and said to his mother "Mama, come here. There's a big lion in the yard." And she looked over his shoulder and said, "Son, you're going to have to go upstairs and stay in your room for a while. You must stop that exaggerating. That's not a lion. That's our dog, Rover. And furthermore, you're going to have to get down on your knees and ask the Lord to forgive you for telling stories."

A few minutes later, the mother returned and said, "Did you get down on your knees and say your prayers and ask the Lord for forgiveness?" He said, "Yes, mother, I did." She said, "Well, what did the Lord say? Did he give you forgiveness?" "No, mother. He said he thought it was a lion too." (Laughter)

So sometimes we don't all see everything the same way. We hope these papers will aid in bringing together divergent viewpoints, particularly the viewpoints of our historians. But even though this occasion marks the opening of a group of these papers, that is not really why we're all here.

We're here not to celebrate the breakthroughs of yesterday, but as those of you who have attended all of these provocative meetings know, we are here to try to chart the breakthroughs for tomorrow. And as what some might call an ex-monarch, (Laughter) I want to assure you that it's no new experience to one who has been where I have been and gone through what I've gone through, to hear about the problems, (Laughter) as well as the different approaches to those problems.

I never had half as high an opinion of the past as I have of the future. So it is the future to which we should address ourselves and which I think we have at least approached the last day and a half.

I think it's time that we all take a good dose of introspection. In three years, I have had ample opportunity to do that among my sheep and lowing herds and my cattle. I don't think that there's any problem confronting the great people of this great nation that we don't have the capacity to solve, physical, intellectual or—with apologies, Dr. McGill, who seemed to sum it all up in one big word—financial.

I believe we have enough to find the answer and the solution to all that confronts us. Now, I agree with you that there's a good deal of loss of faith. But we're a pendulum nation. We're a nation that is hell bent on action for a short duration and then a good long sleepy time of inaction.

I have served in public life 40 years. I know we have the best system that man has ever yet devised to govern our people, but I can only recall two great social surges in my 40 years, both of which have been followed—without being uncomplimentary to anyone (Laughter)—by rebirth of such words in our vocabulary as "regressiveness."

A good many of you youngsters cannot recall the days when we had no electricity in this area, before REA was born, when we had no conservation program of any kind, when we had no social security and public housing had not yet been born, when unemployment compensation was just two big words that no one really understood. But following the activities of the '30's and the war that followed, there was a period of inaction on our part because—in the words of Senator Mansfield who told me, he said, "We've come too far too fast during my Administration. The people want just a little letup and a little rest." That was the feeling, I think, that confronted President Truman when he followed the action years of Roosevelt. They wanted to just stop and pull off their shoes and sit and rock for a while. And they did. And as long as the majority will prevails in this country, you're going to see some of that.

So ye of little faith, do not be discouraged because your time will come again. (Laughter) Following the great war and the election of a Republican president, we made some attacks on our problems of education through the National Defense Act, but I don't think anyone here contends they were major attacks on our real problems.

If we did anything during those years when I was a leader in Congress of consequence about the overall cause of education or health or the neglected problems of civil liberties, civil rights, or the poor, I don't remember it. But there came a time when our nation who had suddenly been confronted with a great tragedy started reflecting and engaging in some introspection and decided that we ought to get going again, and we did.

We no longer held up the bugaboos of we don't have the money. This country has the money to do anything it's got the guts to do and the vision to do and the will to do. (Applause)

When we came back before the Congress after Dallas in '63, we took the causes that were the cancers that were eating away at our society and where the poor were getting $12 billion annually, per year, in public appropriations, in five years we moved it to $24 billion; we doubled it for the poor. Now, I didn't do that and the Democrats didn't do that.

The courage and faith and the union of the people did that. They had leadership and yes, they had arm twisting. But all the people did it. We were spending on health $4 billion a year on two billion two hundred million people. We moved that up the ladder to $14 billion.

President Truman had tried to do the same thing at that twilight period following the Roosevelt Administration, but we were tired and we wanted to rest, and we were foot-sore. Most of these recommendations that were executed in middle '60's were formulated by the brain thrusts and spoken by President Truman back in the late '40's.

In the field of older citizens, including our social security, we raised our public appropriations and our private contributions from $17 billion to $29 billion, an advance that has never been equaled in our history.

And in the field of education, the bugaboo of Federal control that had kept the Congress from acting for so many years, except a little during Lincoln's time—a vocational agricultural bill now and then in the interim—we moved the educational expenditures and the educational commitments in this nation up from two billion three to eleven billion in five years.

So I'm not worried about our inability to meet our problems if we know what we want to meet. I might say that New York City, during the period that we were making these appropriations for the poor and doubling the expenditure from $12 to $24, turned back many millions of dollars that Congress had appropriated for the poor and the President had allocated for the poor to the poor in New York City because they didn't have the planning and the organization to carry them out.

Now, I think that—I don't want to give the formula. If I had felt that I was the one to do it and that I had all the answers, I probably wouldn't be where I am today. I reached another conclusion, but I do have an opinion on it. I do think, first of all, that we've got to have the courage to do what we think the national interest requires.

Second, I think we've got to start with the faith and the belief that we can do it. We have the capacity. Third, I think we've got to realize that it's absolutely essential that we do it without regard to political parties,

without fear of favor, with equality to all and that there be a union among us. And that means first of all, I'd say, right here is the place to begin as a union between the students and the faculty and a much better understanding to them. Who am I to tell people how to communicate?

But a union between the student and faculty and the governing bodies and a union among those selected to speak with all the people, for all the people in the Legislature and in the Congress.

I got the name of being an arm-twister because Senator Dirkson didn't like the fact that I was getting votes for programs that he opposed. (Laughter) And I never did apologize for that name. I'm rather proud of it, because if it takes just a little twisting to double the investment that we make in health and poor and older people and education in this country, that's a very small price to pay for it.

So I would say that if all of us engage in enough introspection and come up with the answer to this problem, what the Congress wants to know. This country can finance all the higher education that we think we ought to have for all the people that think they ought to have it, and lower education too, and any other kind of education, in my judgment.

We must be equitable to all. We must be pruduent in what we do. But we don't lack the resources. I've never been convinced a moment that because of the Vietnam war or because of any other excuse you want to use, that we've deprived these laudable purposes, health, education and so forth, with the funds they needed. I think there are other causes.

Now, I really think the paymaster, the man who calls the signals on my ranch or the paymaster in our business or the controller in any company or the legislator, the Appropriation Committee in any institution I've ever worked for or served—and I was in the Congress 24 years—has one principal thing in mind: are we getting a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent? Are we getting value received?

And I submit, sir, there's a dangerous trend in this country among the paymasters and among those who must pay the taxes—and the legislators are just symbols, they just speak for them. They say what they think their people are thinking and won't say. But they do not believe that there's enough union, that the students don't believe in the faculties, some don't believe in themselves, a great many don't believe in the system. I don't believe any of that is true. I think they do. I think there are exceptions to all rules.

They don't think that faculties teach anymore. They write and talk and travel to seminars and symposiums. (Laughter) But I think that we can realign our forces and bring together our students and our faculties and our governing boards and our leaders in the media and meet any financial problem that we've got to meet, just as we do in wars, just as we do in other crises.

Now, we just happen to have made two great surges, social surges, in my lifetime. But I submit that there may be another one on the way and in the wings. I hope it will be preceded by an agreement among ourselves such as discussions like this can help us arrive at that will tell us what we want, why we need it and convince those who pay the bills that we must have it. I believe it can be done or this library wouldn't be here, the school wouldn't be here; the great advancements I saw in the paper yesterday morning.

I had to borrow $75 to get to school and I had to borrow $200 to stay in school from the Masonic Lodge and I tried 24 years to put a student loan bill through the Congress and failed. But as I said one time to the Congress, I never realized, I never thought, I never imagined I'd have this power as President of this great nation, but now that I have it, I assure you I'm going to use it. (Applause)

And we used it to the extent that last year the General Accounting Office showed that more than a million college students borrowed more than a billion dollars guaranteed by the government of this country. Now, we had rocked for 24 years and didn't do anything about it. But we're doing something about it now, and we can on all of these other problems if we only have the vision to know what we want to do and the will and determination to do it.

Now, Mr. Cohen said something about Task Forces yesterday and I think that all of you will find this a valuable research source. I'm so happy that we're now able to make them public. Mr. Cohen always favored making them public. He didn't make the commitment to all the participants that they wouldn't be made public during the Administration. I did. That put us in a little different light. A man who has a promise is in somewhat of a different position than one who hasn't promised. But I'm able to comply with my promise.

Most of the fellows were ready to have them made public the day they turned them in and really wanted them to be made public. But I had to think about the man on the Civil Rights Task Force in Jackson, Mississippi, who joined that Task Force and some pretty far reaching and advance recommendation that day, what the consequence of his act would be when he got home. And I had to think something of my own conscience where I'd made a commitment that they wouldn't be used, would not be made public and embarrass them.

They were, after all, for the benefit of the President to make his recommendations. All that I could find that was good, feasible, had any opportunity to march, I picked out. Now, there's still some back there that haven't been implemented. If you can find them and get a new leader, well, I'm sure we'll have some more laws on the subject. (Laughter)

I have the definite feeling that these deliberations that you have conducted here were undertaken in the same spirit as our Task Forces were undertaken. I believe that their work has borne great proof. Sixty laws are on the books. And I believe that your discussions will bear great fruit too.

I think some day that—this may be an overstatement; I hope not—that each of you, not only panelists, but all of you here will say, "I was glad that I was there." And I want to thank all of you for being here. I want to present only one guest before this group breaks up. Except for him, there wouldn't be any library or any Public Affairs School, or I doubt that I would even be here. He was a source of great strength to me throughout my presidency and still is and is to the cause of education in this nation. But because he's a very shy man, as most effective men are, he's not known to all this group. And I want them to know and love and respect Mr. Arthur Krim as I do. Arthur would you come up here. (Applause)

I called Arthur for two days once when I was in the White House. I called him in California, New York and Israel. I finally got him and I said, "Where in the hell are you?" He said, "I'm here in the White House." I said, "When did you come?" He said, "I've been here three days." (Laughter)

Arthur serves on the Board of Columbia University and many other capacities. The most important board he serves on though is the LBJ Ranch and he comes down there every few weeks and works on this library and works on this Public Affairs School and works for people everywhere.

I want to say thanks to Dr. Spurr and Mrs. Rostow and the others who planned this conference, and Mr. Middleton. I think that on the whole, it's been very good and very productive. I'm deeply indebted to John Gardner and Wilbur Cohen and Dr. McGill for their great speeches as well as the contributions of all the panelists.

Mr. Middleton tells me that we plan to open the civil rights papers here in April and we want to invite all of you to return again. We hope that we'll be able to demonstrate in the years to come that this is a university and this is a library that concerns itself with human beings and their problems and that really has a heart and really cares about people and trying to find the answer to their problems.

We had a cowboy out at Sonora that had a heart problem and went to his doctor, not long ago. The doctor told him he'd have to have a transplant. He said, "Well, where do I get that?" He said, "Well, down in Houston, the university has great medical facilities there as well as others, and you go to Houston, Texas."

He got his wife to take him in the pickup and they drove down to Houston. Dr. DeBakey, after he examined him, agreed he had to have a transplant and he had it. Dr. DeBakey told him before they went in that there's one decision he'd have to make. He'd have to sign a statement that would relieve anyone of any responsibility and he'd have to select the heart.

He said, "You have a choice of three today. We have an international ski champion, a virile vigorous young man from Salt Lake City. His heart is available. We have a beautiful Hollywood actress 22 years of age. Her heart is available. We have a Republican banker, 69 years old. His heart is available. You make your choice."

He said, "Well, I'll take the banker's heart." And the transplant took place very successful. When they wheeled him out in the chair, his wife was under the drive-in to take him home in the pickup. He said, "Doctor, I'm so grateful for the great service you performed for me. I don't know whether I can ever do anything for you, but if you're ever in the cow business and you're out in Sonora, call upon me if I can help you."

Dr. DeBakey said, "Well, that's nice of you. I doubt I'll ever be in Sonora; more improbable that I'll ever be in the cow business. But if you want to help me, my curiosity was aroused when you had the opportunity to get a virile young man's heart or a pretty woman's heart, why did you take the banker's heart? I would like to know your reasoning process."

He said, "Well, Doctor, I'm not sure I did the right thing, but I had to make up my mind quick and the way I approached it was that if I had to have a new heart I wanted to be sure I got one that had never been used." (Laughter.) (Applause.)

Now, I just want to observe this in conclusion (laughter), that if any of you have to have a different heart I hope you won't come here unless you want to find one that has been used because we intend to use ours. (Applause.)

Mr. MIDDLETON. Ladies and gentlemen, that brings this Symposium to a conclusion. We'll see you on the opening of the civil rights papers. Thank you.

(Whereupon the Symposium was concluded at 12:00 o'clock noon.)

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING HONORED ON 20TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct pleasure in joining my colleagues in speaking in support of the Youth for

Understanding teenage exchange program.

As one who is vitally interested in fostering international cooperation, I am convinced that this program has made a real contribution toward that goal.

The dedicated leadership of YFU's executive director, Mrs. Rachel Andreson, has guided the project from infancy to a dynamic and innovative exchange program. In 1951, when the program started, Mrs. Andreson was asked to lend her assistance. At that time she was executive director of the Ann Arbor Council of Churches. Mrs. Andreson has been instrumental in establishing the local committee structure, which oversees the operation of the program on the local level. Mrs. Andreson has seen her staff grow to 50 full-time office and staff workers. She has been honored for her contribution to international understanding by the Federal Republic of Germany—1958, the Michigan House of Representatives—1963, Finland—1964, the University of Michigan—1967, and for Brazil—1968, 1970, and 1971.

Although the program originated in Michigan, its efforts have gradually expanded so that students and families from every State in the Union are involved. More than 30,000 students from 45 countries have participated in the program since the program was first established with the cooperation of the Detroit Rotary Clubs in 1951.

Youth for Understanding has several types of exchange programs. Their first started in 1951 with the placement of 75 German students in homes in the Detroit area. The program continues to bring students from all over the world to live with American families and attend American high schools for 1 year.

Youth for Understanding also has a program to send American students overseas for 2 months during the summer.

Youth for Understanding conducts more intensive study programs for American students. The 13th year abroad program provides high school graduates with the opportunity of spending a year abroad after high school, studying and living with a family abroad. YFU also offers college students the opportunity to participate in a summer survey course abroad for 6 hours' credit.

Two YFU programs offer the opportunity for musically inclined students to participate in an overseas tour each summer. YFU offers a string and a wind ensemble.

The contributions of YFU have been recognized by the Department of State, as well as several other governments.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the headquarters of Youth for Understanding in the Second District and I wish them continued success in their worthwhile efforts.

I insert several documents explaining the program at the conclusion of my remarks:

A TELEGRAM FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

FEBRUARY 2, 1972.

To: Mrs. Rachel Andreson.

From: President Richard Nixon.

It is a pleasure to join with so many friends on Capitol Hill who pay tribute to you and to the continuing contribution of the Youth for Understanding Program to international peace and goodwill.

As you know, I have long been among those who have most admired your vigorous efforts and I fully share the sentiments that are expressed for you on this occasion.

RICHARD M. NIXON.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING OVERSEAS

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Youth for Understanding is the largest and fastest growing organization in the field of teenage exchange programs. More than 30,000 students from 45 countries have participated in Youth for Understanding programs since its establishment in 1951–52. Youth for Understanding is one of the three teenage exchange programs officially recognized by the United States State Department.

The statement of purpose of Youth for Understanding is contained in Article II of its By-Laws. It shall be the purpose of this corporation to:

A. Promote international understanding by sponsoring, developing and carrying out international student exchange programs, to arrange for international cultural exchanges and for exchange of youths desiring to accomplish needed services in other countries, and to do all things necessary to achieve these purposes, including raising and investing necessary funds, soliciting, receiving and accepting funds, gifts, grants, bequests and devices, in any form, acquiring, holding transportation and facilities, setting up auxiliary committees and organizations for these objectives, and cooperating with existing organizations and interested persons toward these ends.

B. To acquaint teenage students brought to the United States from other countries with American family and community life by having them live with American families for approximately one year and to enable the students to gain an understanding and appreciation of the American way of life through participation in typical high school, family and other aspects of community life.

C. To carry out, finance and implement fully an educational and cultural exchange program contemplating the sending of teenage youths from the United States to other countries for various periods of time, arranging for and administering their activities, and contemplating bringing teenage youths from other countries to the United States for educational and cultural purposes in the interests of international understanding and good will.

D. Recognizing that Youth for Understanding has had definite religious undergirding, both in the broad objectives for which it has stood and in the personnel connected with the program, it is to be understood that this aspect shall be retained in the corporate structure.

E. These purposes are meant to secure an interfaith and interracial approach to international good will by providing qualified young people with broad experience through living with families of other countries.

HISTORY OF YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

Youth for Understanding began in 1951 when the Detroit, Michigan area Rotary Clubs agreed to host 75 German teenagers who were selected for an exchange experience by the United States State Department. When it became apparent that the participating Rotary Clubs could not find sufficient homes for these students among their membership, Mrs. Rachel Andresen, the Executive Director of the Ann Arbor Council of Churches, was asked to lend her assistance. Her educational and professional background in the area of social work and her extensive experience with a variety of state and community organizations well suited her to cope with this challenging situation and to find the necessary homes which met with the State Department requirements.

In January, 1952, the Rotarians and the State Department asked her to officially supervise the program for the remainder of the year. A request for more German students for Michigan for the following school year was granted on the condition that Mrs. Andresen would be made the permanent supervisor and that the program function on a statewide basis. The Ann Arbor Council of Churches received permission to act as the official agency from the Michigan Council of Churches and named this area of their activities "Youth for Understanding." Mrs. Andresen, as Executive Director of the Ann Arbor Council of Churches, was responsible for the total operation of the Council, as well as its new exchange project.

During the next five years, the Occupation Budget was utilized for the selection and financing of students brought to Michigan. The role of YFU continued to be that of home placement and supervision. In 1956, the State Department continued to select students, but withdrew its subsidy as a result of the termination of Germany's occupation status and its normal establishment as an independent republic. However, some funds were made available for program development and in this way continuation of the program on a private selection basis was encouraged. Although most of the students at that time were from Germany, it was during this period that other countries were being added to the program.

In 1955, the second phase of operation was added to the exchange program. American teenagers were taken to European countries for ten weeks of their summer vacation. Returned exchange students from previous years found placements for them with the help of their parents. Although only a few students participated in this phase of the program the first few years, they brought favorable accounts of their experiences back to their communities and schools and because of their enthusiasm, Youth for Understanding began to grow.

This growth included the addition of the third phase of the program, a youth chorale. The Youth for Understanding Chorale consisted of a group of Michigan teenage musicians recommended by their school music departments and also meeting the general requirements of all other exchange students. Beginning in 1957, this group met every week for practice in Ann Arbor, Michigan, starting in the fall. During the summer of 1958, the teenage musicians toured Europe, performing before public audiences and in the European schools. During their tour they were housed in the homes of families who were found by the returned exchange students from previous years. The musical group was well received and has continued as an integral part of Youth for Understanding since that year. It alternates its tours, traveling one year to Europe and the next year to South America. It will tour Germany, Austria and Yugoslavia in the summer of 1972.

During these years of expansion into other countries, emphasis was placed on the development of local committees to oversee the program in their respective areas. The development of organized local committees came about through contacts with interested individuals who had either heard of the program through returned students or had deliberately been contacted and asked to help.

Throughout the United States, a system of regions and areas have been set up. There are five general responsibilities for area representatives.

Primarily, the area representative acts as the liaison between local communities and the Youth for Understanding national headquarters. This involves forming community committees by contacting local high schools and members of the community who are interested in publicizing Youth for Under-

standing, selecting host families and American exchange students, and who can provide supervision and a well-rounded experience for international students in the community. The area representative then works with the community committee, supplying them with information, materials, travel and counseling consultation and problem-solving, coordinating activities with the Ann Arbor office.

Secondly, the area representative finds homes in the local communities for international students, matching interests, home atmospheres and community activities with those of the student. Schools are consulted to insure that they will take these students in and can work with the area representatives and host families in solving problems which may arise.

Thirdly, the area representative selects recommended American students for the summer and year programs abroad, working with the community committee to determine the qualifications of each student.

Fourthly, the area representative sets up a scholarship committee as part of the community committee, which works on fund raising to help worthy students in the area participate in the Youth for Understanding program.

A fifth responsibility is to provide the overall supervision for the Youth for Understanding program in that area, using guidelines set forth by the Supervisor of Area and Field Representatives in Ann Arbor.

The committees are not isolated in their own communities since they are in constant contact with the central office in Ann Arbor and with each other. Committee chairmen are encouraged to offer advice as to the direction the program will take and conferences are held at necessary intervals with committee members for purposes of evaluation and recommending different procedures. These committees are under the supervision of 90 area representatives.

Although it is not regarded as a separate phase of the program, the development of exchange programs with South American countries represents the values gained by Youth for Understanding from person-to-person contact. Some Uruguayan students had taken part in the exchange program in the earlier years, but a large -scale exchange program had not developed previously because of school difficulties. The reversed seasons between South and North America created a school year calendar opposite to ours. Thus, in order to complete a full year of school in the United States, a South American student had to leave his school before the year was finished and return during the next year, which his classmates had already begun. Because of this, South American countries were requiring that any of their students who participated in an exchange program would have to make up two years of school. Thus, not very many South American students applied as exchange students.

The tour of South America by the Youth for Understanding Chorale in the summer of 1960 resulted in the opening of many new contacts in these countries and stimulated renewed interest in exchange programs. A committee was formed in Uruguay which worked out a compromise plan with the Uruguayan Minister of Education. Uruguayan students were permitted to finish their school year in December, take part in the exchange program in the United States for the rest of the American school year and return to their own school and go on with their original class. This plan is now the normal calendar pattern of exchange of Youth for Understanding with all South American countries. Students from the United States, however, visit South American countries on the same basis as they visit those in Europe and Asia.

An important part of the American overseas program is the Thirteenth Year Abroad Program. It started in 1961 when six American students went overseas. It permits American high school graduates to attend a European secondary school and live with a family for a period of fourteen months. A total of 435 American students have participated in this experience.

A new program known as the Community College Program was begun in December, 1967. It permits older foreign exchange students to attend community colleges in the United States. Currently eleven students are attending community colleges in California, Iowa, and Michigan.

Youth for Understanding effectuated a major change in its orientation and evaluation policies for outgoing and incoming students in the summer of 1970 with the introduction of the Saginaw Valley College sessions. Approximately 6,170 exchange students participated in the sessions last summer. They were held on the campus of Saginaw Valley College, a state-supported, four-year college located near Saginaw, Michigan, which Youth for Understanding rented for the summer. There were three basic programs: (1) orientation for outgoing American students, (2) evaluation sessions for returning European and South American students, and (3) orientation for incoming European students. (See Appendix B for more information.)

The planning and development of Youth for Understanding has been industrious and imaginative. The program is flexible, allowing new phases to be introduced when desirable and developing new ideas that are unique to the exchange student programs. The variety of programs offered illustrates this point.

As a result of its increase in size, particularly the addition of the South American program, Youth for Understanding was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1964. However, it still receives moral support for its activities from the Michigan Council of Churches and the Ann Arbor Council of Churches.

The central office, which was originally housed in Lane Hall in a room donated to the Ann Arbor Council of Churches by the University of Michigan, has made a series of moves, and is now located in a former fraternity house of the University of Michigan known as the "Hoover Mansion." The program is administered by an Executive Director, Mrs. Rachel J. Andreson, governed by a Board of Trustees, employs 50 full-time office and staff workers, and has leaders involved in each of the communities which participate in the program.

In addition to the involvement of 45 countries, exchange students have been placed or selected from communities in 42 different states of the United States. This has been due to a large extent to the movement of persons out of Michigan who have carried with them the knowledge and enthusiasm about the program. Youth for Understanding welcomed its 20,000th exchange student, a girl from Finland, in August, 1969. The latter occasion was attended by the Honorable John Richardson, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. As of February 1972, more than 30,000 students had participated.

THIRTEENTH YEAR ABROAD

This permits American high school graduates to attend a secondary level school and live with a family overseas. Students must have at least a B plus average and demonstrate skill in learning a language. The stay is from June to the following year's July and the fee is $1,350.00. The students receive language instruction, and attend orientation and evaluation sessions to round out the experience.

SUMMER SURVEY COURSES

The Summer Survey Courses enable American students enrolled in a college or university to tour Europe on one of three special study tour programs. They are being conducted in cooperation with Saginaw Valley College, Saginaw, Michigan, which grants six hours of credit and provides professors who conduct seminars, present lectures and give tests en route. The one week orientation session prepares each student for his particular course work. Fee is $1,050.00.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING CHORALE—YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING STRING ENSEMBLE

These groups are composed mostly of Michigan high school students, as a chorale and accompanying ensemble, which tours overseas each summer. The participants must be recommended by their high school music department. They practice from November to June, then travel either in Europe, South America, or Asia, giving concerts and living with families during the summer. The fee is $800.00.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING WIND ENSEMBLE

The Wind Ensemble, a group of musically inclined students, travels on a concert tour each summer. It is comprised of students who live within driving distance of Ann Arbor, due to rehearsal demands. Students must be recommended by their music departments. Fee is $800.00.

NORTHVILLE, MICH.,
April 6, 1952.

DEAR MRS. ANDRESON: I am sorry that I have not written you sooner but the enclosed oration will show you where much of my time has gone.

I will give this oration this coming Tuesday in the district contest of this school area. In it I have summed up much of what my trip meant to me. Perhaps you would like this copy for your files.

As I was in the process of writing it when I heard your husband speak over in Ann Arbor, I'm afraid he must be given credit for my last paragraph. I hope he doesn't mind too much.

Many thanks for all you folks have done for me.

Sincerely,

DAVID LEE.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING

The history of the world, since man appeared upon it, has been the history of its wars and their disastrous results upon mankind. Some nations have conquered others and made slaves of the beaten people. Hatreds, mistrusts and fears have become widespread and man has not yet learned to love, trust, and appreciate his fellowmen whose color, religion, or culture differs from that of his own. It is only in comparatively recent times, perhaps within the last one hundred years, that the idea of world wide brotherhood of man has begun to capture the imaginations and hearts of peoples of all races.

Since genuine human progress can only be achieved in a world free from the horrors and degrading influences of war, it is only logical that we then should direct our energies in the search and finding of world peace.

It is generally agreed that the basic causes of wars are hatreds, suspicions, and fears among nations. These conditions exist chiefly because the people of the world neither know nor understand each other. Foreign nations know us only through our tourists who have perhaps scrupulously accumulated a so called jack pot for one thrilling fling in Paris, London or Rome, or they know us through the cinema world which depicts Americans as ludicrous cowboys, blood thirsty gangsters, or insipid comedians. I can well remember my reaction to a question addressed to me by one of my foreign friends. In all sincerity he said. "Are there many cowboys in Detroit?" Then I truly realized how little we knew or understood each other. That we neither know nor understand each other was

exposed to the world even more adequately through the activities of the United Nations where men of many nations had an opportunity to listen to and speak to one another through the medium of the interpreter. Yet, even then it took three days to satisfactorily explain how we interpreted the small phrase, "All men are created equal." Because of this deficiency in understanding our fellow man, a constructive program is necessary to help bring about better understanding and ultimately lasting peace.

Several programs, with these goals as their objects, are developing in the world. Among them is the "Youth for Understanding" program sponsored by the Rotary clubs of this district. I am proud to say that I have had a share in this program and I am hopeful as I view its results at close range.

The idea of this program is the exchange of students at the high school age level because it is a common belief that students at that age are more open minded, not so prejudiced or not so reticent to accept as older persons. They are more anxious to understand and appreciate the customs, cultures, and beliefs of other peoples.

With this in mind and with the cooperation of the U.S. State Department, 75 high school students from Germany were brought to Michigan to live as normal citizens in the homes of Rotarians in the various communities. These students, by living in the homes and by attending school get a first hand and true picture of Americans as Americans, rather than cowboys, gangsters and comedians.

In return several American students had the privilege of going to Europe, not as tourists but to actually live with the people and to try to understand them and to be understood by them. As I said, it was my good fortune to be one of these students.

I lived in homes in Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Finland. I chummed and formed friendships with boys and girls my own age, attended their schools and learned something of their cultures, habits, and nationalistic spirit. I found them to be fundamentally the same as we are. They have the same general hopes, the same dreams and the same ideals. I found common areas of belief, of pride in achievement, of love of beauty, of love for fellow man.

I attended many church services in Europe and although I did not understand the languages, the exquisite beauty of the cathedrals with their majestic structure impressed me deeply. But more than that I found a common area of belief. I felt we shared in a belief for something more all powerful than man.

Every chance I had, I visited museums, Art Galleries, and places of historical interest. In these places I gained some knowledge of their culture and the heritage that is also partly mine. Their factories and industries impressed me as being very clean and working conditions being good. Again I found an area of interest common to man. I found pride in achievement. As I watched them while they proudly pointed out their achievements, I was reminded of the expression on the faces of fellow Americans touring Greenfield Village or the Ford Motor Company.

No one country has a monopoly on beauty. One morning as I was travelling through Sweden, I witnessed a Scandinavian sunrise. The White birch trees with drooping boughs (abundant everywhere) were coated with a heavy frost. As the sun came up from behind them, it turned the world into a fairyland of sparkling beauty. It is difficult to describe my feelings but I felt a love for this country that I am sure must be in the heart of every Swede. That same love for beauty which permeated my being when I first observed the Grand Canyon, over-powered me as I observed the sunrise, and I thought how my good Swedish friend would be affected in the same manner if he were to share the sight of the Grand Canyon. Yes, another area common to us all, love of beauty.

At Christmas time in Finland, the people did everything possible to make an American boy, a long way from home, have a most enjoyable holiday. They showered me with presents and extra attentions. I entered into their games, sang their songs, and enjoyed their fellowship. Finland will never again seem far away or strange to me, for I feel that these people are my friends and will think of me when they think of America. I hope I left as good an impression with them as they sent home with me. Yes, we found love for fellow man had no boundaries, we found that no nation selfishly possessed this common area of love for fellow man. True their methods and customs vary as do ours but these are only surface appearances. Underneath we are the same. We have the same common belief and the same pride of achievement, the same love of beauty, and the same love of mankind. Many of these boys and girls will continue to be my friends, I am sure. I have a deep respect and genuine good will toward them, because they are not unlike my fellow Americans. No hatreds, no suspicions, no fears exist among my foreign friends and me. The basic causes of war—hatred, suspicion, and fear—have become a nonentity to us. True, we who have been influenced are few in number but the program presents a ray of light in a world that sorely needs it. As the Chinese say, "It is better to light one small candle than to curse the darkness."

Of course the Rotary Club program is only one of few groups that is exchanging students at the present time and the effect of so few may not be immediately felt. My plea is that the program be expanded, and continued not for a year but through the years. Then we shall truly achieve an understanding, worthy of world peace.

The mighty Ambassador Bridge that joins two great countries, Canada and the U.S. began as a single wire cable drawn across the river. More and more of these single strands, each weak in itself, were woven together until the combined strength supports this tremendous structure and binds our two countries together in lasting friendship. Just so will these single strands of friendship, as represented by the exchange students, bind together in friendship, various countries of the world.

STUDENT LETTER

OCTOBER 26, 1971.

DEAR MRS. ANDRESON: This past summer I was privileged to be an exchange student to Belgium through Youth for Understanding. Those two months were the best in my whole life.

I lived with a wonderful family. They were all *very* similar to my American family, so I had no trouble at all in fitting in and becoming a part of the family. The first few days, of course, I was very homesick and wanted more than anything to go home—but I remembered being told by many people at Saginaw (you included) that everyone gets homesick and if you get busy and start meeting people, it will get better. Sure enough, by the end of the second week I was ready to stay in Belgium permanently! I traveled quite a bit throughout Belgium with my family and got to know the country quite well. Now, just as I have a second family, I feel as though I also have a second country.

I met so many wonderful and kind people during my stay in Belgium. I learned to understand people better. Most certainly, that is the main reason why I feel so good about my experience. I feel that I succeeded in carrying out the purpose of YFU—namely, better understanding among peoples of other nations. I feel like such a better person for having been an "ambassador" through YFU. I have gained much self-confidence and I have sharpened my ability to understand and communicate with other people. I can remember you saying at Saginaw, "When you come home you will be able to do *anything* and go *anywhere* that you want to." I was rather skeptical when I heard you say that, but now I understand why you did say it. I do feel as though I can do anything now!

I can't tell you enough times how happy I am to have been involved in such a tremendous organization. I have been encouraging others in my school to get involved with YFU and am now waiting anxiously for an exchange student of my own. If there is ever anything that I can do for YFU, I would be more than happy to do it since YFU has done so much for me.

Thank you again for giving me an opportunity to promote international understanding through your program. It is truly a worthwhile organization, an organization that I am proud to have been connected with.

Most sincerely,

LINDA LIVINGSTONE.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to participate in this special order commending Youth for Understanding on its 20th anniversary is one which I welcome. In my opinion, the educational exchanges which are made available to young people at the secondary school level are among the most interesting and exciting experiences that can come to young people, and give assurance of long-range international understanding and peace.

The educational exchanges which are made possible under the Youth for Understanding programs affect citizens at an age when they can assimilate the culture, language, and historical background of another nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Youth for Understanding programs establish a pattern which, if followed on a greatly expanded scale, could involve tens of thousands of high school students, in the United States and in countries around the world, in educational exchanges which could enrich and inspire. Not only does Youth for Understanding establish solid and enduring friendships between peoples of different countries, it enhances the educational levels of all who participate—with the result that the students themselves serve as emissaries of goodwill as well as teachers of others with whom they come in contact in their native lands.

It seems to me significant that the Youth for Understanding program was born of voluntary action in behalf of useful and exciting experiences of foreign study and of entertaining foreign students in our country. Out of the initiative of Mrs. Rachel Andreson who has become the organization's executive director, Youth for Understanding has grown from its local activities in the Detroit, Mich., area to a worldwide activity which served more than 9,000 students last year—including some 435 Americans who traveled to various countries abroad—and approximately 9,000 foreign students, most of whom enjoyed a school year of study and living in the United States.

Indeed, the organization today is staffed by a distinguished body of professional and highly motivated persons. The growth of Youth for Understanding is evidenced by the fact that some 45 foreign countries as well as communities

located in 42 States are today involved in this worldwide program. According to the latest report of Youth for Understanding, this great organization has enabled more than 30,000 young people to participate in student and cultural exchange activities which YFU has undertaken.

Youth for Understanding involves a living experience in a foreign country. The homes and families of the host country are utilized by the visiting students. In general, public secondary schools become the central learning institutions where the visiting students continue their education.

For the most part, private funds are used to defray travel and living expenses. The total budget of Youth for Understanding for 1971 was less than $4 million.

It is encouraging to me to recall that the Youth for Understanding program has had a close association with the spiritual and religious life of our country. Initial support for the program came from various Rotary Clubs as well as from the Ann Arbor Council of Churches where Mrs. Andreson served formerly as executive director.

Mr. Speaker, in commemorating this 20th year for Youth for Understanding and in order to indicate my earnest support of this type of student exchange activity, I have recently been in direct communication with the superintendents of all of the public and private high schools in my congressional district of Illinois. Arthur Collingsworth, Dr. Oliver T. Rose, and Carlos Russo are among those who have accompanied me or have individually visited with educators, and others in Illinois, in behalf of the YFU program. On Monday, February 14, interested students, parents and faculty from these schools will gather at the Libertyville, Ill., high school to discuss the Youth for Understanding program—with the exceptation of interesting additional students in participating in a year of study in some foreign country.

I am hopeful that a large number of students from the area which I serve in Congress will find it possible to enjoy the experience of learning and living abroad. Indeed, in this and other opportunities provided through the YFU programs, coupled with other similar activities which may reach increased numbers of persons in the years ahead, lies the great hope for establishing a world of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mrs. Rachel Andreson and all who have helped to establish and to advance the Youth for Understanding programs throughout these 20 years. I commend Secretary of State Rogers, the Assistant Secretary for Education and Cultural Affairs, Alan Reich, and Miss Harriet Elam, Director of Youth Activities at the State Department, for their support of YFU. In addition, I call this program to the attention of all in the executive branch, and more particularly to my colleagues in the Congress, and urge them to cooperate through legislation, personal efforts, and in other ways, to promote an expanded program of student exchanges through support of Youth for Understanding and other programs of educational and cultural exchange.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to express my strong support or the Youth for Understanding program, which has become such a tremendous success that it now involves more than 6,000 students from 44 countries.

This student exchange program began in 1951, and that very first year the counties of Kent and Ionia in my congressional district in Michigan participated. This year there are 86 overseas students living in Kent and Ionia Counties, enrolled in 30 high schools and representing 13 European countries, Japan, Mexico, the Philippine Islands, South America, and Africa.

An equal number of our Kent and Ionia high school youth travel overseas each summer to take part in a family living experience. Some also participate in a 13-year-abroad study program, a YFU Chorale, a string ensemble, or a band ensemble. Our students who have lived in Finland have also visited Russia. This year our first Kent County student to go to Yugoslavia will initiate a two-way exchange with students from that country.

School administrators and personnel in Kent and Ionia Counties have been most cooperative in integrating YFU students into their high school programs. They feel that the cultural exchange involved enriches the school curriculum. Tuition, books, and many extracurricular opportunities are offered by the schools to integrate the overseas students into the school communities. In return, the foreign students eagerly share knowledge of their own nations.

In addition, the people of the 30 school communities in Kent and Ionia Counties have shown their concern for greater world understanding by volunteering to work on local committees. These committees encourage host families and stimulate interest, as well as financial aid. All of these efforts are aimed at encouraging youth from our area to become exchangees.

For the past 20 years, many service clubs, businesses, and civic, school, and church organizations have been—and are increasingly—represented on these local community committees. In Kent and Ionia Counties, YFU has the support and active participation of many of the Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs, the Jaycees, Y's, Mens and American Business Clubs. The Grand Rapids, Mich., Education Association, parent-teacher-student associations, student councils, school international clubs, and parents' advisory groups are active members of these committees.

The Grand Rapids Symphony, Grand Rapids Civic Theater, Grand Rapids Community Concert Association, and Kiwanis Clubs provide complimentary tickets to cultural events in the area.

Active cooperation is given by the Grand Rapids Catholic Diocese, and Protestant and Jewish church groups.

The Grand Rapids Press, suburban Almanac, and other newspapers, WOOD television and radio, and WZZM television and radio, serving Grand Rapids and the surrounding area, cooperate by presenting YFU news and public spot announcements as well as special programs.

YFU has received three local grants, recently awarded to benefit our American YFU students in local areas. The Loutit Foundation of Grand Haven, Mich., in 1970 awarded a 3-year grant of $5,000 to three counties, including Kent—Grand Rapids. The Grand Rapids Foundation has awarded YFU $5,000 to be used in 1972 for students in Kent County alone, and this year, also, the Grand Rapids Rotary Club is providing the four Grand Rapids public, two Catholic and two private Christian schools in the immediate area $2,500 to benefit YFU-Rotary selectees. Qualifications of all these students will involve their potential as young ambassadors from their own localities and the United States, as well as financial need.

The feelings of the overseas students who have participated in the YFU program in Kent and Ionia Counties were superbly expressed by a student from Uruguay as she left the United States and Kent County after a 6-month family-school-and-community living experience. She wrote:

> I have learned a lot about this country, and about myself. I have learned how to understand and love people that suddenly happen to be my parents, my friends, my world. If this is what happens to every exchange student from all the world, good understanding between nations will soon arrive. I hope and I'm sure this program will keep on growing. I think it's great, and what happened to every one of us during this time will never be forgotten.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this month will see the completion of 30,000 exchanges under the Youth for Understanding program, a landmark for one of the most significant exchange programs for high school level students. It has grown from modest beginnings 20 years ago to an annual level of thousands of participants from five continents.

Youth for Understanding offers a chance for the world's youth—at a most open and questing age—to gain an awareness of the wider world and a sympathetic appreciation of other cultures. A German girl mastering an American poem, an American student singing to awed Mexican youngsters, a Filipino boy viewing the dimensions of U.S. grain fields—these pieces of experience are the cement of international understanding which Youth for Understanding fosters.

This cross-cultural experience is made the more profound and indelible by having the participants, Americans and foreigners, live with host families and enter directly into school life during their foreign sojourn. My own district presently hosts three young men from as many European nations and has seen numerous others in Illinois communities over the program's two decades. I expect our student guests have returned to their homes with something of Illinois' 16th district in their bones and left a similar heritage with their host families.

It is doubly satisfying for a Congressman to praise an international effort which does not need our money. Youth for Understanding is virtually self-financed from student fees. Foundation

and individual contributions help make it possible to offer some supplemental scholarships to students of lesser means.

One can be cynical about international exchange program and about the sometimes ephemeral words "understanding" and "good will." Yet the Youth for Understanding program has contributed to both in a real and practical way. Would that more of our young people, here and abroad, were touched by it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise with my colleagues to praise the work of the Youth for Understanding program which is headquartered in my home State of Michigan.

We are all aware that the final source of the deep divisions which plague the peoples of the world is the lack of genuine understanding of, and appreciation for, the individual and his uniqueness. Throughout the centuries man has worked in many ways to overcome these divisions by getting to know more about and appreciate more fully his fellow man. Today, when we are able to communicate with individuals half-way around the world in the twinkling of an eye, when we can travel thousands of miles in only a few hours, when the statements and actions of world leaders are in the news only moments after they occur, today, more than ever, we need vehicles for understanding and appreciating our fellow man.

Youth for Understanding is just such a vehicle. And it performs its marvelous magic on those who have the least prejudices, the greatest degree of openness, and the most to gain by a genuine appreciation for our fellow man. We frequently hear phrases about youth indicating that they "are the leaders of tomorrow" and pointing out that our young people are our greatest asset. Often we do not recognize that the substance of such a statement is contained in another oft-quoted adage: "As the twig is bent, so grows the tree."

Since 1951, over 30,000 students have had the opportunity to be bent in the direction of a more open and understanding world. Youths from 45 nations have participated in this experience in the appreciation and understanding of the lives and ways of other people through Youth for Understanding.

While the young people who participate in the youth for understanding program receive a part of their education in our country—and young Americans receive the benefit of the educational experience of other nations—the students also live with native families and participate in the life of those families. Certainly this kind of experience exposes youth of all nationalities and backgrounds to the differences which exist between the peoples of the world.

But most significantly it exposes them to the very real truth that, in spite of our differences, we are more alike as human beings than we often allow ourselves to admit. Methods of government may differ, modes of dress and patterns of living may be unique, but under it all family and community life, the respect of man for man, sustain society and make it grow. The recognition of this basic fact, and the learning experience which is provided through coming into contact with new and different education systems certainly contributes significantly to a broader understanding of our own life and our place in a world rapidly growing smaller.

I had the opportunity to participate directly in one fine aspect of the youth for understanding program during the summer of 1970. At Saginaw Valley College, one of the fine educational facilities in my area of Michigan, these young people receive orientation and evaluation sessions as they enter and leave the program. It was my privilege to provide many of the students with some information regarding our American way of government and the democratic system in general. In meeting with these young people, I was impressed by the depth of their interest and their desire to learn and know more about America, its life and its people. Every one of us should have the opportunity for this type of experience. I know that I learned from my short time with the groups which I met and I am sure that the American families with which they lived also gained from the experience of having an exchange student in their home.

Most of all, however, the young person involved became convinced of the necessity of all men getting to know and appreciate one another. And that fact is the best testament we can make to the success of the youth for understanding program.

To hope that it continues to perform this function successfully in an increasingly complex world is our prayer.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in saluting the fine work of the Youth for Understanding student exchange program. The purpose of this program, which has its headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich., is to develop understanding among people of many nations through a family living experience. One of the ways it seeks to accomplish this is by sending American students overseas for 2 months in the summer to live with families in other countries. From a modest beginning in 1951, under the leadership of Dr. Rachel Anderson, the program has grown so that now about 4,000 exchange students on a nationwide basis are involved each year. Overall, some 39 countries have sent us students, and American students have gone abroad from most of the 50 States.

This person-to-person approach is an excellent way of promoting international understanding, and I am pleased to add my voice in paying tribute to this excellent endeavor.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to make a few brief remarks on behalf of a program which I consider to be a valuable part of our educational system today—Youth for Understanding.

This international student exchange program is very popular in Indiana. In recent years, approximately 100 teenagers from high schools in Europe, Asia, and South America have attended high schools in Indiana each year. Just last year, some 25 students were welcomed in my own fifth district. Living with local host families, they have made significant contributions to their schools and larger community. Several have come to Indiana from behind the Iron Curtain.

In return, an average of 40 Indiana high school students each year have enjoyed an intercultural experience with families in other countries. Last year six had the opportunity to study for a full year in Sweden, Holland, Germany, and Finland, in the language of the country—think of what an incentive that would be to master those language drills.

Almost every Indiana family which has participated in the program cannot say enough good things about it. They become real YFU fanatics. Many, in fact, continue hosting foreign students year after year.

Recently I received a letter from the David Hartman family in Hartford City, Ind. The Hartmans first participated in the YFU program in 1959, when their daughter was chosen as an exchange student. Since then, this family has hosted nine international students.

Mrs. Hartman writes of her family's experience with YFU:

> Many of these perceptive young students, both from Indiana and other countries, as well as the families involved on both sides of the ocean, have indicated that the relationships and understanding developed in the course of this people-to-people program have been signally important to them, and their communities, in altering attitudes and promoting better international understanding and good will. The young people involved in Youth For Understanding will fill positions of leadership in their respective countries in the future.

Certainly this people-to-people approach is superior to foreign aid programs in promoting understanding and intercultural exchanges. And it does not cost the American taxpayers one cent—it is entirely privately financed, either through the student's family or through a local service organization, church, or other community group.

The Robert Paars of Lebanon, Ind., have hosted five different "sons" from Europe and South America. They write:

> We have always felt that each one of our exchange sons was someone very special, that we must be the luckiest family participating on any such program, and have formed a very close-knit group. We have also discovered with each one of our boys, that the relationship started during the year spent with us has continued to grow and mature through the years after their return home.

In 1960, the Paars took a 5-week trip to Europe and visted every one of their European sons. Mr. Paar writes:

> We met their families, fiances and friends. Each reunion was truly a memorable event, for the boys have all now matured into very wonderful young men of whom we are so very proud.

I personally have been sold on this type of program ever since my parents and Purdue University jointly sponsored four foreign exchange students from Ethiopia several years ago. Of the four, three graduated successfully, and one ranked second in his graduating class.

These three former students now are heading up their country's agriculture development program. Certainly this would have to be valued as a worthwhile investment.

In summation, I commend the youth

for understanding program for its contribution to international understanding on an independently financed, nonprofit basis. We could use more programs like it.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today as we recognize the work of the Youth for Understanding International Teenage Student Exchange program, let us express our particular pride not only in the outstanding young people who are carefully chosen to participate in this program but also in the thousands of families in our Nation and throughout the world who unselfishly open their homes to promote international understanding and good will.

Traveling abroad by students to Oxford, Heidelberg, the Sorbonne and other great universities has been customary for centuries, but the idea of teenage student exchange has only developed and approached its full potential in recent years.

In today's complex world, with national and international tensions continually reaching crisis proportions, what better way could there be to increase human understanding and to teach us to live in harmony by reducing ideological conflicts than for students from abroad to live as members of private families and as members of local civic and church communities.

The value of student exchange and foreign study as a means of learning to communicate with people of different cultural backgrounds cannot be questioned, and it is through communication and mutual appreciation of one another's values and life styles that we can help bind nations together in peace and understanding. And as one who has studied and traveled abroad under the Rotary Foundation program, I can attest personally to the extraordinary values of living, working, study, and traveling among people of different lands.

Youth for Understanding, in cooperation with the State Department, is the largest teenage exchange program in the United States. In Idaho, YFU started in 1969–70 with three students in my Second Congressional District—one student in Buhl and two in Gooding. This year, Idaho is hosting 19 YFU students.

I would particularly like to commend Mr. and Mrs. Don C. Hawks of Gooding, Idaho, who this year are serving as area representatives for Youth for Understanding and who have in the past acted as host family for two South American girls.

Second District families who are hosting YFU students this year are Mr. and Mrs. John P. Hamilton of Buhl—Jose Pinherio of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. Ross Corless of Heyburn—Marisa Baer of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. Doran Butler of Bliss—Monica Pino of Chile;

Mr. and Mrs. Burrel Williams of Shoshone—Marcio Caliope of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Kroll of Idaho Falls—Jose Rebello of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. McKim of Heyburn—Maria De Fatima Ferreira of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Sandy of Hagerman—Lucia T. Theoduloz of Chile;

Mr. and Mrs. David Boring of Gooding—Nidia E. Velasco of Argentina;

Mr. and Mrs. Gary Major of Gooding—Brogotte Boisseau of France;

Mr. and Mrs. James Evans of Glenns Ferry—Francisco Pereira of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. Bob Anderson of Gooding—Matti Leinonen of Finland;

Mr. and Mrs. Morris Lattimer of Murtaugh—Fredrik Wachfmeister of Sweden;

Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Hurst of Bellevue—Bernard Hardick of Holland;

Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Arbaugh of Hailey—Annette Stubenrauch of Germany;

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Jenkins of Jerome—Jeanette Postma cf Holland;

Mr. and Mrs. Matt Smith of Twin Falls—Mehmed Housic of Yugoslavia;

Mr. and Mrs. Vernon L. Gillespie of Mountain Home—Guilherme Ferreria of Brazil;

Mr. and Mrs. Norman B. McIntosh of Kimberly—Wilson Moraes of Brazil.

It is with pleasure and with a deep sense of pride and gratitude that I join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute today to the students, families and many others whose dedicated efforts have made Youth for Understanding the successful and worthwhile program it is today.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, since its inception in 1951, the Youth for Understanding, world-famous international teenage student exchange program, has enjoyed a special place in the hearts of thousands of residents of Michigan's Eighth Congressional District. Its success, its acceptance has been achieved because the program has proved to be one of our Nation's greatest "ambassadors" in cultivating better understanding and harmony among exceptional representatives of the countries involved.

The Eighth District, with particular emphasis on Saginaw, Mich., has assumed a leadership role in making this program one of the finest.

Only last year, approximately 6,500 YFU exchange students took part in the summer programs at Saginaw Valley College between June 14 and August 28 in Saginaw. There were three basic programs, including orientation for outgoing American students; evaluation sessions for returning European and South American students; and orientation for incoming European students. Stuart D. Gross, director of public affairs at Saginaw Valley College, and a member of the Youth for Understanding Board of Trustees, spearheaded this unique session.

A few years ago, it was my privilege to speak at an informal gathering of students from foreign countries at Saginaw. It was truly a rare and beneficial experience for me. I came away completely convinced that "people-to-people" contact, which the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower so advocated, must certainly be accelerated if this world is to truly reach a lasting peace.

Mrs. Roger Follebout, representative for the Saginaw area of YFU, has informed me that the Eighth District hosted approximately 200 international students last year and sent abroad approximately 100 American students for the summer months. This year about 150 international students are residing in the Eighth District and it is hoped that 125 American students will be sent abroad.

The YFU headquarters, located in Ann Arbor, Mich., recently revealed that since 1951, 30,000 students from more than 40 countries have participated in the program. At present approximately 3,100 students—1,234 from Europe, 1,615 from Latin America, 214 from Asia and 40 from Africa—between the ages of 16 and 18 are living with American families and attending local high schools in 45 States. More than 2,500 American high school students will go overseas through YFU to live with families for either a summer or all of 1972.

Just how meaningful; just how lasting is a program of such a personal nature? I think that an American family in the community of Ubly, Mich., has given the best testimony. I urge you to read the following letter that Mrs. Lynn Spencer wrote a few years ago to Mrs. Rachel Anderson, YFU's founder and executive director. It read:

> Our Mauro Bastos has become a permanent member of the family now and his family receives a weekly letter from us (done with carbon paper, circulation 11) which he will continue to receive when he returns home to Brazil. This allows our scattered family to communicate by sending one letter home. The messages between members contained in this letter allow us to remain closer together than in any other way, and give the English girl and her family, the Colombian boy, and now Mauro and his family an insight into everyday life in these other countries.
>
> This year's experience has changed all of us; our rural son has gained some understanding of the urban thinking; our urban Mauro has found many of the differences in life a contrast of city-country rather than geography; and all of us have gained sympathy and understanding of a new viewpoint.

It is a pleasure for me to extend my congratulations and thanks to the Youth for Understanding program and to all individuals who have contributed to its great success. I wish it the very best in the years ahead.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join so many of my colleagues today in honoring Dr. Rachel Andreson for her outstanding achievement. I just want to emphasize two things about Youth for Understanding which, in my opinion, make it of particular value among all the fine student exchange programs.

First, Youth for Understanding was the first program to reestablish communications between American young people and those teenagers in Germany and Austria who were just young enough not to have been involved with the Hitler youth movement but were nevertheless tarred with the Nazi brush in world opinion. We all say we believe that the most effective way to international peace is through mutual understanding. In this instance, Dr. Andreson practiced what we preach by implementing this program at a time when contact with the ex-enemy as an equal was not universally supported.

Second, Youth for Understanding is not only the largest of the student exchange programs, but also seems to have an unusually varied geographical distribution. Our experience with the program in Florida has been interesting. We have participated in it for only the last 3 or 4 years, but already enthusiasm has

grown enormously. It is not only the large urban areas, traditionally more international in outlook than rural sections, but small towns as well who have been among the most eager to welcome foreign students in their homes. I think it is significant that this program has been able to arouse such support in rural regions.

We want to continue to back these student exchange programs, not only because they are a step towards future world peace but also because they awaken us to a sense of our own American heritage and values. I am glad to have had this occasion to express publicly my support of Youth for Understanding.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, Michiganders who have worked with Youth for Understanding regard it as one of the most worthwhile volunteer organizations operating in the field.

Youth for Understanding was founded in Ann Arbor approximately twenty years ago. In the last two decades it has been responsible for an excellent program involving 30,000 young people and 40 countries. An extended living situation is provided in homes of host families.

Thousands of enduring friendships have been created by this people-to-people program. Understanding and good will have been quietly established with beneficial consequences which cannot be readily measured.

The emphasis is on high school students who are given the opportunity to spend 6 months to a year in the host country. Selection standards for both students and hosts are high.

America is well blessed with bright and adventurous young men and women. We are also the leading nation in the world in terms of volunteer organizations which do good deeds for society, accomplishing meaningful results with minimum fanfare.

I salute Youth for Understanding for its two decades of success, and I urge them to sustain their record of distinction.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues today in pointing to the benefits derived from student exchange programs.

In particular Youth for Understanding has made quite an impact on the people of my State. It seems to me that all of us have a role to play in bringing about world peace. And, I can think of no better way to advance it than through the exchanges made through Youth for Understanding. I am indebted to Mr. Don C. Hawkes, of Gooding, who is the area representative of the organization in Idaho, for sending me the names of those people in my State who have taken part in Youth for Understanding. As a means of paying tribute to them for their citizenship, I include their names as a part of my remarks at this time:

Jose Pinherio, Brasila, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. John Patrick Hamilton, Route 2, Buhl, Ida. 83316.

Marisa Baer, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. Ross Corless, 764 West 400 South, Heyburn, Ida. 83336.

Monica Pino, Talca, Chile; Mr. & Mrs. Doran Butler, Star Route, Bliss, Ida. 83314.

Marcio Caliope, Fortaleza, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. Burrell Williams, Route 1, Shoshone, Ida. 83352.

Jose C. Rebello, Rio de Janeiro; Mr. & Mrs. C. W. Kroll, 797 7th St., Idaho Falls, Ida. 83401.

Maria De Fatima Ferreira, Goiani, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. Edward C. McKim, Route 1, Heyburn, Ida. 83336.

Lucia T. Theoduloz, Iquique, Chile; Mr. & Mrs. W. A. Sandy, Hagerman, Ida. 83332.

Nidia E. Velasco, Cordoba, Argentina; Mr. & Mrs. David Boring, Route 2, Gooding, Ida. 83330.

Brogotte Boisseau, Trappes, France; Mr. & Mrs. Gary Major, 814 Michigan, Gooding, Idaho 83330.

Teodora Garcia, Chillian, Chile; Mr. & Mrs. Mark Howell, Route 1, Parma, Ida. 83660.

Francisco Pereira, Braganca Paulista, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. James Evans, Box 636, Glemns Ferry, Ida.

Matti Leinonen, Helsinki, Finland; Mr. & Mrs. Bob Anderson, Box 206, Gooding, Ida. 83330.

Fredrik Wachfmeister, Lund, Sweden; Mr. & Mrs. Morris Lattimer, Box 133, Murtaugh, Idaho 83344.

Benrard Hardick, Enfchede, Holland; Mr. & Mrs. Leonard Hurst, Bellevue, Ida. 83313.

Annette Stubenraucg, Kiel, Germany; Mr. & Mrs. H. L. Arbaugh, 116 3rd Ave. South, Hailey, Ida. 83333.

Jeanette Postma, Groningen, Holland; Mr. & Mrs. Harold Jenkins, 720 North Davis, Jerome, Idaho 83338.

Mehmed Housic, Sara-Jebo, Yugoslavia; Mr. & Mrs. Matt Smith, Highlawn Drive, Twin Falls, Ida. 83301.

Guilherme Ferreria, Fortaleza, Brasil; Mr. & Mrs. Vernon L. Gillespie, 350 West 15 South, Mountain Home, Idaho 83647.

Wilson Moraes, Recife, Brazil; Mr. & Mrs. Norman B. McIntosh, Kimberly, Idaho.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in commending Youth for Understanding on its outstanding student exchange program. Each year. through the efforts of this fine organization, as many as 4,000 teenagers from 44 nations around the world are given the opportunity to broaden their horizons by living as a guest in an American home or abroad. Youth for Understanding, which is nonprofit and nonsectarian, works with community schools, churches, and civic organizations to raise the scholarship funds which make its programs possible.

In our era of increasing tensions and distrust among nations and peoples, Youth for Understanding is making a vital contribution toward developing friendship and trust between the youth of America and of other countries, an effort which deserves congressional interest and support. Those young people who have participated in the program carry away with them unforgettable memories they will treasure all their lives. but perhaps even more important, they are ambassadors of goodwill from their countries to ours and vice versa.

I can think of no more valuable way for young people of all nations to gain understanding of customs, traditions. and ways of living different from their own than to actually experience them. It is an education that cannot be had by reading books or watching television or hearing a lecture. It teaches young people to reject the stereotypes of race and religion and national origin and to learn the tolerance that comes with recognizing people as individual human beings, united in the common brotherhood of all humankind.

I congratulate Youth for Understanding on its fine programs, and hope they will continue to expand in the future.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring the fine work of Youth of Understanding, a nonprofit educational organization, has sought to promote international understanding on a person to person level. Youth for Understanding is the largest teenage exchange program in the United States and in 1972 over 2,500 American high school students will go overseas under the program. Because all exchange students have the opportunity to live with families in a foreign land, the experience is an invaluable one—both personally for the teenagers involved and for the nations of the world. What better ambassador could America have than these enthusiastic and idealistic young students? What better way could we have to share our national cultural life with others than by sharing American homes and families with teenagers from other lands. All of the fine people involved in this program should be commended. In these days of international turmoil, their efforts to promote peace and understanding become increasingly meaningful.

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to participate in this special order and to express my personal support of the very important Youth for Understanding teenage exchange program.

One of the problems confronting this world is the lack of understanding between the peoples of nations, generating distrust and suspicion.

By exchanging young people with other countries, the Youth for Understanding program is helping to bridge this chasm between nations through the family living experience.

International students living in America have an opportunity to observe the true fiber of the American people. They learn more than just how our schools function and what kind of cars we drive. They have a real opportunity to discover just what makes America tick.

By the same token, host families in this country learn much the same thing about their guest and his homeland. The process is repeated abroad, with American students discovering another country and the people of that country, through our student ambassador, discovering America.

I certainly want to encourage participation in the Youth for Understanding program, and I hope it can be expanded in the future.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for taking this special order to recognize the accomplishments of Youth for Understanding. I want to associate myself with his remarks about the fine opportunities this program has provided for teenage students.

I am especially proud of a project launched by Youth for Understanding in Cleveland. Project SAY—Sponsor A Youngster—began in November of 1969.

The object was to promote a greater involvement of inner-city youngsters in the summer exchange program. Cleveland was selected for the project, because of its racial makeup which includes a considerable diversity of ethnic groups within the urban area. Dr. Marise T. Hadden, then YFU's director of Intergroup and Community Relations, was in charge of planning. She was assisted by some of Cleveland's community leaders, including Mayor Carl B. Stokes, Superintendent of Schools Dr. Paul W. Briggs, and Job Corps Director Dr. Zelma George. A committee of interested citizens began working to implement the project.

Financing was the prime concern in arranging for participation of inner city students, but the involvement of youngsters without the need for financial assistance was also encouraged.

An "Around the World" luncheon was held to stimulate interest. High school administrators were asked to send two potential exchange students and educators, clergymen, businessmen and women, political leaders, former exchange students, and other people from the community were invited. The guest speaker was His Excellency Ebenezer M. DeBrah, Ambassador from Ghana. Ghana and Liberia were the most recent countries to send students to the United States under the YFU program. His Excellency strongly advocated the program as a way for young people to learn about other cultures before their attitudes hardened into unchangeable patterns.

The luncheon resulted in the formation of a permanent committee to solicit support for the project. Committee members included: Chairman, Mr. Frank Jones; Mrs. Conella Brown, assistant superintendent of Catholic schools; Mrs. Kay Tyler; Mrs. Louise Grier; and Mrs. Grace White Ware. Mr. Jones subsequently became YFU area representative for Cleveland and is now a member of the YFU headquarters staff as coordinator of Ethnic Minorities.

The committee worked diligently both in raising funds and in screening candidates. Forty-three youngsters met the standards of the committee and Youth for Understanding criteria. Despite the efforts of the committee and the community in raising funds, more money was needed. Mrs. Rachel Andreson, YFU's executive director, recognizing the value of program development in inner-city areas, came to the rescue. She asked the board of trustees of YFU to provide the needed additional funds and they agreed.

The youngsters participated in a special orientation program and then YFU's regular orientation program at Saginaw Valley College. Then they left for their unforgettable experiences in Finland, Sweden, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Japan, and the Philippines.

Project SAY succeeded because of the dedication and cooperation of the Greater Cleveland Community and the commitment of YFU to the development of an inner-city program. Hopefully, the lessons learned in Cleveland will be applied to other urban areas for the benefit of many more inner-city students.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years Youth for Understanding has given international students the chance to live and study in the United States, as it has allowed American students to do so abroad. Forty nations, including our own, have participated in this program over the years, and now YFU involves about 4,000 exchange students each year.

Through this program, students can participate in family life in foreign cultures. This is in addition to the enrichment they receive from formal schooling in other lands.

Through these activities, students certainly do gain understanding of other peoples; they carry this understanding back to their homelands and share it with their neighbors. Understanding is a basic step toward mutual trust, cooperation, and peace among nations—goals we all seek. For this reason, I am happy to join this salute to Youth for Understanding.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in his recent state of the Union message, President Nixon urged that—

> We must remember that the greatest resource for good in this world is the power of the people themselves—not moving in lockstep to the commands of the few—but providing their own discipline and discovering their own destiny.

Discovering one's destiny is a thrilling experience in any age, but in today's world with its tensions and periodic explosions, civilization calls for more understanding, not only of ourselves, but of people throughout the world.

During the past 21 years, we have experienced crisis after crisis, often accompanied by war and destruction. Yet, during this trying period, a little known, but most effective program, Youth for Understanding, has been directed from an office in Ann Arbor, Mich. This international teenage student exchange program has involved some 30,000 students from 41 countries. During the 1971–72 year alone, over 1,600 foreign students will be visiting our country. These international students come from 29 countries, from such diversified areas as Argentina, Finland, Germany, Northern Ireland, Thailand, Egypt, Korea, and Yugoslavia. Just this year another 1,523 young people from South America arrived on our shores. They represent every country on that continent. These young people will be living, studying, playing, working, and observing in 32 States from New England to California, Minnesota to Louisiana. This student exchange program is designed to help them influence man's destiny on earth.

Communication is important and we can first learn to communicate by becoming better acquainted with people. We should meet with them, study with them, live with them and make friends with them. One really gets acquainted with people of other lands by living in the same home with them, eating at their table, and glimpsing life through their eyes. Our future security demands a vast increase in this kind of experience, a truly "people to people" approach.

We should recall Chancellor Brandt's reaction to the recent Florida visit he and his son enjoyed. After his high level talk with the President at Key Biscayne, Chancellor Brandt had the opportunity to move among a cross section of America, and he reports the experience was indeed refreshing. So impressed was he with the quality of American life, and the attitude of Americans, that he voiced the wish that all Germans could have the same opportunity to see the real America. Some West Germans will, through the Youth for Understanding program.

Chancellor Brandt's comments are indeed a striking testimonial to the value of such a program.

The success of the program is largely attributable to the leadership of Rachel Andreson, the executive director. Her background includes a degree in music from Wayne State and a masters degree in social work from the University of Michigan. In March of 1967, she received a Sesquicentennial Award from the University of Michigan as "one who exemplifies principles found in their theme: Knowledge, wisdom, and the courage to serve." In 1964 she was presented the Order of Merit by President Kekkonen. In 1958, she was awarded the Knights Cross of the Order of Merit by President Heuss of the Federal Republic of West Germany. In 1968, the Ministry of Education of Brazil awarded Dr. Andreson the Grand Cross of the Order of the Albatross and the Gold Medal of Arechal Rondon. She is also the recipient of numerous civic awards from churches and organizations in the Ann Arbor area.

Dr. Andreson is a symbol of dedication to all who are associated with the program. Those of us who have been involved in international affairs have long been frustrated by the lack of interest on the part of some North Americans in foreign policy and international affairs. Too many individuals become so involved in petty problems that things of international importance become too remote. This is far from realistic in this age of advanced science and space technology.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Youth for Opportunity program. In my opinion this program, which began in 1951 and involves over 6,000 foreign exchange students, is thoroughly worthwhile. These 6,000 represent more than half of the total number of teenage foreign exchange students currently living in the United States.

Arriving here from 44 foreign countries, these students are invited into typical American homes. The emphasis of this program is on the word "typical." The exposure is not to a dream situation, but rather to the average American family's way of life. Through participation in high school, family and other aspects of community life, these students become familiar with our customs, beliefs, and ideals.

The Youth for Understanding program is not an agency to promote a particular way of life. It tries only to further understanding between cultures and ways of life.

Let me reiterate my conviction that this program, operating on a limited budget, yet wide-ranging in scope and

effect, is well deserving of general support.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today a number of my colleagues in giving recognition to the important work of Youth for Understanding, the largest of the international teenage student exchange programs. Youth for Understanding sends American students abroad and brings foreign students to the United States for study. A large number of Minnesota communities and schools have participated. Two schools in my district, Archbishop Grace High School in Fridley and Columbia Heights High School, welcomed exchange students participating in the Youth for Understanding program in the 1971–72 school year.

Two students from Germany—Mr. Peter Christiansen and Mrs. Angelika Joseph—and two from France—Mr. Pascal Manoukian and Mrs. Sylvie Morazzani—attend Archbishop Grace High School. Sister Mary Mark is the principal at Grace.

Mrs. Magda Belsack of Belgium and Mrs. Eira A. M. Toivonen of Finland attend Columbia Heights High School. Mr. Dewey R. Breisch is the principal.

The families who are acting as the American parents for these students also deserve recognition. The Barnes, Votruba, Meyer, and Harty families are hosting the Grace High School exchange students. At Columbia Heights, the Stanoch and Zook families are acting as hosts.

There are some obvious advantages to exchanges of this nature: Person-to-person contacts between foreign teenagers and Americans of all ages help to foster international understanding. Americans traveling to foreign lands, as well as foreign exchange students coming to the United States, have new social, cultural, and political experiences. To growing and intellectually inquisitive youth, these experiences can be important positive molders of opinions and throught patterns. Obviously, all experiences will not be positive, but exposure to the reality of American life should be a more positive long-range influence than a distorted view of our country.

Youth for Understanding plays an important role also on a personal level. Not only do the participants learn about the people and land they visit, they learn a lot about themselves. While the opportunity to travel permits them to see and participate in another culture, it also gives them an opportunity to see themselves more clearly. The year that each teenager is away from his or her home environment inevitably leads to a growth of personal awareness and sensitivity to his or her individual situation. While this aspect of the program is not often emphasized and is not the raison d'être for Youth for Understanding, to the individual it is important and socially significant.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I noted among our American youth a great stirring. Young people were caught up in some of the most far-reaching controversies ever experienced by our Nation: The horrors of Vietnam, the agonies of starvation at home and abroad, growing racial tension, and the threat of pollution to our earthly environment. These concerns were central to the lives of American youth then and they are today. Failure of our citizens and our institutions to grapple with these matters will lead to youthful commitment being displaced by cynicism. That is why we must do whatever we can to nurture programs such as Youth for Understanding. Through exchange programs such as these and the other youth oriented programs dedicated to building constructive relationships with peoples of other nations, youthful idealism can be converted to mature problem-solving.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in an expression of support for Youth for Understanding, a most worthwhile and successful teenage foreign exchange program.

I am especially proud to note that this fine program originated partially within my own congressional district in the State of Michigan. Youth for Understanding began in 1951 when the Detroit, Mich., area Rotary Clubs agreed to host 75 German teenagers who were selected for an exchange experience by the U.S. State Department.

Since that time Youth for Understanding has developed into the largest and fastest growing teenage exchange programs. More than 30,000 students from 45 countries have participated in Youth for Understanding programs since the initial endeavor in 1951. This organization is now one of only three exchange programs officially recognized by the U.S. State Department.

The program is active throughout my entire congressional district. Presently there are over 20 students from at least 12 different countries living with families in my constituency.

The participating schools include Allen Park High School in Allen Park, Annapolis and Crestwood High Schools in Dearborn Heights, East High School and Vogel Junior High School in Garden City, and Lincoln Park High School in Lincoln Park.

Huron High School in New Boston, John F. Kennedy and Taylor Center High Schools in Taylor, Wayne Memorial High School in Wayne, and John Glenn High School in Westland are also participating in the program during the current school year.

Mr. Speaker, last year Mrs. Patricia Tallmadge, a member of my district office staff, provided me with a very special insight into the Youth for Understanding activities.

During the 1970–71 school year, the Tallmadge family participated in this program and acted as a host family for 5½ months, during which Miss Irene Maureira of Chile resided with them. After Miss Maureira's warm and happy stay in Wayne, Mich., the Tallmadge's daughter, Miss Mari Tallmadge, traveled to Chile with Miss Maureira and remained there for 3 months. The Tallmadge family has related to me that this has been one of their most pleasant and delightful experiences, and I have heard similar comments from many others who have become involved in this program.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to express my appreciation and support for Youth for Understanding. It is certainly one of the most worthwhile youth programs in existence, and I would recommend it to any family interested in participating in youth exchange activities.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, surely, in the effort to keep this world a peaceful one, the contribution made by organizations such as Youth for Understanding is incalculably great, and fully deserves the support and commendation being demonstrated in its behalf today.

In bringing young people from many countries together in an indepth, meaningful fashion, the inevitable result is greater mutual tolerance and understanding.

The "multiplier effect" of this type of exchange student program has been well established. I have had personal knowledge of several situations in which students from abroad have created numerous friendships with Americans of all ages—friendships which have proven lasting and meaningful to all concerned. The goodwill and fond memories endure, I am sure, for a lifetime.

In my own congressional district, the 10th of California, Youth for Understanding has been operating for 7 years. During that time 246 foreign students have lived with families and attended school in the area, and 242 young people from my district have spent similar periods abroad. Twenty-eight different countries have been represented in these exchanges.

Attitudes are formed when we are young, and I shall reiterate again my support for programs which make it possible for young people from all cultures to become familiar with different points of view and ways of life. Youth for Understanding has been remarkably successful in promoting these goals, and I am hopeful that by recognizing these efforts now they can be expanded and strengthened. In so doing we have, literally, everything to gain in terms of understanding among human beings.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of man's existence in the world, one of the things which has led to strife between nations, religious fellowships, and racial groups has been suspicion and unfamiliarity with the stranger.

Even a panoramic look at today's world shows us the divisions which exist between men, often based upon ignorance and fear of the unknown.

The most cursory investigation of the U.S.S.R., for example, reveals that the Chechen, Ingush, Karachai, Balkar, Crimean Tartars, and Jews are the victims of far greater racism than any known in the Western world. Indeed, it is government sponsored racism. the most pernicious because it leads to pogroms and concentration camps.

The mystical and unmaterialistic Orient would provide equally fertile ground for the observation of man's inhumanity to man. Here we find feared and despised Chinese minorities in countries such as Thailand and Indonesia. The persecution of Hindus in Pakistan and Moslems in India is well known. In Africa, Nigerians despise Biafrans, because they are short and ambitious. In South Africa, it is not only whites and

blacks who fail to live in harmony. Indians and blacks live in mutual suspicion which occasionally explodes into violence. In Latin America, Indians and mestizos regard each other as less than human.

Even Europe, allegedly "advanced" in such matters, shows a similar proclivity toward suspicion of the stranger. Slovaks hate Hungarians, Poles hate Germans and Russians, Finns are at odds with Swedes and Russians. The Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes have long been in conflict. The Irish have been hostile to the English, and the English have reciprocated. In fact, the Irish of County Cork dislike the Irish of County Connaught. Darker Italians from the south are treated as inferiors by northern Italians.

These webs of hatred have led to genocide, committed not only by the Germans in World War II, but by the British in Tasmania, the Dutch in South Africa, the Portuguese in Brazil, and the Russians in Hungary and the Soviet Union.

Our own society has not, of course, been immune from such tensions between racial and ethnic groups. The unfortunate fact is that such divisions have been so much and so unfortunate a part of man's history that Brewton Barry, in his work "Race and Ethnic Relations," states that racial harmony itself is a special exception. In the three cases he cites, unusual factors apparently play a large part in causing it. In the case of the Tungus and the Cossacks of Manchuria, for example, the cause of harmony seems to be their shared hatred for a third race, their Chinese neighbors.

If we have learned anything from history, it is that we pay a high price indeed for such hatred and suspicion. All efforts to bring men closer together, to expose them to their common humanity, to enable them to understand one another as individuals rather than as representatives of groups, whether racial, religious, or economic, is a step toward creating a better world.

It is in this sense that I wish to commend Youth for Understanding for its efforts in this area of breaking down prejudices and bringing young people from throughout the world to our own country as well as providing young Americans with an opportunity to live and study abroad.

Since its creation in 1951, this organization has brought more than 30,000 students from more than 40 countries into its program. At present, approximately 3,100 students between the ages of 16 and 18 are living with American families and attending local high schools in 45 American States. In addition, more than 2,500 American high school students will go overseas through Youth for Understanding to live with families for either a summer or a full year in 1972.

The function of Youth for Understanding, as stated in its bylaws, is to "promote international understanding by sponsoring, developing and carrying out international student exchange programs—to secure an interfaith and interracial approach to international good will by providing qualified young people with broad experience through living with families in other countries.

As we congratulate Youth for Understanding upon its excellent work in this field, we must at the same time wish it many more years of success. The world is in as much need of understanding today as it has been in any time in its history. The civil strife in Northern Ireland, in Pakistan, and in many other sensitive areas is eloquent testimony to that fact. In this troubled world, Youth for Understanding has played an important role. Hopefully, it will continue to play this role for many years.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, young people bring a special zest to the endless search to understand better the human condition. They seem more ready to trust that the new and unknown is to be accepted and considered, that differences among people are not so much to be feared as appreciated and understood.

The opportunity for large numbers of teenagers to leave their families for a summer or even a year and be welcomed into new families in a distant and foreign land is truly one of the luxuries and marvels of modern times. The resultant experiences enrich the individual lives of all participants, and thus, indirectly the lives of us all.

Cross-cultural experiences teach us something of ourselves as well as others.

People everywhere experience happiness and sadness, but often—because of culture—for quite different reasons. It can in a small way be unsettling for an exchange student to see for the first time new-found foreign friends enjoying a good laugh over something which to him seems pointless, or even worse, cruel.

Furthermore, like a fresh water fish thrown into salt water, an exchange student may initially find that being taken out of his cultural environment and dropped into another can cause him some difficulty. If he is an American with his culturally instilled organizational sense of human relationships and a sense of impersonal responsibility to his community and country, he may at first blush find a culture which places primary importance on one's family and friends and a very personal sense of responsibility to them a difficult environment in which to relate to others. On the one hand he may be frequently and unduly disappointed when others do not keep their promises to meet him at a certain time or provide him with assistance he had counted upon. On the other hand, he may find it emotionally draining, at least initially, to devote most of his time and attention to simply being together with the family and friends, enjoying each other's company.

Time, of course, does not translate well and time zones are only one kind of time barrier. A day in one culture may be a week, a month, or even years in another culture. That is, what one is accustomed to doing and seeing done within a certain calendar period may be recognizable in another culture only over shorter or longer calendar periods. A society's priorities by-in-large are defined not so much in public debate as they are in the collective social and cultural adjustments of a people through the ages.

Further, languages do not equate and are as varied in their capabilities to give voice to feelings and thoughts as the instruments of an orchestra. They reflect the felt historical, social, and moral needs of a particular people seeking to give expression to their own experiences and their own sense of the world around them. Learning a foreign language is really a process of learning to intellectually and emotionally understand the world in a new way, and involves considerable sympathetic imagination, going far beyond the mechanical learning of a language which, of course, can be done by machine.

These and many other similar kinds of experiences, coupled with a reaching out on his own part, enables an exchange student to better appreciate cultural differences. And with such an appreciation comes a deeper understanding of the oneness of man's experience. All men share a certain poverty, a poverty imposed by certain common limitations, some of which are cultural. Appreciated and understood, such limits challenge the human spirit to be surmounted.

Returning to one's own country after having lived abroad is to see your country, your friends, and even your family through new eyes. The occasion can understandably be a cause of some sadness. It is in fact part of the enriching process of the whole experience. While it is unlikely that a great percentage of the teenagers involved today in such exchange programs will go into their respective country's foreign service, their experience is nevertheless invaluable to them and to the world, providing a kind of leaven in their own and the collective experience of mankind. It is difficult to imagine a young person returning home after having lived abroad and not being more awake to the differences among his own people, more willing and more able to reach out and understand, to bridge differences between people and thus strengthen his own society and all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the cross-cultural experience is truly an enriching one, deepening human understanding. I feel that I am privileged to join my colleagues today to honor what in our own culture's terms is "the largest and fastest growing organization in the field of teenage exchange programs," Youth for Understanding. Of course, the real and lasting tribute to Youth for Understanding is being—and will continue to be—paid through the lives of the more than 30,000 students from more than 45 countries which have been privileged to participate in its programs.

Each year, Youth for Understanding—which was founded in the State of Michigan—conducts orientation sessions for Latin American students at the MEA Conference Center in Battle Creek. Just recently, nearly 1,700 Latin American exchange students completed such an orientation session. Last year, I was privileged to be able to speak to a similar group.

I am proud to note that currently there are attending high schools in the Third District of Michigan which I represent 25 exchange students, who through the Youth for Understanding

program are living as sons and daughters with Third District families.

Mr. Speaker, I include a list of these students, the high schools that they are attending and the families with which they are living in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with a summary statement of the activities of the Youth for Understanding:

EXCHANGE STUDENTS, THEIR NATIONAL ORIGIN, THE HIGH SCHOOLS THEY ARE ATTENDING AND THEIR SPONSORING FAMILIES IN MICHIGAN'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

BATTLE CREEK

Central High School, principal, Mr. William Tunnicliff: Mr. Wilhelm Hell, Netherlands, L. Chadderon.

Lakeview High School, principal, Mr. Theodore N. Thomas: Miss Angelika Hartmann, Germany, R. Kinney.

Pennfield High School, principal, Mr. Robert Grimes: Mr. Thomas Wohlfarth, Germany, A. Kurzmann.

CHARLOTTE

Charlotte High School, principal, Mr. James H. Champion: Mr. Manuel Schroeter, Germany, L. Lautzenheiser.

CLIMAX

Climax-Scotts High School, principal, Mr. Dennis McMahon: Mr. Tony Peetermans, Belgium, W. Pratt. Miss Pirkko Kivinen, Finland, J. Longman.

ELSIE

Ovid-Elsie High School, principal, Mr. Blain Lentz: Miss Marie E. Wahlstrom, Sweden, L. Marton.

GRAND LEDGE

Grand Ledge High School, principal Mr. Elmer Weaver: Miss Eva Fjeldstad, Norway, L. Pryor. Mr. Soren Jensen, Denmark, G. Powers.

HASTINGS

Hastings High School, principal, Mr. Robert Vander Veen: Mr. Janez Resman, Yugoslavia, L. Markley. Miss Margaretha Peters, Netherlands, G. Cove. Miss Raili Taipale, Finland, E. Haywood.

KALAMAZOO

Msgr. Hackett High School, principal, Bro. Donald McCoy, S.M.: Mr. Margus Frost, Germany, M. Graf.

Loy Norrix High School, principal, Dr. Joseph Serra: Miss Vladislava Bokan, Yugoslavia, W. W. Kent. Mr. Henri C. Funck, Belgium, A. Parker. Miss Elisabeth Gerdts, Germany, K. Borst. Miss Annette Weigelt, Denmark, R. Arend.

MARSHALL

Marshall High School, principal, Mr. William Crumrine: Miss Sandra J. Huber, Netherlands, F. Van Wieren.

MIDDLEVILLE

Thornapple W. K. Kellogg High School, principal, Mr. Richard Muessig: Mr. Helmut Kohl, Germany, R. Munn.

OLIVET

Olivet High School, principal, Mr. Walter Creason: Mr. Lassi Hietanen, Finland, J. Bowers. Mr. Per-Olof Wiklund, Sweden M. Hunter.

PARCHMENT

Parchment High School, principal, Mr. H. Richard Johns: Miss Vera Antic, Yugoslavia, L. Cox.

PORTAGE

Portage Northern High School, principal, Mr. Richard Higgs: Miss Annick Wels, France, J. S. Kostin.

SCHOOLCRAFT

Schoolcraft High School, principal, Mr. James Migliaccio: Mr. Han M. Kok, Netherlands, F. L. Thomas. Miss Karin Larsen, Sweden, G. McIntyre.

YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING TEENAGE EXCHANGE

Youth for Understanding is one of the several organizations in the United States that provides, in cooperation with the Department of State, for the exchange of students between the United States and other countries. Through these programs students are sent to live in homes abroad and students from abroad come to live with American families. The program is fully interfaith and interracial. In 1970 it received the official endorsement of the Division of Youth Activities of the United States Catholic Conference.

The purpose of YFU is to develop understanding among people through a family living experience.

International students have the opportunity to develop an appreciation of the American way of life through participation in family, school and community activities. As a regular student in a high school he learns first hand the philosophy and conduct of American schools.

The purpose of sending American students overseas for two months in the summer is to introduce them to life in another country. They share in family and community life to develop greater appreciation of the cultural background and historic contributions of other peoples. The 13th year students have the additional opportunity to study abroad.

Sponsors: YFU works with community committees to provide sponsorship through local organizations, such as high schools, churches, PTAs, service clubs, business and professional groups. These YFU committees assist in finding host families for international students. They welcome them to the community and offer many enriching experiences during their stay in the United States.

Local committees also help in the selection of American students who wish to go abroad, and may help raise funds for International and American exchange students.

Host families receive International students as members of their own families and furnish them with room and board. They may also provide some spending money or help find employment so that the student may earn pocket money. Each student is expected to live as a member of the family, doing his share of household chores, which includes taking care of his room and personal effects. While some students feel a bit strange at first they soon come to feel very much at home with the family. This relationship is mutually gratifying.

Families who wish to become hosts to a student from abroad may apply through the YFU community committee, the regional or the Ann Arbor office. An application form is provided and families are interviewed by a representative of YFU.

Families are carefully screened to select the kind of family that will provide a significant and wholesome experience for students from abroad. While extraordinary merit is not required, they are expected to represent the best of typical American family life. Each student and family is assigned to a YFU representative for home calling and counseling.

Programs of the YFU exchange: The YFU has five programs at present:

1. International Students—High School Program. International students are selected by competent YFU national committees of other countries. They come for a stay of 6 or 11 months, which includes study in an American high school. They are well qualified youth, 15 through 17 years of age, in good health, and with a working knowledge of English. Students submit their applications abroad and are screened to obtain the type of highly qualified student who will give and receive the most in this cultural exchange. Once a student has been approved by his National Committee his credentials are sent to the YFU International headquarters in Ann Arbor for final acceptance. Then he is assigned to a host family which has been interviewed and recommended by a local YFU committee.

2. Mexican Program. Mexican students of junior high and high school ages come to the United States to live with families for six weeks. The procedure for the selection of Mexican students and the assignment to families in the United States is the same as for International high school students.

3. American Students—Summer Program. Each year YFU sends hundreds of American High School you to other countries. Most of them live for two months with carefully selected families. Since they go in summer, attendance at school is not intended, although some may visit for a few days before schools close for summer vacation. Special language study and classes in government, art or history may be available in some countries where there is a sufficient concentration of American exchange students. This opporttunity to travel and live with a family in another country has a broadening influence in ones personal development. Host families overseas are carefully chosen by YFU National Committees.

Jr. High School students as well as high school students are included in the summer to Mexico exchange.

4. American Students—13th Year Study Abroad Program. A select group of American students who are high school graduates with high academic ability, and excellent scholastic record with a facility in a foreign language may apply for the 13th year of study abroad. Students live for approximately 14 months with a carefully selected family and attend an approved school.

5. American Students—YFU Music Programs. Each year a Chorale is developed, usually in the vicinity of Ann Arbor, which rehearses for several months and then makes a tour, either of Europe or Latin America. Students interested may inquire about requirements at the Ann Arbor office or the Music Department of their high school. Applications must be submitted very early as students must be accepted as a YFU exchange student and then be auditioned by the Chorale Conductor in October preceding the summer tour. Other musical groups are also formed in a similar manner.

Applicant may apply directly through his high school, the local YFU committee the regional or the Ann Arbor office. Schools are not given quotas, but only qualified students should apply. Selection is on an individual basis, determined by information from the application, references, school records, personal statement and the interview.

Since its beginning in 1951, Dr. Andresen, the Executive Director, has guided the development of the program. From a small group of 75 German students placed in southeastern Michigan, the program has grown to include about 4000 exchange students on a nationwide basis each year. Thirty-nine countries have sent us students and American students have gone abroad from most of the states in the United States.

Regional staff representatives and their committees are now located throughout the United States. They are available to answer all inquiries from students, host families and schools.

To make this exchange possible, YFU has offices in Europe, South America, Philippines, Japan and Africa. YFU chairmen and committees overseas are all residents of each country.

Two sound, 16mm films in color, about YFU students living here and abroad are available for schools, churches or clubs.

For further information about the Youth for Understanding program or for assistance in developing a YFU committee in your area, please write to the International Office in

Ann Arbor, Michigan. Your inquiry will be referred to the staff representative nearest you or a member of the Ann Arbor staff will contact you directly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to salute and commend the Youth for Understanding International Teenage Student Exchange program.

Originally founded in 1951 when German and Austrian youngsters were brought to live with American families, the program has now expanded to encompass more than 40 countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas. The program brings youngsters from these countries to the United States and, in addition, sends American teenagers overseas for periods of from 2 months to 1 year. Youth for Understanding, one of three teenage exchange programs recognized by the State Department, is operated on a nonprofit basis from its headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich., and seeks to foster greater international understanding through a family living experience.

I am particularly impressed and encouraged by the noteworthy development and success of Youth for Understanding's exchange program with South and Central America. YFU overseas currently has extensive exchange programs operating in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. In fact, the program in Brazil is the largest and most rapidly growing YFU program in the world.

I believe that the kind of intercultural program exemplified by YFU is unsurpassed for encouraging true understanding between Americans and people throughout the world. Young people are natural goodwill ambassadors, able to make the necessary adjustments to fully understand, appreciate, and enjoy their experience and contact with unfamiliar cultures and life styles. They retain the memory of their experiences clearly and eagerly share them with their own communities when they return home. It is just an exchange which holds out the greatest hope for the continued growth of true mutual understanding and respect among all the countries of the Americas and all the nations of the world. And it is quality programs such as Youth for Understanding, carefully and thoughtfully conceived and executed, with high standards yet great flexibility, that make the exchange experience so memorable and productive for so many youngsters.

I salute the Youth for Understanding exchange program and wish it many more years of continued success.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at the National Prayer Breakfast, President Nixon stated that 1972 is a "year of opportunity for peace such as America has never had." I certainly agree that such an opportunity exists and hope that we will have the wisdom to take advantage of it.

An organization which has been working on behalf of peace for 20 years is the Youth for Understanding program. In a telegram to Dr. Rachel Andreson, who has almost single handedly been the moving force behind this program, the President said:

> The program's student exchanges provide a splendid opportunity for teenagers to learn about other peoples and cultures. The ties of friendship and understanding they promote augur a more peaceful and promising future for mankind.

Again, I share this view and would like to take advantage of the Youth for Understanding program.

The YFU program is dependent on the hard work of countless volunteers and the willingness of thousands of Americans to share their homes with teenagers from abroad. For example, Mrs. Sherman Monroe, of Fort Pierre, S. Dak., is a regional manager for this program. She works with schools, churches, and communities of South Dakota in placing students from other countries in our schools on either a 6-month or 1-year program. She also helps American students who want to go to a foreign country on our program. She coordinates the activities of other volunteers who work locally to call on schools, interview and qualify host families and to keep in touch with these people during the students' stay in the United States.

There are approximately 100 students in South Dakota with YFU this year. Fifty of them are European students of the 1-year program. The other 50 are South American students who come for a 6-month home stay. This kind of interaction and understanding is invaluable in promoting a world of peace.

I would commend my colleagues for arranging this special order to provide recognition for this program. I am glad that I can take part by adding my praise and complements to all the hard-working people who have done so much to promote understanding among the youth of our world.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to join my colleagues in honoring the work of Youth for Understanding. The headquarters of this nonprofit educational organization is in my own State of Michigan. Its very name denotes its purpose and its value—to promote world understanding through a living experience for young people. In its 20 years of existence, more than 30,000 teenagers from 48 nations have participated in the Youth for Understanding program. The young Americans who have lived abroad will never forget this experience. And the youths from Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa who have seen firsthand how Americans live and learn have returned to their homelands with a better understanding of life in the United States. The strength of the bonds made by these person-to-person cultural exchanges cannot be underestimated, and I recognize this organization's outstanding work in promoting international understanding.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the past 21 years, Youth for Understanding has helped forge an important link in strengthened and expanded world understanding.

Originally sponsored by the Michigan and Ann Arbor Councils of Churches, it continues to cooperate with these and other groups, but now as a national independent organization. Since 1951, it has brought over 12,000 foreign high school students to the United States and sent 8,000 American students to live with families abroad. These foreign students have the opportunity not only to live with an American family for a period of 11 months, but also to attend a local high school during that time.

The American students, on the other hand, have two options from which to choose. If they are attending high school at the time of their participation in the program, their summer is spent with a foreign family. But if these students have already graduated, they may go abroad before entering college. Or, if these students choose, they may spend 14 months in a particular country while pursuing further education in an accredited school. No matter which method, each student is introduced to the language, culture, and ideas prevalent in whatever country he or she visits.

Mr. Speaker, selection of foreign students is done by national committees in respective countries. U.S. community organizations give financial support to incoming and outgoing students and YFU works with schools and student councils to make the academic arrangements.

Presently, YFU maintains a student choir that tours both Europe and Latin America. Also, this fine organization annually runs an exchange with our neighbor to the south, Mexico. In December and January, the Mexican students live with an American family, while during the summer, their American counterparts spend time in Mexico.

YFU provides benefits to the families who receive foreign students, as well as the young people who participate directly. I have in my office many letters that express the feelings of the families who in the past have had foreign exchange students living with them. I quote from one of them:

> Time goes so fast. It seems like only yesterday since Hans joined our family. My wife and I have become accustomed to referring to "our three sons" without much difficulty because the three are much closer in many respects than most brothers born into the same family. We are dreading the time of Hans' departure.
>
> Our association with YFU has been one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences of our lives. Communication has been excellent at all levels and a whole new world has opened before us. The problems we anticipated didn't materialize and countless little things we did not expect have brought joy and laughter. I suppose you receive frequent letters from host parents bragging about their son or daughter so I hope you will forgive the following remark—We still think we have the best!!!

Mr. Speaker, I think the letter speaks for itself, but it goes without saying that if this one example is any indication of what the participants of this program feel about their experiences, YFU is a tremendous success. A success, not only in the joy brought to these people, but also in the international understanding it surely has fostered.

I strongly commend this organization and hope that it may continue and expand its fine work.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, as one whose

family has benefited greatly from Youth for Understanding and as a member of Rotary International, it is a pleasure for me to join with my distinguished colleagues in support of this fine student exchange program. Begun in 1951 as a Rotary project, it has been ably administered by Mrs. Rachel Andersen, executive director, since 1952. Under her leadership it has achieved cooperation with many church and civic groups and has helped to meet the need for greater cultural understanding of more than 30,000 student participants from 45 countries and 42 different States of these United States of America.

From its original inception it has expanded to include not only the 1-year and 6-month exchange of high school teenagers, but exchanges of college-age youth; summer survey courses which include tours and seminars; chorale and concert exchanges; and, more importantly, an exchange of youthful good will and enthusiasm.

Such programs encourage our youth to more fully understand their own cultures and those of other peoples. A recent attitudinal study definitely showed that such exchanges result in improved attitudes toward other people, thus, contributing in achieving the stated objective of YFU, "an interfaith and interracial approach to international good will."

I speak from personal experience as my contact with the program resulted in an exchange which has brought three young people from Mexico to live in our home, and given four of our daughters the pleasure of similar experiences in that country. Today, I express praise for the tremendous job that this fine organization and others like it are doing for youth from many nations and many walks of life. I also wish to express my gratitude and that of my family for the personal benefit we have derived from this truly "living" experience. I heartily commend to others the program's great potential for personal growth.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Youth for Understanding program.

For years, students have traveled to other lands in pursuit of knowledge. The great universities of Europe—Cambridge, Heidelberg, Oxford, and the Sorbonne—have been centers of international learning.

In the latter half of this century, teenage student exchange programs have become very popular. The ages of the participants introduce a new dimension to foreign studies.

One such program, Youth for Understanding, was begun in 1951 by Dr. Rachel Andreson. From a small beginning of 75 German students placed in southeastern Michigan schools, the program has now grown to 6,000 exchange students placed annually all over the world.

Briefly stated, the purpose of Youth for Understanding is to develop better relationships among people of different lands through common living experiences. Each participant becomes, for a limited time, a member of a private family. As such, he learns of his host's life at home, in school, and in his community.

Families are carefully screened to assure that they will provide significant learning experiences for the young people.

The teenagers, on the other hand, must have good scholastic records, be active in school, church, and community affairs, and capable of handling responsibility.

Youth for Understanding has five different exchange programs at the present time. These are: First, the International Student High School program; second, the Mexican program; third, the American Students Summer program; fourth, the American Students 13th-Year Study Abroad program; and fifth, the American Students Music program.

Youth for Understanding depends upon high schools, churches, service clubs, and business and professional groups to sponsor qualified students. It works closely with the Department of State to exchange students of the United States with those of other countries.

In Illinois, over 30 schools participate in the Youth for Understanding program, including several in the quad-cities area.

At a time when all of us need to develop a better understanding and appreciation of peoples of other lands, Youth for Understanding helps fill the need.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to join in the tribute today to Youth for Understanding. This international teenage student exchange program deserves great commendation and far more public recognition.

Operating principally with private funds, its programs have included more than 30,000 students from more than 40 countries. Last year, 29 students from Minnesota, including 11 from my Third District, participated in the Youth for Understanding program in 19 different countries. In the last 3 years, 320 students from 43 different countries have stayed in Minnesota homes.

The State Department encourages and helps to promote Youth for Understanding programs. In the aggregate, Federal support makes up only a tiny percentage of the Youth for Understanding budget. The result is an excellent partnership of private initiative and modest Government encouragement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add my voice today to the many others in praise of Youth for Understanding.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, the Youth for Understanding exchange student program has a worthy purpose—to promote international understanding and goodwill by providing young people with broad experience through living with families of other countries. Under this program each year my own State has had approximately 100 teenagers from the school systems of Europe, Asia, and South America attending Indiana high schools while living with local host families. These students have made valuable contributions to their schools and communities. Several of these young men and women have come to Indiana from behind the Iron Curtain, a fact which may hold forth the best hope that future leaders of the Iron Curtain countries may prove to be more enlightened than those of the present day. In turn, each year a group of Indiana high school students have studied in foreign countries and have had the enriching experience of family life abroad. The relationships established through this interchange cannot help, but work toward a better understanding between the peoples of the world.

I gladly join in this tribute to Youth for Understanding and congratulate the leaders for their dedication to this worthwhile program.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today in the recognition of the merit and success of the Youth for Understanding International Teenage Student Exchange program. As the largest teenage exchange program in the United States, Youth for Understanding has had many participants from my area of western New York and it enjoys broad community support. In the Rochester area, for example, the program is operated by the affiliated Association for Teenage Diplomats.

Currently there are 35 students from throughout the world attending Rochester and Monroe County high schools. In addition, another 17 South American students are due to arrive in our area today for 6 months of study in the local high schools. This summer over 100 high school students from the Rochester area will go abroad under the program and 13 more will study for a full year in foreign schools. These are part of the almost 4,000 students who will participate this year.

As has been explained here today, the purpose of the Youth for Understanding program is to develop greater understanding and friendship through personal contact and family living experience. Many families in my area have taken foreign students into their homes and also sent their own children to a foreign country under this program. They refer to the experience as a great enrichment of our lives. This is the general reaction of the more than 30,000 students and families who have participated in the program since its inception 20 years ago.

Justification for programs of this kind has been that they contribute to the stability of relations between nations and improve the prospects of peaceful conditions and understanding among us. This purpose remains as valid and important today as during the post-war period which fostered this program. For these students who come here it provides an opportunity to obtain a balanced and more complete view of our country than is presented abroad by the information media. For those American youth it expands their understanding of the strengths and needs of our country and gives many foreigners a fresh acquaintance with the best of American youth.

I am pleased to see that Youth for Understanding has so many friends and supporters in Congress, and I hope that its backers will see that the program continues to make its unique contributions to promoting greater understanding on a

person-to-person basis. I join in praise of all those who make possible this outstanding program and commend their admirable efforts.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, for centuries students have traveled to foreign lands in pursuit of learning. In earlier times they left the great universities of Europe to study and travel in other lands. In the latter half of the 20th century, this exchange program has extended to teenage students who travel abroad to learn at a younger age, live with and as members of families in a community and participate in local school and community affairs.

In Fresno, Calif., in 1970, two of our students traveled to other lands and in 1971, three went abroad. In addition, several foreign students came to live with us in central California.

This teenage exchange is proving its value and holding out hope for better human understanding and enlightment. It is well known that youth is more flexible, more adaptable than the older generation and can better absorb and relate their different experiences. This is why student exchange is valuable at an early age.

Student exchange is designed to help youth to live in the kind of a world we have today and to help them shape man's destiny. Communication must be improved but we can learn to communicate only as we become better acquainted with people. This means we must meet them, study with them, live with them, and make friends with them. There is no better way to get to become acquainted with the people of other lands than to live in the same home with them, eat at the same table with them, and learn to see life as it appears to them.

The prospect of the future demands a vast increase in this kind of exchange experience, a truly "people to people" approach. Each of us can have a share in making this sort of exchange possible.

That is why I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to endorse the student exchange program of Youth for Understanding.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that so many of our colleagues are taking this opportunity to offer tributes to Youth for Understanding.

Few privately operated programs have done as much to further international understanding, by enabling people at an impressionable age to spend substantial amounts of time getting to know countries other than their own.

YFU has been operating in my own county of San Diego for 8 years. Some 20 high schools in San Diego and adjacent Imperial counties now participate in the program, which brings 30 to 40 students from abroad to our community every year.

I am advised by Mr. Mark Miranda, the YFU area representative for San Diego-Imperial, that the youngsters hosted by the two counties are given every opportunity to examine U.S. life in detail. Generally, these visitors remain in this country for a full year, with the exception of those from Latin America, who stay 6 months. Rather than just tour about the country, the foreign students are encouraged to become more familiar with our ways through sustained contact with local families, schools, and other institutions.

Whenever possible, the visiting students are assigned to a family with a teenager of the same sex and equivalent age.

And the YFU effort, of course, works both ways, although the number of Americans traveling abroad under its auspices is considerably less than the number of foreign students brought to this country. Scholarship help is available for those who need it and can qualify, thus assuring variety in the selection of participants.

All in all, Youth for Understanding is an exemplary effort, which I am pleased to join in honoring.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join many of my colleagues today in paying special recognition to Youth for Understanding.

As one of the largest organizations in the United States providing for the exchange of students between the United States and foreign nations, Youth for Understanding has contributed much by the furtherance of international understanding and relations. Through its five programs for high school, junior high school, and high school graduate students, YFU has reached out to every corner of the globe in its short period of existence. This reaching out has done much to enhance the mutual knowledge, understanding and appreciation of different cultural and historic backgrounds among the peoples of the world.

Through its programs, YFU has placed thousands of young Americans in homes of other nations, and has brought thousands of young people from other nations to the United States. These are programs that provide a complete living experience for American students and foreign students, in which they became members of host families.

Since its beginning in 1951, Youth for Understanding has grown to such proportions that it now provides for an international exchange of more than 4,000 students each year. From countries as far away as Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Norway, Brazil and Peru, students come to the United States each year to live with American families, attend American schools, and develop an understanding of American culture and history. At the same time, hundreds of our American youth annually travel to Argentina, Belgium, Finland, Yugoslavia, Liberia, Venezuela, and other nations to live and share in and develop greater understanding of the culture and history of those nations.

In my State of Nebraska, YFU has placed more than 250 foreign students and sent more than 100 Nebraskans abroad since the program was begun.

Surely the result of this exchange program is a better understanding and relations with the United States, our heritage, culture and way of life by the nations of the world that participate in the program with us. This is evidenced in the glowing reports our American students bring home with them after such participation in other countries, and their appreciation and greater understanding of those cultures and heritages. Who can say how much programs such as this contribute and will continue to contribute to world understanding for better relations and peace in the world ahead?

On this occasion of the 21st year of Youth for Understanding, it is fitting that we commend the many people who have organized and directed its programs, and the many students who have participated. The wide acceptance of the program itself is becoming more and more evident by the local community projects to sponsor exchange students. I commend YFU for its fine program and wish it continued and expanded success in the future in bringing the nations of the world together through greater understanding.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy and proud to join my colleagues in calling attention to the outstanding work of the Youth for Understanding international teenage student exchange program.

It is through programs of personal contact in cultural exchange that a greater international understanding is fostered. Youth for Understanding is the largest teenage exchange program in the United States. In cooperation with the State Department more than 30,000 students from more than 40 countries have participated in the program since it was founded in 1951.

Youth for Understanding is a nonprofit educational organization which seeks to foster greater international understanding through a family living experience. Students come from Western European countries, Africa, Japan, and the Philippines for 1 year—August to July—and from Latin America for 6 months—January to June. American students go to Western Europe, South Africa, the Philippines, Mexico, or Japan. They are 16 to 18 years of age and are chosen from applications submitted to the committees in their own community to the Ann Arbor office.

During the school year 1971–72 there were 39 students living with families in Wisconsin and attending high schools there. In my own congressional district there were students from Germany, the Philippines, and Belgium. A total of 46 students attended 31 schools in Wisconsin in 1971 from Latin America.

Eleven students from Wisconsin took part in the program overseas where they lived with selected host families and attended schools.

The program has consistently enjoyed great success and I wish to commend the founder, Mrs. Rachel Andresen, the board, and the program for the valuable contribution Youth for Understanding has made to world understanding.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join our colleagues today in this special order honoring the outstanding achievements of the international teenage student exchange program operated by the Youth for Understanding.

Through this program, many young people from foreign lands have come to my district of San Diego, Calif., as ex-

change students. Their presence has enriched our community by fostering greater international understanding among our citizens. The exchange program is entering its ninth year in San Diego. Twenty high schools have participated, hosting students from countries in Europe and South America, plus Japan and the Philippines.

San Diegans who have served as host families repeatedly praise the program, citing their own warm experiences in opening their homes and family to these visiting young people. I would also like to point out that much of the success of our local program rests with the Youth for Understanding area representatives in San Diego, Mr. Mark Miranda, who has devoted his time to promoting this worthwhile activity.

I hope that this exchange effort will have many more years of success, and know our colleagues will be interested in some of the following comments made by foreign students who have participated in the program:

COMMENTS

"Backyard cookouts are not for me. They are a kind of joke because you get all the meat, and potatoes filled with fuel fumes."—*Jan Sorensen, 19, Denmark.*

"I hope to come back to see my American dad cooking again. Brazilian men never go into the kitchen. This was the funniest thing I ever saw."—*Teresinha Nacli, 17, Brazil.*

"I think Americans are too much afraid of germs. There is nothing wrong with cleanliness. But every other ad on TV is about germs that cause this and that. People talk the same way."—*Angelika Specht, 17, West Germany.*

"TV was something else. We never have a program interrupted for a commerical. But I got so used to it that I am going to miss the time to get up in the middle of the movie to get a drink."—*Christine Weber, 17, West Germany.*

"To me the U.S. is one big kettle of boiling water. There are great big differences from the coasts to the middle area and from the north to the south. One of the things that I didn't quite agree with was people's saying that this is the greatest and most free nation in the world."—*Birgitte Thomsen, 18, Denmark.*

"I learned that other families and communities and countries have troubles too and bad times just like the ones I was used to. Another little thing: I really like the fountains. You can't find them anyplace in Germany."—*Cornelia Scholvin.*

"I will miss hamburgers, drive-in movie houses, salted popcorn, ice cream, the American-style TV."—*Sönke Sönnichen.*

"I'll miss the mountains and the blue skies in Utah and the informal American way of life."—*Dietlinde Schroeder.*

"I went to Tucson, Arizona. I found the change in climate and landscape pretty hard, but already I miss the sun and desert."—*Regina-Maria Schletter.*

"Riding snowmobiles, ice skating and skiing excited me. As an American clerk in the airport in Chicago said to me, 'Happiness is skiing in South Dakota!' "—*Sonia da Silva, 18, Brazil.*

"I'm taking back jeans. They cost twenty dollars at home."—*Ana Vasconcelos, 17, Brazil.*

"When I left my American home yesterday, I was torn apart. I was looking forward to seeing my family and friends in Germany again and didn't want to leave here either."—*Regina-Maria Schletter.*

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, in these times of growing concern and confusion in international relations, there is an organization that has transcended national boundaries and biases in the effort to attain better international understanding. I speak of Youth for Understanding, an international teenage exchange program which seeks to bridge the cultural and social gap among students of all nations through a family-living experience.

This person-to-person approach has enabled individuals, communities, and, consequently nations, to understand themselves and each other better.

I commend this organization for their role in the all-important search for international understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the people of North Dakota have been in the forefront of using this avenue toward international social and cultural understanding.

I would like to submit for the RECORD the names of the sponsors, schools, and foreign students presently participating in this outstanding program in North Dakota:

LIST OF FOREIGN STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAM

A. C. Bertsch and D. Walery, Bismarck; Bismarck Junior College; Roeland L. Buyze, Netherlands, and Patricia Aparicio, Columbia; D. M. Tracy, Bismarck; St. Mary's High School; Anders Gustafsson, Sweden;

B. Marsaa, Cando; Cando High School; Carin Wahlberg, Sweden;

M. Bauer, Carrington; Carrington High School; Augusto Sy, Jr., Philippines.

C. Volesky, Dickinson; Trinity High School; Alberto R. Magsino, Philippines;

Dr. Marvin Towarnick, Fessenden; Fessenden High School; He Heikki Y. Miettinen, Finland;

R. Nelson, Harvey; Harvey High School; Bienvenido Just II, Philippines;

T. Huber, Hazen; Hazen High School; Philipp Abellaneda, Philippines;

J. M. Kokkeler, Hebron; Hebron High School; Anders I. Henriksson, Sweden;

C. Johnson, Jamestown; Jamestown High School, Basilius Groen, Netherlands;

J. Frey, A. Dohn, and J. S. Homan, LaMoure; LaMoure High School; Emmanuel A. Padilla, Philippines; Harald Scherrer, Germany; and Bunar Ukmata, Yugoslavia;

R. Feickert and V. Mushik, Mandan; Mandan High School; Erling T. Moller, Denmark; and Tuovi Rantala, Finland;

S. Flickinger, Minot; Minot High School; Heide Rieke, Germany; R. Romine and L. Link, Minot; Bishop Ryan High School; Margit B. Starmans, Netherlands; and Ulf Bostrom, Sweden;

J. Ottmar, Mott; Mott Lincoln High School; Tomio Takeshita, Japan;

H. Mickelson, New Rockford; New Rockford High School; Ritta Ojaranta, Finland;

J. Eylands, Rugby; Rugby High School; Jouni E. A. Korri, Finland;

W. Erickson, Stanley; Stanley High School; Rolf Sugland, Germany;

L. Buckman, Stanton, Stanton High School; Guy Ol Vanden Buicke, Belgium;

M. Brumlow, Tioga; Tioga High School; Michele M. J. Marie Kloppers, Netherlands.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to join with so many of my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute today to Youth for Understanding, one of the major components of our Nation's effort to promote peace among nations by fostering understanding between peoples. It has long been my conviction that if we are to break the vicious circle of jealousy, hostility, and conflict between nations, we must create a new spirit of trust and understanding among peoples. One of the surest ways to promote such mutual respect is personal contact and discussion. It is for this reason that I have supported and will continue to support exchange programs and particularly those such as Youth for Understanding which are aimed at our young people.

Since its inception in 1951, Youth for Understanding has compiled a distinguished record of service. From a small initial teenage exchange program with Germany, it has grown to become one of the largest youth exchange groups not only in the United States but in the entire world—and one of only a few programs officially recognized by the Department of State.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee and as one who strongly believes in the great value of close and friendly relations with our hemisphere neighbors, it is especially gratifying to note that at present the largest number of foreign students involved in the various programs of Youth for Understanding come from Latin America and this despite the serious difficulties resulting from greatly different school year calendars between North and South America. This year, as an example, in only one of the many programs of Youth for Understanding more than 1,750 Latin American students will spend 6 months in the United States. In addition, several hundred young Americans will be spending their summer this year in South America.

Mr. Speaker, in a hemisphere of almost a half billion people, the benefits derived from the exchange visits since 1956 of more than 9,100 Latin American students to the United States and of more than 1,400 of our own young people to other hemisphere nations, seem small and unimportant. Yet, we must bear in mind that these young people's experiences have touched the lives of tens, if not hundreds of thousands of others. Moreover, we must remember that all of these students represent the very best of their own country's youth. They are chosen on the basis of high standards of selectivity in all participating countries and many of them will undoubtedly become the future leaders of their respective countries.

Compared to the staggering need for international goodwill and understanding, the numbers of young people exchanged by Youth for Understanding and similar programs has been small indeed; but most important of all a good beginning has been made and a sound program worked out.

Thus, hope for a peaceful world rests on a little bit sounder ground today than it might have, had it not been for the foresight and hard work of the hundreds of people all over the world who have worked so hard to make Youth for Understanding the magnificent success it is.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in citing Youth for Understanding for the fine work it is doing in the area of international student exchanges.

Many Americans traveling abroad

have been shocked to find that even people of friendly nations hold distorted ideas about American life. They speak of crime in our streets, riots, unemployment, and general chaos, often quoting our own press reports. Even American self-criticism is often misunderstood abroad. At the same time, the foreigner just doesn't know about the remarkable quality of everyday American life as it exists under our form of government.

This is one reason international exchange programs such as Youth for Understanding are so important. A program like this offers the young person from abroad the chance to see the everyday side of American living. The memory of 6 months in an American family, going to American public schools, may affect the attitudes towards this country of future Presidents, ministers or simply the citizens of those nations with whom we must deal. Just as ignorance breeds distrust, so a short time spent sharing the hopes and fears of a family of Americans can result in sympathy and understanding.

Youth for Understanding has brought over 30,000 young people from Western Europe, Africa, Japan, South America, and the Philippines into American families. Our Florida teenagers have entertained contemporaries from Chile, Finland, and the Philippines. The visitors have accompanied our youngsters to school, and have entered fully into the lives of their American families. These young people from abroad are seeing a new and much more real America than they could possibly see through their media.

This year alone, over 2,500 American teenagers will go overseas through Youth for Understanding. They will come home better equipped to understand and deal effectively with people whose language, culture and attitudes are not ours. In our world of split-second transportation and communications, we already have to cope with much closer and heavier international involvements. In the future, it is going to be the rare American whose life is not touched in some way by an influence from abroad. No program can be more useful in preparing our young for such a role than Youth for Understanding, and programs like it.

Youth for Understanding has done a fine job since 1951 in cooperation with individuals from communities all over the Nation, people who spend their leisure hours working to make this program a success. I want to commend the 78 Florida families who have taken young people from abroad into their homes and into their lives this past year. My sincere best wishes for an experience rich in learning and understanding go to the following Florida teenagers who have gone abroad or are going through Youth for Understanding: Donald Brooks of Bonifay; Bonnie Ann Purvis of Brandon; Martha L. Allred, Lyn Trick, Lee Stewart, Katherine Muncy, and Roma Eyster of Cocoa; Beth Eibling of Ft. Lauderdale; George Bellinger of Melborne; Linda Boedeker and Kyle Strickland of Merrit Island; Paulette Louise Judd and Ruthanne Moss of Orlando; Laura Ann Terry and Lynne Vickery of Pensacola; Mary Alyce Bartosek, Charlotte Maxwell, Alicia Kenaston, Anne Witte, and Colleen Lyons, all from Rickledge; Joel Coryell from Satellite; Frank Roberts from Indian Harbor Beach; Francine Rutigliano from Tampa; and Brette P. Sanford of Seminole.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join today in saluting the student exchange program known as Youth for Understanding—and to congratulate this very fine organization on the occasion of its 21st birthday.

Eleven years ago, the late President Kennedy formally proposed the establishment of the Peace Corps, and the Congress responded with legislation which has made it possible for a generation of young people to serve as American ambassadors of goodwill in scores of foreign lands.

At the time the Peace Corps was being established, Youth for Understanding was already in operation—a lusty 10-year-old program that was providing a two-way form of communication between young people in this country and abroad.

American high school students were moving, at an ever increasing pace, across the oceans to foreign countries. High school students were moving, also at a growing rate, to this land of ours. Our young people were learning the cultures, the attitudes and the philosophies of the people in the countries which they visited. Young people from abroad were, in turn, learning the cultures, the attitudes and the philosophies of Americans.

Youth for Understanding, then, has enriched the peoples of many nations. It has opened a door to communication between the people of the United States, and the peoples of the other free countries which inhabit this planet, earth, with us.

As a representative from Michigan, I am pleased that Youth for Understanding is headquartered in my great State.

I am particularly pleased that nearly two dozen schools in my congressional district—which covers all of Macomb County—actively participate as host schools. These schools include:

Armada High School.
Carl Brablec High School.
Center Line High School.
Chippewa Valley High School.
Davis Junior High School.
Eisenhower High School.
Fraser High School.
Lake Shore High School.
Lakeview High School.
L'Anse Creuse High School.
Memphis High School.
Mount Clemens High School.
New Haven High School.
Richmond Community High School.
Romeo High School.
Roseville High School.
Adlai Stevenson High School.
Utica Community High School.

In addition, Macomb County Community College plays an active role in this student exchange program.

I congratulate all of these educational institutions for the job they are doing to further the goals of the Youth for Understanding program. I also congratulate the scores of families in Macomb County who have played host to the young people from other countries during their stay in the United States.

Youth for Understanding has helped to underscore the fact that education involves a lot more than merely attending school. The learning process is enhanced, and the horizons of our children are enlarged, because of this student exchange program. The teenagers taking part in this program—our own teenagers and those from other countries—are seeing life from a new perspective. They are learning about people—not people in the abstract, but people in the flesh. And they are learning about each other's problems, each other's hopes, each other's aspirations.

All Americans should take pride in the accomplishments of Youth for Understanding. I hope all Americans will join in paying tribute to this outstanding organization as it reaches its "age of majority"—and will join, too, in wishing Youth for Understanding many more productive years in teaching young people the world over the real meaning of the word "communication."

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to the youth for understanding international teenage student exchange program.

It is my firm conviction that only through efforts such as this which involve active participation with people throughout the world can we achieve real understanding of the many kinds of thoughts and ways of all mankind. Understanding breeds tolerance and compromise—intellectual commodities which are extremely valuable, especially in this world where tension quickly rises and far too often results in violent confrontation.

And what better "friendship ambassadors" do we have than our young people who are likely to be flexible in the face of change; who frequently are less hardened by prejudice which age oftentimes reinforces. If we are to achieve the ultimate—a harmonious world community—we must open our minds and our hearts to all nationalities. And as the youth for understanding program provides, we must open our homes so that young people from around the world will learn through personal experience what living in the United States is really like.

In my home State of Indiana, approximately 100 students each year from high schools in Europe, Asia, and South America attend high school while living with local host families. These students have made significant contributions to their schools and communities and in turn, have learned much that they will share in their native communities. This is a meaningful, thoughtful progression of understanding which rests on the strongest of bases—actual experience.

I commend the youth for understanding program for creating this invaluable opportunity for so many young people. In particular, I would like to encourage the young people in this country to become involved in international student exchange whether by actually going to a foreign country or by expressing an ac-

tive interest in the foreign students in their own communities.

Ours is a rather unique challenge in that we are geographically denied extensive exposure to people from foreign countries. I ask our young people to make that special effort to become involved in international exchange student programs such as the youth for understanding program.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today in this well-deserved tribute to the Youth for Understanding program of the International Student Exchange.

Over the past 20 years more than 30,000 students from 45 countries have participated in this remarkable effort to promote international understanding. It is one of only three teenage exchange programs officially recognized by the Department of State.

A number of young people from the 23d District of Ohio, which I serve, have contributed to and benefited from this program, both as participants living with families abroad and as Ohioans welcoming young exchange visitors from overseas into their homes.

May "Youth for Understanding" enjoy continued success in its outstanding endeavors for international accord through person-to-person programs.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of ideological conflicts, when the world is shrinking in terms of travel time, we find ourselves in the position of being brought closer to our neighbors on this planet, yet often painfully distant in understanding them.

I join my colleagues in speaking for programs such as Youth for Understanding. It is through such exchange programs that the leaders of years to come may have the opportunity to meet and gain a better understanding of each other.

We cannot fail to see the importance of learning from our fellow human beings, and in turn, relating our own experiences with the hope that they may learn from us. Indeed, no reasonable person will dispute the fact that the future of our very existence depends upon the degree to which the people of the world are able to understand each other. The people-to-people approach of such programs as Youth for Understanding affords us a chance to move toward a day when we shall not feel threatened by the fires of global conflict ignited by misunderstanding, and when fear would be replaced by communication.

The future demands that we make every effort to relate to our fellow human beings, both in our own country and in other nations.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today "Youth for Understanding."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNGATE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NEW STATE OF BANGLADESH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the principle upon which our own existence as a nation is based and to which we have maintained allegiance at a sometimes considerable price for nearly 200 years is that of a people's right to freely determine their own destiny.

If, Mr. Speaker, this is true, it seems at least coldly logical that we support the same idea in our attitude toward the newborn nation of Bangladesh.

I believe, of course, it is more than logical, I believe it is morally compelling.

If Bangladesh were taken out of context, as it were, we would have no other course in the name of consistency and self-belief but to recognize its existence in the company of nations.

Leaving Bangladesh in context, fraught as it is with overtones of international politics and cold war cross purposes, it makes sense, I think, for us to recognize the fact of Bangladesh, quickly and cleanly, if only to avoid the nonrecognition mistakes of the past, for many of which we have paid dearly.

Bangladesh is a fact. It is a newly formed nation of 73 million people with a government de facto. There seems to me to be no currency in ignoring it.

Beyond that, Bangladesh exists de jure because its people freely chose to exist separate and sovereign in an overwhelming expression of self-determination. And they have paid an enormous price in blood and hunger in their commitment to that destiny.

In recognition of our own belief in government by the consent of the governed and in consistent adherence to our policy of encouraging this same approach whenever and wherever the opportunity presents itself, we ought to recognize Bangladesh de jure.

Until we do that, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are free to regard Bangladesh in any way except awkwardly and guiltily, nor are we true to the validity of our own national convictions.

THE ILLEGAL DRUG TRAFFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this year during the congressional recess, I had the opportunity to investigate firsthand the problem our country faces in illegal drug traffic.

Traveling to Turkey and other countries involved in growing, processing, and transporting of narcotics, I spent many hours talking with and discussing the drug problem with public officials.

One of the first results of my investigation was the full realization that this problem is not a national one, but an international one, and that its solution cannot be achieved by any amount of effort by the United States standing alone. Instead, it requires a full, concerted effort by the entire family of nations. This need for international cooperation is amplified by the fact that increased U.S. narcotics and customs personnel, no matter how efficient and sophisticated, will not be able to stem totally the flow of illicit drugs into our country. The State Department has stated that even with the most effective law enforcement program conceivable, only about 10 percent of the illegal drug traffic could be stopped. In fact, figures just released by the U.S. Bureau of Customs indicate that 1971 was a record year for seizures of heroin and other narcotics entering the country. And yet, the 1,309 pounds of heroin seized represents only 10 to 20 percent of the total heroin imported to the United States last year.

A brief look at the problem of detection shows the hopelessness of our ever totally preventing the entry of illicit drugs. An estimated 4 tons of heroin enter the United States each year, hidden in ski poles, diplomatic mail, luxury cars, private jets, canned food, inside apparently perfect fruit such as watermelons, hollowed out books, scuba tanks, dolls, candles, and many other exotic hiding places.

Approximately 220 million people with baggage, half a billion tons of freight, 65 million cars and trucks, 360,000 planes, and 157,000 ships will enter our country in 1 year. Looking closer at only the last item, an estimated 32,000 places can be found on a large vessel where drugs can be hidden. So, while our law enforcement efforts at home must continue, we cannot rely on this alone. We must find a way to cut off the supply before it ever gets to our shorelines.

The harm that drug addiction inflicts on our country is well known to all, but a few statistics to highlight the great need for decisive actions in this area may be in order.

There are estimated to be more than 200,000 narcotic addicts in the United States. This is the largest number of known addicts in the world and the figure is growing daily. Drug abuse is the major cause of death for those in the 15 to 35 age bracket in New York City, where people die at the rate of three per day from heroin addiction. Over 1,000 babies are born in our country each year addicted to heroin as a result of their mother's drug abuse. It costs at least $35 per day to support a heroin habit and with 200,000 addicts, this hits about $7 million daily. The Justice Department estimates that approximately $1.5 billion was stolen in 1969 to pay for hard drugs and it is going up rapidly each year. The cost of crime related to illegal hard drugs exceeds the cost of all forms of Federal law enforcement; the Federal courts and prisons, the FBI, and the Justice Department. Drug addiction is estimated to cause half of the crimes committed in the Nation's Capital.

While these statistics reflect the problem of our own country, drug addiction is an international dilemma. I found that many foreign officials have been slow to realize this. But, I believe they are finally getting the message.

THE OLDER AMERICANS HOUSING ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege of introducing, with my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ROBERT STEPHENS), the Older Americans Housing Act of 1972. Enactment of this bill will implement the most significant recommendations of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging concerning housing and related programs for the low-moderate income elderly.

The 1971 White House Conference on Aging was remarkably successful in identifying and focusing national attention upon the needs, wants, and aspiration of the 20,000,000 older Americans. The recommendations of the White House Conference embody the collective wisdom, experience, and good will of the more than 3,000 delegates from throughout the country. The unifying theme of the White House Conference was the need for action now.

Nowhere was the urgency of effective, prompt action more evident than in the findings and recommendations concerning the housing and related needs of the low-moderate income elderly, the often forgotten elderly. These people during their working careers were provident, pension-earning, taxpaying citizens who constituted the stable, middle-class element of our society; however, inflation has eroded the purchasing power of their fixed retirement income and now that they, unlike younger people, are unable to improve their economic station, they have been deprived of the housing security, independence, and dignity which they earned. These are the people whose incomes, while sometimes too high for residency in low-rent federally subsidized public housing, are not sufficient for suitable housing on the private market.

The Older Americans Housing Act of 1972 will provide an immediate and effective response to the most urgent needs of older Americans for suitable housing and related services. The bill contains four major elements. First, it will allow the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make direct 3-percent loans to organizations designed to construct specialized housing facilities for the elderly. When the housing projects so funded become operational and 90-percent occupied, they will be eligible for refinancing by conversion to the interest assistance program, thereby immediately repaying Federal loan moneys to a revolving fund. A revolving fund of approximately $500 million would be initially created by refinancing of Federal housing loans already outstanding using interest assistance funds already appropriated for fiscal year 1972 and new appropriations of less than $20 million for fiscal year 1973. This housing program would provide approximately 35,000 units of specialized elderly housing during its first 2 years of operation.

The second part of the bill provides for direct 100-percent grants to nonprofit organizations and public bodies to build senior citizen centers, including senior centers built in conjunction with housing projects so as to provide outreach and supportive services to residents and nonresidents in the neighborhood and community.

The third program embodied in the bill provides that HUD may make either grants or loans to elderly persons living in their own homes to rehabilitate their homes to keep them in a decent, safe, and sanitary condition. Qualification for the grant or loan would be based upon inability to receive similar funding through private lending organizations. For those able to repay the money, they would be expected to do so and the interest rate would be 3 percent. However, for those whose incomes were insufficient to be able to repay the money, a direct grant would be made for the rehabilitation of their home, and the Secretary of HUD would have the first lien against the property when it was transferred due to death or sale.

Finally, the bill provides for a specialized organizational component within the Department of Housing and Urban Development led by an Administrator for Housing and Related Programs for Older Americans. The Administrator would have responsibility for operating the elderly housing program, the senior citizens center program, and the loan and grant program for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing. Additionally, the Administrator would have authority and responsibility for initiation and conduct of research programs concerning the health, physical, emotional, and social aspects of all housing and related programs for the elderly; and the development and implementation of programs for training professional and semiprofessional staff personnel to improve the competency, efficiency, and sensitivity of the management of federally assisted housing projects and programs for the elderly would be within his jurisdiction. In short, he will synthesize all elements essential to a comprehensive and effective program.

The Older Americans Housing Act of 1972 captures both the letter and the spirit embodied in the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging. It gives specialized attention and specialized response to the needs of those of the older Americans who have contributed so much and who without our help cannot now effectively compete in either the private or the subsidized housing market.

We are forever compelled to face our responsibility of balancing all the national needs against the available resources. Unfortunately, we cannot responsibly respond effectively to all needs simultaneously. In my judgment there is no cause more meritorious or more urgently needed for the elderly.

SOUTH VIETNAM PERMITTED TO SABOTAGE POW PRISON INSPECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today documents that reveal that the United States permitted the South Vietnamese Government to sabotage an inspection of American POW camps in North Vietnam at the same time that Presidential aide Henry Kissinger was engaged in secret negotiations. In January 1971, the South Vietnamese Government requested that Amnesty International, a private international organization dedicated to the freeing of political prisoners of all persuasions, attempt an inspection tour of inspection tour of North Vietnamese prisons. The North Vietnamese agreed to such an inspection on a reciprocal basis. After final arrangements had been made for a trip to North Vietnam in June, the South Vietnamese suddenly and unexpectedly canceled the visas of mission members complaining that their officials were too busy to receive the group.

Apparently the United States missed an excellent opportunity to find out about numbers of prisoners and conditions in the North Vietnamese prison camps. What I am shocked to learn is that the Government of the United States sat by and did nothing while the South Vietnamese Government scuttled the trip. It is inconceivable that we allowed the Government of South Vietnam to veto this inspection trip.

I have also learned that Amnesty International in planning another mission to inspect both North and South Vietnamese prisons. I have called upon Secretary of State William Rogers to persuade the South Vietnamese to cooperate in this new venture. We cannot allow the South Vietnamese to again prevent us from learning about the true condition of Americans who are POW's in North Vietnam. This time the United States must insist that the South Vietnamese cooperate with any new inspection mission. After we have lost tens of thousands of lives and billions of dollars from our Treasury, the least we can expect from the South Vietnamese is their full cooperation in an attempt to win inspection of North Vietnamese prison camps.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that Amnesty International would be an ideal organization to conduct such an inspection tour. Its leadership covers a wide political spectrum including William F. Buckley, Jr., who is a member of the American Advisory Council. Amnesty International ordinarily adopts prisoners and then works for their release. The organization has won the release of many prisoners in a number of countries.

Mr. Speaker, the American Government must not repeat a tragic error of failing to press the South Vietnamese for reciprocal prison inspections when Amnesty International attempts a second mission.

The documents and the letter to Secretary Rogers follow:

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

("I detest your ideas but I am ready to die for your right to express them.—Voltaire.)

OBJECTS

The objects of Amnesty International are: (a) to ensure for every person the right freely to hold and to express his convictions and the obligation on every person to extent

a like freedom to others: and in pursuance of that object to secure throughout the world the observance of the provisions of Articles 5, 9, 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(b) Irrespective of political considerations, to work for the release of and provide assistance to persons who in violation of the aforesaid provisions are imprisoned, detained or restricted or otherwise subjected to physical coercion or restraint by reason of their political, religious or other conscientiously held belief or by reason of their ethnic origin, colour or language provided that they have not used or advocated violence. (Prisoners of Conscience.)

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Article 5: No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 9: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 18: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Amnesty International is a non-political, non-sectarian and non-governmental. It has consultative status with the United Nations, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

Amnesty International is financed through national sections and local groups and by individual subscriptions from all parts of the world.

Amnesty International is governed by an International Council. This Council meets once a year and is composed of representatives of the National Sections and members of the International Executive Committee. The latter are elected by the Council each year and take responsibility for the day-to-day work of the International Secretariat in London. The Chairman of the Executive Committee is Mr. Sean MacBride S.C.—former Foreign Minister of Ireland and former President of the Council of Ministers at the Council of Europe. The Secretary General is Mr. Martin Ennals.

Amnesty International arranges missions to the countries with which it is concerned and sends representatives to speak to governments. It also sends observers to trials whenever this is worthwhile and possible. It establishes contact with prisoners and their families, to give assistance.

Amnesty International is pledged to oppose the death penalty for political offences and has established a special fund for this.

Amnesty International was founded in 1961 and its work now extends across the world. It has 27 national sections and more than 900 groups. Each group "adopts" three prisoners: one from each of the major political blocs; the third from the developing countries. This system ensures political neutrality.

PRESS STATEMENT FROM AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

(By Martin Ennals)

JUNE 28, 1971.

MISSION TO VIETNAM

On 22 January 1971, Mr. Do Thieu Liet, a counsellor at the South Vietnamese Embassy in London visited, at his own request, the Secretary General of Amnesty International at the headquarters of the organisation. Mr. Liet brought with him a copy of a new white paper published by the South Vietnamese government reporting, inter alia, on the treatment of "persons kidnapped" by the North Vietnamese authorities. Mr. Liet stated specifically that he had been requested by his ambassador to present the publication to Amnesty International and to seek the assistance of Amnesty in influencing the North Vietnamese authorities with regard to their prisoners.

The Secretary General accepted the publication and explained the mandate of Amnesty International with regard to prisoners of conscience and political prisoners. The ways in which Amnesty could act upon the request from the South Vietnamese government was discussed in terms of a possible visit to both parts of Vietnam. Doubt was expressed as to whether the Northern authorities would agree to a visit.

On 18 February, a representative of Amnesty staff attended a press conference at the South Vietnamese Embassy by special invitation. After the conference the question was again raised privately of the assistance that Amnesty International might give in response to the request made on 22 January.

On 20 March the International Executive of Amnesty International considered the situation and agreed that their chairman Mr. Sean MacBride should undertake a mission provided that he was able to visit both parts of the country. The terms of reference of the mission were drafted after the meeting and circulated to members of the International Executive Committee before receiving approval. These are as follows: "To discuss and examine the treatment of political prisoners in North and South Vietnam; to make representations to the respective governments for the release of prisoners of conscience; and to discuss and examine the conditions, treatment and possible release of civilian and other prisoners detained as a result of the existing armed conflict."

On Friday 2 April the Secretary General at his request, met the Ambassador from South Vietnam in London and together with an Amnesty staff member discussed the proposed mission of Mr. MacBride. There was no question raised of visa difficulties or of any particular date being unsuitable. Forms of application were sent to Mr. MacBride who holds a diplomatic passport issued by the Irish government. Doubt was again expressed as to whether the North Vietnamese authorities would agree to issue a visa.

Prior to the March meeting of the International Executive Committee Mr. MacBride had been in contact with the International Association of Democratic Lawyers who had agreed to refer the possibility of a mission to the North Vietnamese government. An assurance was received through these channels that a visa would be forthcoming for Mr. MacBride's visit. This was communicated direct to Mr. MacBride who then began to make preparations for his travel.

Discussions were held with the representatives of North and South Vietnam in Paris and with Mr. Ambassador Bruce of the U.S. government, charged with the Paris talks. A visit was also made to Stockholm for talks with the Swedish government regarding the possibility of certain exchange arrangements being made for prisoners. A special brief on North and South Vietnamese prisoners was prepared in Amnesty headquarters.

Funds for the mission were approved through four national sections of Amnesty on condition that both parts of Vietnam were to be visited.

There were considerable delay in receiving an answer from South Vietnam and eventually it was decided to try to re-route the mission to visit North Vietnam before South Vietnam although this was considered by Amnesty International to be a regrettable variation in procedure.

The North Vietnamese ambassador in Paris then indicated that unless there was an assurance of a visa from South Vietnam the purpose of the mission for which agreement had originally been given would be considered to have changed and he was not therefore able to issue a visa at that time. At the beginning of June Mr. MacBride received a letter from the South Vietnamese ambassador in London indicating that the time was not considered appropriate for a mission as the officials whom Mr. MacBride would wish to meet were too busy to receive him.

In these circumstances the mission had to be postponed. The next meeting of the International Executive Committee which will consider the situation is on 11 July in London.

FEBRUARY 1, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: It has come to my attention that Amnesty International, a private international organization dedicated to the freeing of political prisoners of all persuasions, may undertake a second mission to inspect POW camps in both North and South Vietnam.

As you know, Amnesty attempted a similar mission in June 1971. The South Vietnamese cancelled visas for mission members and as a result the North Vietnamese backed down on what was to be a reciprocal arrangement.

We cannot allow the South Vietnamese to again prevent us from learning about the true conditions of Americans who are POW's in North Vietnam. This time the U.S. must insist that South Vietnamese cooperate with any new inspection mission. The American government at the minimum should receive full cooperation from our ally who we have supported with tens of thousands of lost lives and billions from our treasury.

Amnesty International would be an ideal organization to undertake such a mission. Its leadership covers a wide political spectrum including William F. Buckley, Jr., who is a member of the American Advisory Council. As you may know, Amnesty International has worked for and won the release of many political prisoners around the world.

The American government must not repeat the tragic error of failing to press the South Vietnamese for reciprocal prison inspection when Amnesty International attempts a second mission.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

THE CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Children's Dental Health Act, an important piece of legislation because it launches a multipronged attack to solve our dental-care problems in the country. Under provisions of the Children's Dental Health Act, $50 million would be authorized to treat the dental problems of low-income and rural children. Another $9 million is authorized to aid communities which want to fluoridate their water supplies but, because of lack of funds, are unable to do so. The bill also authorizes $57 million in grants to public and nonprofit institutions carrying out programs to train dental auxiliary personnel and another $26 million would be authorized for grants to institutions engaged in studies

of the most effective means to utilize this auxiliary personnel. Finally, the bill authorizes the President to appoint a seven-member Dental Advisory Committee which would look into the Nation's dental-care problems and advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The need for this legislation is plain. By the age of 2 years old, half of America's children have suffered from tooth decay. By the time the average child enters school, he or she has three decayed teeth and by age 15, that child has 11 teeth which have been either decayed, filled or are missing. Over half the Nation's children have never been to a dentist, and among low-income families, that level rises to 70 percent.

The Division of Dental Health in the Bureau of Health Manpower reported that $4 billion is spent annually by Americans for their dental care. But that care is to treat conditions which the report states, need never have developed at all or which could have been arrested earlier at less cost and less professional time.

The $50 million authorization to treat children will provide preventive, corrective, and followup care. The money for fluoridation goes to communities which want the treatment in their water supplies. Studies show that children who live in communities which have fluoridated water have fewer cavities, sometimes by as much as 65 percent.

The provisions dealing with dental hygienists and assistants is particularly important because it is designed to maximize the dentists' productivity. There is currently one hygienist for every six dentists practicing in this country when the minimum desirable ratio is one hygienist for every two dentists, according to professional groups. But if we are to meet that minimum ratio, we must graduate 48,000 new hygienists in this decade. At our current rate, we train only 23,000.

This bill, originally authored by Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, has received widespread support reflected in the vote December 10 of 88 to 1 for its passage. The Senator is to be commended for his work, as is Senator EDWARD KENNEDY who chairs the Subcommittee on Health. The bill has been endorsed by major dental organizations. I will be resubmitting this bill at a later date for cosponsors.

A VALUE-ADDED TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, some of us in Treasury would know something about it. At least that is what Treasury Secretary Connally told me Monday of this week about the possibility that the administration may be considering new taxes in light of the staggering deficit the administration has and will have run up by the end of the new fiscal year.

The Secretary disavowed any knowledge of the possibility of tax increases when I questioned him during our Ways and Means Committee hearings on the administration's request to increase the debt limit another $50 billion, to bring it to $480 billion.

It must have come as a shock to him when, on the following day, the White House let it be known that the administration is considering placing a so-called value-added tax on the backs of the already overly taxed low- and middle-income Americans.

It is reported in the press lately that Secretary Connally is becoming disenchanted in his current capacity. I do not blame him. I would be upset too if I were Secretary of the Treasury and a bunch of mere White House staffers were selling the President on a whopping tax increase without my knowledge.

Or perhaps this is the fiscal work of the James Bond of the White House, Henry Kissinger, secret agent doer of and dabbler in all things.

Actually Mr. Kissinger should have a good knowledge of the value-added tax. He is an acknowledged expert in foreign affairs and VAT is a form of taxation used extensively in foreign lands.

In France it is 23 percent. In Germany, 11 percent. The Swedish rate is 15 percent.

The VAT has been described as one of the most insidious forms of taxation used today.

Insidious because it is a hidden tax. That is, the merchants who pass it on to consumers simply include it in the price without separate mention. At least this is how it is done in Europe.

Insidious because it is a regressive tax. That is, it bears heavier on low- and middle-income people.

In contrast to VAT, the Federal income tax is a progressive tax, generally based on the ability to pay.

The VAT balloon floated by the White House yesterday carried a revenue-raising figure of about $16 billion. Former Treasury official Stanley Surrey estimates that $3 billion to $4 billion can be raised for each 1 percent of VAT. Thus to raise the $16 billion the administration is talking about would require a national VAT levy of 4 to 5 percent.

For months now I have expressed fear that the administration would be forced to raise taxes and would attempt to do so by putting the load on the small taxpayer. This confirms my fear.

At the same time it is appalling to note that not one hint has come from the administration concerning another revenue-raising avenue open to them. This is to close the remaining loopholes in our Federal income tax laws.

When we wrote and passed the tax reform of 1969 we knew more work was needed. The Nixon administration pledged to help. For 2 years the Ways and Means Committee has waited in vain for its promised recommendations on estate and gift taxes.

It is estimated we could raise an additional $20 billion in Federal revenues if the remaining Federal tax loopholes were closed. But to do this we would need the full support of the President and the administration and to date they have not paid even lipservice to this approach.

Certainly additional Federal revenues are going to be needed if the administration continues to underestimate tax receipts and run up these deficits. But let us have no talk of consideration of a value-added tax for whatever purpose.

The taxpaying public is heavily burdened as it is. It seems it would be far more appropriate to close the loopholes and raise the moneys this way. We can do this with support from the administration. If new moneys are to be raised let us work together to provide equitable taxation and pursue sound fiscal policy.

THE FINANCING OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, sometime later in this session of the 92d Congress this House will consider legislation providing for the continued financing of public broadcasting.

This week the Subcommittee on Power and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted hearings on several measures to provide for increased funding to support educational programing. Mr. Sheldon P. Siegel, executive vice president and general manager of WLVT–TV, the Lehigh Valley Educational Television Corp. serving the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area of Pennsylvania, was among those who testified.

From his vantage point as manager of an ETV facility, Mr. Siegel was able to offer real insight into the problems which confront public television at the local level. "Many station managers," he explained, "spend most of their time in a relentless search for 'survival funds'," and are thus seriously restricted in allocating time and effort to the creation and development of new and imaginative programing.

He makes an excellent case, I believe, for increased financial support of the local public broadcasting facilities—not for the sake of pouring more money into public broadcasting, but to enable community public broadcasting facilities to play a more meaningful role in the community.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Siegel's most pertinent remarks:

TESTIMONY OF SHELDON P. SIEGEL

It is an honor to have been asked again to testify before this distinguished Committee; my previous appearance having been in April, 1970, when the continued financing of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was under discussion.

Much has changed in Public Broadcasting in these past 20 months—for the good; but much, unfortunately, has remained the same. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has been initially funded; the Public Broadcasting Service has found its sealegs and a measure of public acceptance; but the problems, predominantly economic, of the local educational/public television station have not been ameliorated in these past 20 months.

To the contrary, tightening economic pressures on participating school districts everywhere have resulted in a curtailment and, indeed, in some areas, a complete halt in support of instructional television programming activity on local stations. Businesses and industry have tightened their own

belts, and what meager funds were flowing into public television stations through underwriting and direct contribution, have seriously diminished. State governmental support of educational television has also been eroded through constantly increasing demands on its treasury.

Yet, with all this, the local non-commercial public television station—born without any visible means of support—has been called upon to serve its local constituency, and despite the adverse economics—practically all ETV stations have responded with new and imaginative programs for its local community.

One often reads in the daily press of the need for economic stabilization. I think that is exactly what is needed now, if local public television is to exist and, hopefully, thrive. It is to this end that I would like to direct my remarks.

If I may paraphrase from the Bible. In the beginning, there were the stations. The question is—will they be there in the end?

The stations preceded the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service, the numerous other entities which serve in our behalf. Yet, there are times when it appears that we shall be survived by those that come after—which may be the law of nature, but ought not to be the guiding principle of the destiny of public broadcasting.

For in my opinion, and I believe that of the great majority of my colleagues, the destiny of public broadcasting, its ultimate acceptance in the grass-roots of America, lies with a strong local public television station, responsive to its local constituency—programming for that constituency—in the interest of that constituency.

But you can't have all this, unless you pay your light bill first. Mandrake the Magician would be hard pressed to produce a significant program without first producing the funds to pay for the production staff, the graphics, the cameras, and the heat. The station must first have the sound economic base upon which to build this structure of community service.

Many station managers spend most of their time in a relentless search for "survival funds." Instead of expending energy in the creation and development of new and imaginative programming efforts (which takes dollars), many ETV managers, particularly in the smaller- and medium-size markets, spend most of their day in designing new and imaginative ways to seek funds to pay the telephone bill.

I do not say that the future of public broadcasting, with its emphasis on support of the local station, need be built at the expense of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting or a strong national program service. I do say, however, that the economic well-being of the local station must become a *prior* concern from which all else must flow. For the local public television station provides an avenue of communication for the local community. A good local public television station registers the pulse of its community.

I am sure that the distinguished members of this Committee are aware that the amount proposed in several bills relating to financing public broadcasting may not be equal to the task ahead. I do not think any useful purpose would be served by dwelling on the adequacy or not of the dollar amounts discussed.

What *is* important, in my view, is the direction and thrust of the expenditure. What *is* important is that the focus should be put where it truly belongs—on the local station to do the local job that must be done.

There is little sense in providing for a first class interconnection of poorhouses which simply exist to funnel a national program service.

As I recently noted in a letter to the Honorable Fred Rooney, a member of this Committee, whatever funding develops, from whatever source, it is imperative that the major designation and thrust for any funding bill keep the local stations as the major priority.

The heart of public broadcasting today, as it has always been in the past, lies with the local station. The funding and direction of public broadcasting must be primarily oriented towards the support of the local station.

This need not necesarily be at the expense of a national program service if sufficient funds are available; but when there must be a choice, the needs of the local communities, through their stations, should be served first.

These funds enable us to produce local programs, for example, such as our station undertakes in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, to fill a community need.

Two weeks of continuous live local programming every night, featuring all local candidates for political office, including school board, city council, state Senate and Assembly, d.a., judgeships, and United States Congress. Live, local election returns; public hearings, featuring the Governor; State House Committees; Ecology versus the Environment; and Fluoridation.

Monthly live City Council and School Board Reports with telephone questions direct to city and school officials; regular weekly exchange of views by college students and community leaders of seven local universities on our "College Speak In", which recently featured the Honorable Wilbur Mills in a special hour telecast. Programming such as this can only be done at the grassroots level—and supported by funding that puts the money where the program is—locally.

As to a formula of local station percentage in any funding bill, I would suggest an increasing sliding local percentage with concomitant decreasing percent for the national service as the *total* dollars increase.

At the present time, 12% of the funds are going to meet local station support. For example, in a total $45 million new funding bill, 30% could be the initial local factor, which would yield about $15 million local funds and $30 million nationaly. This is a modest step in the right direction.

If the local percent were to increase, for example, 5% for every $5 million, a total appropriation of $65 million, would have a 50% local factor, or about $30 million; with the remaining 50% or $35 million still available for national programs.

You will note such an approach would still guarantee a strong national commitment at a consistent dollar level, yet recognize the need to increase the local station dollars as more federal funds became available to cover increasing demands on the local public television facility.

A local-national ratio could also be worked out for appropriations as needed beyond the figures noted here, but I hope I have illustrated a concept on how a sliding formula might work with the need for increasing local support at the matrix.

Our greatest single need at this point is for unrestricted general station support that may be utilized by the local stations. Candidly, in my opinion, the source of this support becomes secondary. The real issue is the need; not necessarily the mechanism by which this is generated.

I am certain that this Committee is benumbed by those testifying on a variety of bills, who preface their remarks by saying that the appropriation they seek is really inadequate for the task at hand—or if an amount has been proposed, that it is insufficient.

I have tried to spare you this kind of financial analysis—believing that the *real* point at issue is the direction this funding should take—for if the principle upon which the funding is based is sound—if the emphasis is "right on" as they say in the present day vernacular—then the dollars to do the job right will ultimately flow in the needed amounts—for the public will have been served.

They will support and encourage your efforts as responsible Congressmen, and public broadcasting will realize its promise of being a dynamic and motivating force for the benefit of all our citizens.

Thank you.

THE INCOMPARABLE JERRY WEST—WEST VIRGINIA'S BASKETBALL REPRESENTATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in these days of turmoil and confusion, the American people instinctively turn to athletics as a cathartic. Every sport has its hero, worshipped by thousands. West Virginia is proud to present its representative in the world of amateur and professional basketball, Jerry West. News media across the Nation are today acclaiming his skill and his character as a good citizen. It is my great pleasure to offer this little tribute to his matchless gifts.

Jerry West is a gifted, graceful, modest young man, admired by millions of basketball fans everywhere.

As one of West Virginia's greatest "natural resources" he has been—and still is—a wondrous "ambassador of good will" not only for his native State, but the entire Nation.

To the National Basketball Association, he is a "special person" because of his many attributes both on and off the court.

West Virginia University never had a better player than the 6-foot 3-inch, 175-pound, two-time All-American superstar, Jerry West, a "complete player" in every respect.

Neither have the Los Angeles Lakers for whom Jerry West is in his 12th season as an all-time, all-pro performer.

Indeed, those of us who have followed his star-studded career closely believe he may be, pound for pound and inch for inch, the greatest basketball player who ever lived.

His amazing achievements are too numerous—and too well known—to list here. Suffice to say that all of the records he established as a "Mountaineer" remain intact as do his numerous marks with the Lakers and the National Basketball Association.

Only three players in pro basketball history have scored more points, only four have made more free throws, and only five have been credited with more assists.

Just last month Jerry West was voted the Most Valuable Player Award in the NBA All-Star Game in Los Angeles, where his last-second field goal gave the West team a 2-point victory over the East. It seemed most fitting inasmuch as he always has been known as "Mr. Clutch" for his exploits on the court.

Two years ago, this gutty guard led the league in scoring and was acclaimed the NBA's Most Valuable Player in the

championship playoffs—but he told the world—

I would gladly trade that singular honor for a team title.

That is the type of person this deeply dedicated athlete is.

Several months ago, Jerry West reluctantly agreed to a "night" in his honor at a game in Los Angeles. In lieu of gifts, however, he requested that all proceeds from the sale of the souvenir book be used to establish a perpetual "Jerry West Scholarship" for the needy at West Virginia University in Morgantown. A deserving youngster, not necessarily an athlete, will be the recipient each year.

Jerry West has given of his time, effort, and money to help young people and old in various ways. Just recently he served as chairman of the Christmas Seal Campaign for his home State.

It is with tremendous pride that we West Virginians—and members of the District of Columbia chapter of the West Virginia University Alumni Association—spearhead a salute to this distinguished alumus and national sports celebrity.

We are constantly reminded that Jerry West has not played on a championship team except in high school at East Bank, W. Va., and with the U.S. representatives in the Olympic and Pan-American Games.

To millions of Americans, however, Jerry West is a true champion in every respect and always will be—long after his career as a player comes to an end.

Thus, it is with the utmost esteem, respect, and admiration that fellow West Virginians and West Virginia University graduates, and thousands of others, join in paying tribute to Jerry West on Sunday afternoon, February 13, 1972, when the Lakers play the Baltimore Bullets at College Park, Md.

May Jerry West, wife Jane, and their three handsome sons, Dave, Mike, and Mark, enjoy this moment of recognition to one so humble and so deserving.

MORE PLANT AND JOB LOSSES OVERSEAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of my continuing concern in matters of foreign trade and overseas investment, I feel that the following articles should be brought to the attention of each and every Member of this House. These are the articles of respected journalists and wire services and not something that comes off the top of a Congressman's head in the middle of a floor debate. I think that they go a considerable distance in documenting the increasing concern many of us have felt about recent trends in our economy. The more articles, such as this, one reads, the more convinced one becomes that the time for Congress to begin exhaustive hearings into foreign trade and the multinational corporation is upon us. H.R. 10914 would serve as an effective background for such hearings and has already been filed several times with an impressive list of consponsors. The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 5, 1972]

ROYAL TYPEWRITER FACTORY TO LEAVE CONNECTICUT FOR ENGLAND

HARTFORD, CONN.—Royal Typewriter Co. yesterday announced it will move all its typewriter production overseas—a step expected to affect 1500 workers.

"Tragic" was the reaction of one union official.

Royal announced in September that it was considering moving all production to its facility in Hull, England.

Royal employes were told in a letter that the decision to move has been made "as a result of years-long and continuing competitive pressure from lower-cost foreign made typewriters."

"After considering all elements of continued operations of the Hartford manufacturing facility, we have concluded that Royal must transfer all typewriter production from Hartford to more economical facilities," the company said.

It added that no decision had been made on when the transfer would be completed.

A union spokesman said no arrangements had been made for transfer of any production workers to England.

Royal said it will maintain marketing and administratve personnel numbering about 700 in Hartford.

MORE U.S. GOODS "MADE IN JAPAN"

(By Dean C. Miller)

NEW YORK.—You may think that the Dodge Colt compact car, Royal's "Apollo" typewriter and Bell & Howell's super-8 movie camera have little in common.

But they do.

They're all made in Japan.

To the long list of "American" products made overseas can be added many models of television sets, some General Electric washing machines, RCA radios and even Spalding baseball gloves.

Each year Americans spend billions for Japanese products bearing American brand names. Many people aren't even aware of it because labels and plates denoting point of manufacture often are under or on the backs of the machines. Hitachi makes some models of the RCA radio and GE washing machines. Mitsubishi Corp. makes the Colt compact.

NCR, Burroughs and Dictaphone place their names on calculators produced in Japan by Sharp, Sanyo and Nippon, respectively. Most Monroe calculators are produced in Japan by Canon. Many Philco-Ford television sets also are produced abroad.

CHEAP LABOR SOUGHT

This flight to cheaper labor markets has cost Americans about 275,000 jobs just in the radio-television and electronic area and the fields of leather footwear, steel, apparel and textiles, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics. Imports in these areas in 1970 contributed nearly $4 billion to the balance of payments deficit.

It has been estimated that Americans in 1971 imported 90 percent of their home radios, 51 percent of their black and white television sets, 42 percent of their shoes, 16 percent of their new cars, 96 percent of their motorcycles and 68 percent of their sweaters.

Besides products made overseas and bearing American brand names, a vast quantity of goods are assembled here from components manufactured abroad. IBM, the leading maker of computers, has a component manufacturing plant in Taiwan. That island also turns out television components and other electronic parts for Philco-Ford, Admiral and General Instrument Co.

Little by little, the drive towards cheaper labor, a major factor in productivity which ultimately determines profit margins, is chipping away at American industries. Take the portable typewriter industry for example. Major producers like Royal, Remington, and Underwood, acquired by Olivetti, an Italian company, make their products overseas. Allen Business Machines (formerly R. C. Allen), an American manufacturer of office typewriters, was forced out of business entirely.

ONE U.S. PORTABLE

Smith-Corona portables, made by SCM Corp., are the only portables still produced in this country. SCM manages this through automated manufacturing methods at its production complex in the Cortland, N.Y. area. Despite the automation, Smith-Corona still hires 3,500 workers at these plants. But you can bet that these workers worry some as they feel the pressures of foreign labor closing in on them.

Corporations also feel that pressure. They're caught between the desire to make more profits through higher productivity and public resentment when they phase out plants and operations in favor of foreign labor.

[From Business Week, Aug. 28, 1971]

MULTINATIONALS TAKE IT IN STRIDE

Rohr Corp., a diversified manufacturer based in Chula Vista, Calif., close to the Mexican border, seems just the sort of company that would have to make some quick adjustments to the new U.S. trade program. When it landed a contract to make rapid transit cars it set up a plant south of the border to do its labor-intensive assembly work at Mexican wage scales—and now must pay a 10% import surcharge on all the work done there Yet the company has no intention of making any changes. For Rohr, the 10% penalty does not come close to offsetting the labor cost advantage. "We can hire a welder in Mexico for a week for what it would cost us per day up here," a spokesman says.

Rohr's reaction is shared to a surprising degree by other U.S. multinational companies that make goods abroad for consumption back home and thus stand to be blooded by their own government's protectionist sword. The auto industry, for example, can absorb the impact without pain. Demand for Detroit's imports—GM's Opel, Chrysler's Cricket and Colt, and Ford's Capri—is so great that executives are not lowering their sales targets, especially since cancellation of the auto excise tax offsets the duty surcharge.

THE GAP REMAINS

Many multinational companies find that the gap between domestic and foreign manufacturing costs is so wide that the surcharge does little more than dramatize it. Remington Rand Div. of Sperry Rand, for example, makes two-thirds of its manual typewriters in Italy and South America and recently shifted all its calculator manufacturing from the U.S. to Japan. Division president Edward L. Brown thinks the surcharge may help the domestic office-machine industry, but sees no chance that his company might change its production setup. At Bulova Watch Co., which makes most of its jeweled watches abroad, President Harry Henshel says the labor differential of 2 to 1 is "too big for the surcharge to make any difference."

Dozens of U.S. electronics companies have manufacturing affiliates in the Far East, where the cost advantage is "a hell of a lot more than the 10% surcharge," says chairman Moses Shapiro of General Instrument Corp. In any case, Shapiro adds, "we went to Taiwan mainly to compete against the Japanese, so our position really isn't affected."

REVEALING

Ironically, judging by complaints received by the Treasury Dept., the import surcharge worries many multinational manufacturers not because it is so big but because it may look so small on invoices they send to customers. The surcharge represents 10% of the "value added" by manufacture abroad, and a retailer may get a pretty clear idea of his suppliers' costs and markups. Manufacturers like to keep such matters secret, especially if their costs are embarrassingly low in relation to prices that are charged.

But most businessmen are postponing

judgments until they see how costs passed along are received in the market and how the monetary confusion settles down. President Henry E. Bowes of Bell & Howell Co. is less concerned with the surcharge than with the possibility that revaluation of the yen will boost the cost of making his company's Canon cameras in Japan.

"We're telling the Japanese that we'd be happy to renegotiate our contracts, but only in dollars," Bowes says. "The surcharge doesn't bother me much, but if the Japanese insist on yen contracts, to hell with it—we'll pull out."

Schwinn Bicycle Co., which imports "a significant portion" of parts from West Germany, Japan, and Britain, has been under pressure to renegotiate contracts in all three countries, says financial vice-president A. E. Selkurt. "The dollar's first wavering created a small panic among our suppliers," Selkurt says. "They wanted to renegotiate on the dollar values prevailing today—today, mind you. We have assured them we would recognize the eventual level of exchange in future contracts."

The combined effect of the surcharge and dollar erosion may boost Ampex Corp.'s costs of manufacturing computer core memories in Hong Kong and Taiwan by more than 20%, according to Eugene E. Prince, manager of the computer products division. Prince has no idea how much of this, if any, can be tacked onto prices, because the market is so competitive; he thinks some of it will have to come out of profits. Yet the cost advantage is still far too great to consider moving back home, he says.

The situation is different for the Singer Co., which makes its middle and low-priced sewing machine lines in Italy and Britain. Foreign labor costs run some 60% less per man hour below costs at the Elizabeth Port, N.J. plant whch makes Singer's top line, according to senior vice president Donald Robbins. But the U.S. plant has such superior productivity through high automation, says Robbins, that a permanent increase in import costs of as little as 10% might justify a pullback of some operations from abroad.

Hurting. Not all industries enjoy freedom of choice. This week Washington was being beseiged by businessmen seeking exemptions on grounds ranging from the national interest to special hardship. Hardwood importers, for example, argue that the 10% surcharge on plywood imports from Brazil and the Far East would further inflate housing costs and lead to wasteful depletion of U.S. forest reserves Deltec International, which cans and freezes pre-cooked meat in South America, is protesting that it must pay a surcharge while fresh and fresh-frozen meats are exempt. Since its products go into low-budget foods, it says the impact would fall on consumers least able to afford it.

Importers in a number of industries claim that they are threatened with bankruptcy because their contracts specify a "duty paid" price, so they cannot pass the surcharge along. Businessmen are also flooding government officials with pleas for clarification of the rules. Bell & Howell president Bowes was one of many top executives who trekked to Washington in the last few days. He returned shaking his head. "They have a lot of thinking to do down there," he said. "And they seem to be doing it by the day."

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS DUYULIA

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to announce my congratulations and also my sorrow concerning the retirement of a personal friend and a dedicated Federal employee. I am sure my fellow Members will join with me in honoring such a faithful public servant. Thomas DeYulia, who is the first career postmaster in the history of the Syracuse Post Office is retiring after 33 years of outstanding postal work. The retirement will become effective February 4, 1972.

Tom was appointed postmaster in February of 1971 not as the result of a political appointment but because of his outstanding service in his field. It is a very worthwhile feeling to know that one can advance to higher positions in such an important field as the Post Office Department. His appointment, one of 4,544 since last November was made possible by the postal reorganization and salary adjustment bill.

Thomas DeYulia began his 33-year career with the Post Office Department as a 65-cent-an-hour substitute carrier. He earned recognition throughout his career for his outstanding work. Hs is a model of a career employee.

It was Thomas DeYulia who initiated the postal clerk's Sunday voluntary overtime program in Syracuse which resulted in a 50-percent increase in productivity. This plan along with many other of his ideas was adapted by many of the neighboring postal areas. Mr. Speaker it is no surprise that last year Tom was praised by the U.S. Civil Service Commission for his outstanding and dynamic approach in the methods of post office management.

It is my honor to tell you that besides being a capable manager of his post office Thomas DeYulia has been a great public servant as well. Because of his deep interest in the well being of the people he services he has created many jobs for young people in Syracuse and he has initiated a postal station easily accessible to senior citizens. Tom DeYulia has also kept alive the interests of children by encouraging them to write to Santa Claus.

Thomas DeYulia is certainly an inspiration to all postal employees and, indeed, to all hard-working men and women. He has shown that through determination, hard work and an interest in others, it is possible to reach success and become a credit to his community. He has made a great contribution to the dignity and morale of the Post Office Department. I know I am among many when I wish my congratulations to Tom for his unparalleled service. It is through a man like him that the justification of such a program of merit is in order. I am sure you all agree that Thomas DeYulia is a national example of a career postal employee. Please join me in offering best wishes to Tom and his lovely wife Frances.

THE RANGEL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, CHARLES RANGEL, now in his second year of his first term in the Congress, has through his own initiative, intelligence, and persuasive ability, done what few Members of this House have ever done. He has caused a particular amendment dealing with the control of drugs to be affixed to four bills that have passed this House in the 92d Congress.

In September of 1971 it was his amendment which was added to the foreign aid bill which would have banned aid to Turkey if the Turkish Government refused to end the growing of heroin poppy in that country. As a result of his amendment, the Turkish Government has now banned future crops.

Yesterday in this House he offered his amendment to three separate bills, to wit, S. 748, the Inter-American Development Bank, S. 749, the Asian Development Bank, and S. 2010, the International Development Association, which bills authorized the lending of near $2 billion. His amendments, which were adopted, direct that our representatives on each of the three separate lending institutions cast negative votes against any proposed borrowing country where the President has made a determination that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs from being produced, processed, transported and sold illegally within the United States.

The Rangel amendment, now part of four important bills, is one of the best weapons that this country now has to deal with our narcotics plague. Is it not marvelous that a freshman Congressman is now known by everyone in the House of Representatives for his great work in this area and that there is an amendment known as the Rangel amendment which will undoubtedly be added to every bill where the United States provides monies to other countries, so as to make certain that those countries do their best not to contribute to our heroin plague.

FORTY-THREE MEMBERS URGE PRESIDENT NIXON TO RELEASE HOUSING AND HOUSING-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today 43 Members of the House sent a letter to the President urging that he unfreeze the near $700 million which his administration has frozen and which funds were appropriated by the Congress for various housing related programs.

The letter to the President with the names of the signatories is appended.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President, THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We should like to draw your attention to the adverse results occurring because of your Administration's freezing of funds appropriated for various housing and housing-related programs. We need not cite the shocking state of housing in so many urban, suburban, and rural areas of our country. And we find it most difficult to understand your rationale in having or-

dered the freeze. We urge that you reconsider that action.

Programs whose funds have been appropriated and yet frozen for fiscal year 1972 include the following: water and sewer grant programs—$500 out of $700 million is being withheld. $50 million is frozen for the rehabilitation loan program, and $130 million in contract authority for public housing.

Last week Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney stressed before the 28th Annual Convention of the National Association of Home Builders in Texas the continuing deterioration of inner-city housing. While the Secretary predicted that the industry would start construction of 2.1 to 2.3 million units this year (an estimate far larger than most would make at this moment) even if fulfilled this would be short of this year's quota if we are to meet the 10 year goal of 26 million units set by the 1968 Housing Authorization bill.

We applauded your statement in your State of the Union message to wit: "Our commitment to balanced growth also requires a commitment to our cities—to old cities threatened by decay, to suburbs now sprawling senselessly because of inadequate planning, and to new cities not yet born but clearly needed by our growing population." But we are distressed that your expression of commitment was not accompanied with the immediate release of those frozen funds already appropriated by Congress.

We urge that you issue an order directing that these funds be made immediately available for the housing and housing-related purposes for which they were intended.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
EDWARD I. KOCH,
Members of the Banking and Currency Committee, William Barrett (Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing), Frank Brasco, William Cotter, James Hanley, Parren Mitchell, William Moorhead.

Other Members of Congress: Bella Abzug, William Anderson, Herman Badillo, Nick Begich, Jonathan Bingham, James Burke, Shirley Chisholm, George Collins, James Corman, Ronald Dellums, Charles Diggs.

John Dow, Robert Drinan, O. C. Fisher, Donald Fraser, Cornelius Gallagher, Ella Grasso, Lee Hamilton, Michael Harrington, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Louise Day Hicks, Ralph Metcalfe.

John Moss, Claude Pepper, Otis Pike, Charles Rangel, Thomas Rees, Robert Roe, Benjamin Rosenthal, Dan Rostenkowski, William Roy, William Ryan, Paul Sarbanes, James Scheuer, Louis Stokes, Lester Wolff.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR SHORTER CAMPAIGNS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we have recently passed comprehensive campaign reform legislation which is an historic and essential step in improving our whole electoral process. The spending limitations of this package, particularly for television, will help insure that the airwaves are not completely saturated with political commercials, and that political office is open to citizens of any income bracket. The new reporting requirements will enhance the credibility of elective office.

At the same time, the bill omits one crucial area which is sorely in need of reform—the unbearable length to which we allow our campaigns to run. Long campaigns are expensive, exhausting for the candidates themselves, and simply boring for the electorate.

I have maintained for years that one simple but effective way to cut down on electoral abuses would be to impose a simple limit on campaign length to a proportion which other democratic nations follow. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 8606 to limit the length of presidential campaigns to 60 days. This bill would make illegal the nomination of candidates for President and Vice President more than 60 days prior to election.

Now that the Nation has embarked upon a presidential marathon, this proposal seems more necessary than ever. I am pleased that the Bridgeport Post has agreed with this position and I include here an excellent editorial from the January 24 issue of that newspaper on the campaign reform bill passed by the Congress and the 60-day campaign.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING

The 92nd Congress started its second session on a high note by passing the campaign spending reform bill designed to protect free elections as a cornerstone of our society.

In one sense, our elections were getting to be anything but free.

Campaign expenditures escalated at a rate which threatened to bar from high public office all who did not belong to one of two categories: those personally wealthy and those willing to place themselves in debt to special interest groups.

TV and radio advertising swallowed an ever increasing slice of the campaign budget pie. In the 1968 general election, the two major parties spent about $38 million for media time. This figure represented an increase of almost two-thirds over 1964.

The bill insures that these inflated figures will be a thing of the past. It limits a presidential candidate's broadcasting budget to $8.4 million, no niggardly figure to be sure, but one calculated to end the saturation of TV and radio by political spots.

All federal office seekers must now abide by an all-media spending ceiling of 10 cents per potential voter with no more than six cents going for broadcasting ads.

The new law limits what a candidate may contribute to his own campaign—$50,000 for the presidency, for example. It also requires regular reporting of contributions of $1,000 or more.

This legislation is welcome, and, in fact, overdue. The growing cynicism about our elective process was reflected in the success of the book, "The Selling of the President."

There was a dreadful plausability to the words of Massachusetts Representative Torbert H. Macdonald: "The cost of broadcast time is the chief reason why the availability of money to a candidate has replaced personal ability as the major criterion in the selection of that candidate."

We admit to some regret that the new bill did not abandon the equal time provision and make debate between major candidates possible, but this is mainly for show business reasons. When a President is involved, moreover, the confrontations are bound to be disappointing because appeals to executive privilege and classified information will inevitably be made to evade sticky questions.

The debates of 1960, in retrospect, were a contest of who could shoot from the hip faster. A candidate's five o'clock shadow proved to be more decisive than his stand on an issue. And what questions of substance were really discussed? Remember those interminable answers on Quemoy, Matsu, and the Pescadores?

While we applaud the new legislation, it marks only a first step in bringing campaigns within reason. Next we would like to see serious consideration given to a proposal of Representative John S. Monagan. The Congressman from Connecticut's 5th District wants to make the nomination of presidential candidates more than 60 days before the election illegal. This would make campaigns shorter and even less expensive.

NEW FEED GRAIN OPTION

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this morning's announcement by Secretary Butz of a new diversion option for feed grain farmers giving them larger payments is clearly indicative of the administration's increased efforts to make the feed grain program work in such a way as to afford participants maximum freedom and greater income protection. This new 80-cent payment for additional 10-percent set aside is designed to help make the necessary preplanting adjustments that will greatly improve the market outlook this year. Importantly, this prompt and decisive action should have a significant impact in helping to bolster farm income.

I am sure all of us welcome this announcement. The Secretary should be commended on this flexibility in responding to producer needs and making the program more effective for farmers.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's pioneers of progress and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation.

Benjamin Franklin invented the bifocal lens in 1780.

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation today with cosponsors which I feel may if enacted, provide the means to induce States to establish drug treatment programs for addicts who reside in the various States and, at the same time, insure that present Federal funding and, hopefully, increased levels in such funding for treatment programs will be spent on more effective programs.

The treatment of narcotic addicts, who either volunteer or are committed for treatment, is primarily a State and local responsibility. Only the State, through local law enforcement and health agencies, have the ability to assess what the narcotic treatment needs of the State are. Moreover, the most successful treatment

and rehabilitation programs have been community-based treatment programs. Addicts who have been removed from the communities in which they reside for treatment, have extreme difficulty in adjusting when returned to the community. A great many addicts can be successfully rehabilitated in carefully controlled out-patient programs in the community.

Few States, however, are administratively and financially geared up to effectively treat the narcotic addict population of the State. My own State of Florida, for instance, lacks a coordinated, State regulated and funded treatment program. Funding for those treatment programs which do exist comes entirely from local and/or Federal funds. Many States—at least 15—have no drug program whatsoever.

The means exist to induce the States to organize themselves and appropriate the necessary funds to treat their narcotic addict population, but neither the Congress nor the Federal granting agencies have seized upon it. Since several agencies, primarily LEAA within the Justice Department and NIMH within HEW, presently make grants to treatment programs, conditions or criteria can and should be established which States must adhere to before grants are made to that State.

Presently, however, grants are made by LEAA and NIMH directly to grantees within a State, irrespective of how that treatment program relates to an overall State's needs. Moreover, there is little, if any, coordination between LEAA and NIMH in making such grants. Mr. Dean Crowther, Associate Director of the Civil Division of GAO, which recently made a study of Federal treatment programs concluded that:

> While there is a reasonable amount of money being sent to communities by both the Department of Justice under LEAA and HEW under NIMH, there is not nearly as close a link-up as we would like to see.

In addition, LEAA lacks the competence to make such grants; LEAA is primarily a granting authority for State law enforcement activities.

The legislation I am introducing today will remedy this situation by: First, transferring the authority for making narcotic treatment grants to NIMH, thereby centralizing the bulk of grant authority in an agency competent to administer such programs; and second, inducing the various States to create narcotic treatment programs by making grants to State agencies established for such purposes for distribution to public and private programs which are components of community-based multimodality treatment programs.

Section 6 of the bill amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to delete the authority for LEAA to make grants for narcotic treatment and provides that any sum authorized to be appropriated to make such grants are "authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of section 251 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act in addition to any other sums to be appropriated for such section."

Section 5 of the bill amends the Community Mental Health Centers Act to allow States to make application for Federal funding for treatment and rehabilitation programs based upon their assessment of such needs in the State which cannot be met out of private or local and State funding, instead of private or public treatment programs making application directly to NIMH for funding of their individual program. The funds distributed to the State pursuant to such application would then be distributed by the State agency to the various private and public community treatment programs.

No application for a grant can be approved unless such application is made by a State agency—

> (1) which is established, with the assistance of the Secretary, for the purpose of receiving, administering, and distributing such grants to community-based multimodality treatment programs; (2) which has submitted to the Secretary a comprehensive plan, prepared with the assistance of the Secretary, for the development of community-based multi-modality treatment programs based upon a detailed survey by such State agency of the narcotic addict treatment needs of the State; and (3) which has established, with the assistance of the Secretary, such standards as are necessary to provide criteria for the continuation of narcotic addict treatment programs in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, and for the establishment of community-based multi-modality treatment programs; (4) which agrees that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan and submit to the Secretary an analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the prevention and treatment programs and activities carried out under the plan, and any modifications in the plan which it considers necessary; and (5) which agrees to fund only those community-based multi-modality treatment programs which agree to treat addicts who have been committed for treatment either under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 or under a state civil commitment program.

The term "community-based, multimodality treatment program" is defined as—

> . . . a program for the treatment of narcotics addicts, and other persons with drug abuse and drug dependence problems, established by a State, or a political subdivision thereof, for the purpose of providing comprehensive treatment, including maintenance, detoxification, social and vocational rehabilitation, and other forms of treatment suited to the individual needs of the person treated such comprehensive treatment. Any such nonprofit private treatment agencies and organizations as subsidiary components of such program as may be necessary to provide such comprehensive treatment. "Any such program shall be organized in conformity with the State plan and standards referred to earlier.

By requiring the States as a precondition to receiving treatment grants directly to establish a State narcotic treatment agency that would scientifically ascertain what the treatment needs of the State are, develop a comprehensive plan for the development of treatment programs, and establish standards with the assistance of NIMH for such programs, we are inducing the States to recognize the role they must play in treating narcotic addicts and, at the same time, insuring that both local, State, and Federal funds for narcotic treatment are spent in an orderly, effective manner.

Such funds would be expended on "community-based, multimodality programs" because such programs offer the best chance of success and by integrating various modalities of treatment, both public and private, into a comprehensive community program the needs of the individual addict can be more effectively and economically met. Effective treatment requires a multidimensional approach in which specific services for the addict are integrated with other related health and human services and such services must be provided in a millieu in which the addict and those close to him live and to which he must return after the initial phase of treatment.

The requirement that the State fund only those programs which agree to accept addicts committed to them by State, local, and Federal courts as well as those who voluntarily seek treatment is an outgrowth of the GAO report referred to earlier.

Oftentimes, under both the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 and under State civil commitment laws such as those in New York and California, addicts cannot be committed for treatment because programs at the community level will not accept such addicts. GAO reviewed 22 NIMH grants awarded through April 30, 1970, and none of the grants included a requirement to treat those addicts referred from State and local courts. A few were required to assist the Federal civil commitment program.

States will also be required to offer treatment in lieu of prosecution for an addict charged with both a State and Federal offense who is not prosecuted at the Federal level but would otherwise be eligible for treatment in lieu of prosecution under title I of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. Title I was intended to apply to addicts who committed such Federal crimes as mail theft, check forgery, auto theft, and other nonviolent crimes. Many of these crimes are also violations of State statutes, only under the provisions of NARA when U.S. district courts can invoke title I. Thus, when in many of these cases, addicts are referred to State or local authorities for prosecution, opportunities for pretrial civil commitment in lieu of prosecution are lost if the State does not have a civil commitment program.

GROUNDHOG DAY: A NOBLE AMERICAN TRADITION

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today is Groundhog Day. This morning, just after the break of dawn at Gobbler's Knob near Punxsutawney, Pa., the celebrated weather forecaster will emerge from his underground home to determine what the elements have in store for us in the coming 6 weeks. If he sees his shadow, beware—there is cold, wintry weather ahead. If he sees no shadow—then we can be sure that spring is just around the corner.

Now I know that to many people all over the world, February 2 will be just another Tuesday. But in the United States and particularly in Punxsutawney, Pa., this date has come to have a special meaning.

Some of our distinguished colleagues may need reminding of the ritual that surrounds the 2d of February, Groundhog Day. It is a tradition that has its roots in European folklore. The date, which is also the feast of Candlemas, has been associated with weather prediction since the Middle Ages. Medieval people believed that the day was chosen by hibernating animals to come to the surface to observe the weather. If the German badger came to the outside and was frightened by his shadow on a sunny day, the animal returned to its burrow for more hibernation. This eventually came to mean that 6 more weeks of cold weather was in store. But a cloudy day minus the shadow meant that spring and pleasant weather were on the way and such a sign was to be welcomed by the farmer who saw it as a good omen for the entire year.

The badger gave way to the groundhog as the belief was brought to America by early German settlers. Since that time, Punxsutawney, Pa. has come to be known as the "groundhog capital of the world."

The celebration of Groundhog Day is an important festival throughout our country and many societies and organizations are dedicated to the preservation of this longstanding tradition. The oldest society was founded in 1880 in Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, Pa., an area which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

America anxiously awaits the news from Punxsutawney. Until I can give you the official word, I take this opportunity to wish for all of us a cloudy Groundhog Day, an early spring, and a bountiful year.

U.S. TRADE POLICY IN CRISIS

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the past year we have all become aware of the very serious condition of our international trade balance. In 1971, we incurred the biggest trade deficit in our history—over $2 billion, and the first calendar year deficit since 1888.

The deficit in terms of competitive goods was actually $2.5 billion larger because our export statistics include our foreign aid and food-for-peace shipments. Also, we value our imports on their foreign value at point of shipment rather than on what they cost us landed in our ports of entry. As estimated by the U.S. Tariff Commission, this amounts to an undervaluation of at least 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is very serious and it is doubtful that the realinement of international currencies will bridge the gap between the foreign cost and our own costs and that imports will continue to unfairly plague many important American industries.

In view of the extreme importance of our weak international competitive position, I wish to offer for the RECORD a paper that goes into the historical background of how our difficulties developed. It was prepared by Mr. O. R. Strackbein who has labored in this field for many years.

Mr. Strackbein's analysis goes beyond the superficial explanations that are current, and I urge all Members to read and contemplate on the lessons to be gained from the paper.

The paper follows:

U.S. TRADE POLICY IN CRISIS

(By O. R. Strackbein, President, The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

The basis of our trade with other countries has undergone so radical a change that a drastic change in our thirty-seven year old trade policy is no longer escapable. Indeed a few steps in recognition of this new reality have been taken; but there is little evidence that the depth and scope of the changed conditions that have overtaken us is fully grasped.

Temporary and piecemeal measures are taken in what must be a vain hope that they will suffice. The fact is, however, that we face a competitive defeat that will not yield to temporary and superficial contrivances. We must peer much deeper.

An indescribable variety of products passes outward and inward in our foreign trade. Because of the variety of origins of products that enter into this country from abroad the competitive levels at which they strike their counterparts in this country vary greatly. For that reason the simple tariff system of the past, especially since the rate of duty must be the same toward all countries for the same products (the Communist countries generally excepted), is no longer by itself a suitable instrument of trade regulation.

However, while this observation vitally affects the instruments of control that may be used over imports, it does not uncover the transformed world conditions, including those in this conutry, that make a drastic revision of our trade policy no longer a matter of choice. Unless this fact is recognized and the reason for it, we will flounder in essentially futile but internationally highly irritating and resented efforts to solve our problem.

If we and others would understand what we face today we must go back to the time when our economy began to diverge from that of Europe and the remainder of the world. It needed several generations, two world wars, a deep depression, with the tight economic regulations it brought in its train, to mature the great divergence that separated our economy from its counterparts elsewhere.

First we should go to the roots of the tree we planted before the turn of the century in our fertile soil and upon the lower stem of which we grafted new stock that had not before been seen in the world. Much earlier yet we had wisely provided for free trade among our States.

Among the first roots that we put in the subsoil before 1900 was antimonopoly. It was marked by the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (1890). The importance of this root can hardly be exaggerated. That it was planted meant that economists, political scientists and others, were aware that the nascent mass-production system and the sprouting technology that made that system possible would die aborning unless the reduced costs that were the justification for mass production were passed on to the consumers in the form of lower retail prices. Monopoly, as surely as trade barriers among the States, would have greatly impeded such a result. Therefore we elected to prevent or break up monopolistic practices where they might appear.

The Knights of Labor the newly-born American Federation of Labor and the Populist movement were of the vintage of this era.

The Sherman Act was followed by Theodore Roosevelt's "Square Deal" and then under Woodrow Wilson by the Clayton, the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Reserves Acts. Yet later came the Robinson-Patman Act by way of reenforcement. These actions reflected our faith in fair competition. They were native to this country.

As mass production became an engineering and technological reality, albeit still in its earlier stages, the connection between wages and the purchasing power of the people also began to be perceived. This perception might, indeed, be regarded as the veritable taproot of the new system. Hitherto wages had been looked upon with a jaundiced eye—indeed, as an evil to be kept at levels as low as possible. Unionization of labor was interpreted legally as a conspiracy, and labor organization was very unpopular. We had the British economists (notably David Ricardo, Mill, and others) to thank for this persistent attitude. It was not easily replaced.

Henry Ford of the promising new automobile industry is usually recognized as the promoter of the vision of a mass market nourished by higher wages as the necessary counterpart of mass production. He introduced the $5 per day wage as evidence of his faith. He not only saw that greater volume of output would reduce unit cost but that vastly increasing production would bring drastic savings. He also saw that this greater volume would only be a mockery if it were not met at the far end by a money-backed army of potential customers. He would simply be swamped with an indigestible inventory.

What Mr. Ford must also have perceived, even though he was not an academic economist, was the function of an elastic demand. Elasticity of demand means simply that desirable goods will be bought in greater volume as the price is lowered. This elastic response is not present in the necessities for which the demand is usually inelastic because it is limited by the size of the population. Only so much food can be consumed, for example, so much milk drunk or water swallowed. Lowering of the price does not open a greater market than the head-count provides.

The principle of elasticity of demand, but particularly its recognition, was therefore another one of the great roots that would nurture our system. It ranked with antimonopoly and free trade among the States as assurance of a massive national market.

Our blossoming technology assured growing productivity in our industry. Higher wages, made possible by higher productivity, supplied the mass purchasing power that awaited the rising stream of goods that was coming off our production lines.

If Ford had gained a monopoly he would have had a choice: he could have produced a few thousand cars and sold them at a high price. He could have charged what the traffic would have borne, as monopolists are in a position to do. He might have made a handsome profit per car and he need not have taken on the very burdensome worries, corrosive uncertainties and anxieties that go hand-in-hand with developing a vast and complex enterprise. He could, on the other hand, have done what he did in fact do.

His was a great risk, but the vision of the jackpot at the far end—the mass market, running into millions rather than thousands of cars, drew him on. Had he in fact gained a monopoly it is doubtful that he would have rested on his oars. Had he sold ten thousand cars at a profit of $1000 per car, he would have realized a gross return of ten million dollars. Had he the

option of selling a million cars at a profit of only a hundred dollars per car he would have realized a hundred million dollars, or ten times as much. Which option would he have chosen? In the presence of competition in place of monopoly, the lower-price option would have been the only one open even if it were not necessarily intelligently exploited. In any event Mr. Ford took the long view and without being prodded by imports but impelled by a vision, succeeded at mass production to an astounding degree as a pioneer.

With the success of the automobile the Ford principle became well established and it was extended to a great variety of other products. Any new product or an existing one radically improved that lightened monotonous or time-consuming toil in the household or elsewhere or that catered to comfort, to artistic appreciation or to social prestige, was a candidate for the process that became familiar. The first units made ready for production might be well beyond the reach of the mass market: e.g., the radio and then television. As market tests gave good evidence of wide consumer acceptance venture capital was attracted. Import competition was not a consideration since it was nonexistent. Our patent system in any case provided assurance of a reward if the product was publicly accepted. In time market realities told the remainder of the story.

It is an unwritten history what an endless variety of consumer goods are conceived in inventors' or innovaters' minds only to be lost like the profusion of seeds in nature to devouring adversity. What we see around us in astounding abundance in the form of endless consumer goods is but a selection of the relatively few surviving specimens. Even these will be replaced in time. The failure of inventions in presumably a common experience since some 70 thousand patents per year are issued in this country. Among so many seeds only a small percentage need to germinate, grow and prosper in order to assure abundance. Like the mineral prospector, the inventor is not discouraged if he has the promise of a jackpot.

The great growth of our economy was indeed underwritten by the generation of new products of all kinds of the nonessential variety. Human desires for material abundance are stimulated rather than sated by gratification and expand indefinitely. The mass market may therefore be regarded as virtually limitless if distribution of income is spread throughout the population in keeping with rising productivity—unless, of course, other factors interfere. Some are encroaching imperiously even now.

The American productive system was destined to outstrip all others by far. It gave rise to advertising as a necessary tool to the distaste of many. Per capita consumption of goods in the United States reached multiple proportions compared with other countries in nonessential goods. We produced more of some goods than the rest of the world combined.

We depended on new goods born of new inventions or innovations to employ the oncoming millions of new workers. Even if a new product replaced an existing one, as did the automobile, or electric light, the ensuing mass production, opened a mass market. More jobs were created than had been replaced. In 1970 over 800,000 workers were employed by the automotive industry, and another 316,000 in garages and auto repairs (1967). Many more were employed by the iron and coal mines, by railroads and truck lines beyond the 800,000.

Wholly new products, such as motion pictures, radio and television, were also invented and developed. Jobs that were previously nonexistent soon beckoned and were filled. In 1970 motion picture manufacturing employed 191,000; exhibiting theatres, another 176,000; and radio and television manufacturing yet another 485,000—all virtually net additions to the workforce.

Improvements in established production methods produced similar effects. High speed printing presses, for example, lowered printing costs and led to mass circulation of newspapers and periodicals. The 1970 employment in these media was 448,000.

An endless search for new products and innovations went on. Industrial research and development in 1969 employed 383,200 scientists and engineers.

Advertising as a means of building a national market for new products, employed 109,000 in 1967.

And so it went. The extension of mass production in all possible directions increased employment opportunities. Patent rights provided the necessary period of time needed to reach the popular pocketbook. Then domestic competition prevented stagnation. However, import competition was hardly a factor. It had no part in developing our mass market for automobiles, radios, bath tubs, refrigerators, washers, or any of a long line of other consumer goods. There were few foreign counterparts and in any case there was no foreign mass-production and therefore no threat. The great motivation in this country was the reward of a mass market, not important competition.

After World War II the other non communist countries sought our system for themselves; and we responded generously by extending voluminous financial assistance and productivity guidance.

As a result their productivity soon rivaled us in some instances. However, they did not as readily "buy" our high-wage levels. While wages did rise sharply in other countries in recent years, in 1970 Japanese labor costs (including fringe benefits) were still only a quarter of ours, the British only 37%, the French 39% and the German 54%.

Since their mass purchasing power did not keep pace with their higher productivity and output those countries needed foreign markets for their burgeoning goods. We had lowered our tariffs some 80% since 1934 and therefore stood as a relatively open invitation to other countries for disposal of surplus products in our market.

In response to the outbreak of this new style of competition our firms began a massive trek overseas which in a dozen years resulted in an investment of some $75 billion in foreign enterprise. If we could not compete from our home ground we could serve the foreign markets from within them. We could go to where the low wages are. Also we could even turn around and sell in our home market itself from abroad and to third markets rather than exporting to them from the home base.

Beyond that many of our firms licensed foreign producers to use our patents.

As a result we enjoyed a great boom in machinery exports. This boom went so far that in the first seven months of this year (1971) no less than 45% of our total exports consisted of "machinery and transport equipment" as classified by the U.S. Department of Commerce. These exports were more than twice as high as our total agricultural exports and 2½ times as high as our exports of all other manufactured goods. From 1950 to 1960 we exported $48 billion in machinery alone (exclusive of transport equipment). From 1961 through 1970 we exported another $75.5 billion in machinery other than transport equipment. What might have we expected?

This massive transfer of our technological matrix abroad in so short a time soon confronted our system with its own counterpart under circumstances that could easily be disastrous. Had the foreign mass-production technology grown up over the years with our own system as it did within our States, the wide competitive gap that now threatens its very life would not have developed. Free trade would have been feasible. That is, however, not the history of the foreign development. We advanced far ahead of the rest of the world (Canada aside) and then overnight, so to speak, without time for adjustment, we were confronted with a shocking reality.

We made matters worse by dismantling our tariff during the period when we still enjoyed a long lead in productivity. We persisted in the "Kennedy Round" even after the handwriting was already appearing on the wall in raised letters. Our unwariness and self-deception was phenomenal. Even today there are many who cannot yet read the unmistakable script.

Unless basic corrective measures are taken, beyond temporary tinkering, we will experience the irony of being undone by our very progeny. The gift that we delivered to the world will breach our whole economy—not wilfully, to be sure, but nonetheless certainly because we have no natural defense against it, unless we take preventive measures suited to the deep-seated crisis.

The very gambit by which we rose to productive heights in this country, namely by developing new products or replacing less productive machinery with ever more productive replacements, thus reducing costs and creating a mass market, is now converted into a boomerang. If we seek to pursue the old course we displace workers, as we did so successfully in the coal mines, or if we launch new products with promising credentials, the old magic now fails. The waiting mass market for manufactured goods is no longer there for us. It will be captured by our foreign competitors who today soon become possessed of our patents through license or joint venture with our own capital and in a race can beat us to the jackpot. The new employment to which we looked so confidently in the past takes place surely enough, but abroad rather than at home. We are then left with the burden of displaced workers without the accustomed dividend of expanded factories working feverishly to supply the expanding mass market. Other countries reap the benefit; we shoulder the unemployment and welfare burden.

Are we in a position to stimulate foreign wages? Can we hold our wages at their present levels while foreign wages catch up? Neither avenue offers any early hope of closing the gap.

Or do we suffer from relative inefficiency even though we still out-produce the world in man-hour output?

Foreign productivity during the past two decades has indeed risen much more rapidly than our own. Have we reached our zenith? Economists pelt us with productivity percentages that show us lagging badly behind Japan, West Germany, Italy and other countries.

In a speech delivered by Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, he noted our lag in productivity. He said "American productivity is rising far slower than our major competitors' in the world—1.7% per year against 4.5 in Western Europe and 10.6 in Japan. Over the past five years productivity in American industry had the smallest increase of any industrial nation in the free world.

Yet, it stands to reason that so long as those countries are still playing a catch-up game and having not yet modernized all production, their rising productivity possibly reflects the effects of developing high productivity during the past decade from a base much lower than ours. Once they reach our levels across the board, their upward lead may be expected to subside compared with the period of catch-up activity.

The increase in output per man-hour for all manufacturing employees from 1960–70 was 190% in Japan; 74% in West Germany and 181% in Italy. In the United States the corresponding increase was 34%. Employment in manufacturing in Japan during the

same decade increased 57.3%; in this country, 15.4%.

The more rapid rise in foreign productivity should not of itself be read as a reflection on our efficiency. With our technology within easy reach these countries could accomplish in a decade or two a development at which we worked since the early years of this century. We handed the technology over to them with our compliments along with seed money. Are we now to be penalized for our liberality?

The race is over unit costs of production. Unit cost is a function of material cost including the incorporated labor cost), the in-plant wage level and output per man-hour or other time interval. If output is high, wages may also be relatively high without suffering a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis low wages accompanied by low productivity. However, when the low wages are combined with high productivity the high-wage becomes a competitive handicap. Employee compensation computed from the raw material stage through all the steps of processing and manufacture, including wages paid in operations that supply fuel, industrial chemicals, storage space, buildings, machinery, insurance, finance, transportation, etc, is in the magnitude of 80% of final production costs, in the absence of monopoly. It is for this reason that relative wage levels and salaries are of the utmost importance, in conjunction with productivity, in determining relative competitive capacity.

In this respect American producers stand on a high plateau compared with their foreign competitors. For this reason it is not a mark of keen perception to equate import competition with domestic competition. Although we had internal free trade we recognized the destructive effects of wage disparities, and we instituted minimum wages and obligatory collective bargaining in this country to protect the "fair" employer against competitive defeat from the "unfair" employer or sweatshop operators; but, of course, we could not extend such protection seaward. The tariff, which has now been all but dismantled, once served such a purpose to a degree.

We are wedded through the Employment Act of 1946 to full employment as a national policy. When we insist on greater efficiency in our industries we insist in fact on displacement of workers because no great gain in efficiency can be achieved without rather drastic worker displacement. This conclusion follows from the 80% share of employee compensation in production costs. In the past, as we have seen, worker displacement was indeed the royal road to industrial growth in this country, in so far as such displacement led to lower prices, and lower prices on products that enjoyed an elastic demand meant higher sales, assuming always that wages moved upward with higher productivity. This balance was very important.

Now, to repeat by way of emphasis, we no longer have that road open to us; and it is this fact that constitutes our import crisis.

There are those who would measure the impact of imports on our economy by the number of workers displaced industry by industry in this country by imports. By and of its itself this is not a proper measure. In the first place, what is called an "industry" in this country is often little more than the tip of the iceberg. The "steel industry", for example, consists only of the steel mills, while in fact distinctly less than half of the labor actually employed from the ore mines through the finished product is concentrated in the steel mills. Therefore if 100,000 workers are displaced by imports in the steel mills themselves, over 200,000 are displaced altogether. In the "automobile industry" even a lower proportion of those employed in producing all that goes into a finished car is concentrated on the assembly lines. Yet the latter operation is called the "industry" even though it is only about a fifth of it.

In the second place, the number of workers displaced directly by imports might be balanced by those engaged in producing for export.

Direct worker-displacement, however, is not the heart of our problem today. The workers who are not hired because of the competitive realities described above, which is to say, conditions under which we no longer can look to new product development or radical innovations to generate new job openings—there's the rub. Foreign producers can and do now beat us to our own mass market. Electronics provide an example. Capital will not venture into new products today as it did formerly because our market is no longer our own.

If we compare the trend in employment in those of our industries that are beset by imports with the trend in manufacturing employment as a whole, we may appreciate the lag.

Employment in four "industries" that were stricken by heavy imports in recent years lagged by 427,000 from 1960–70 in comparison with manufacturing employment as a whole, which grew 15.4% in that period, including employment in the four industries in question. These were textile and apparel, steel, leather footwear and stone, clay and glass. The total lag was, of course, nearer 1,000,000 workers, if we take into account the employment in the earlier stages of these "industries," such as iron ore and coal mines, cotton growing, tanneries, quarries, sand pits, etc. The workers who were not hired became a burden on the economy as a whole.

The slack fortunately was reduced in severity by rising employment in other industries. The most lively of these was, of course, machinery manufacture, which as we have already noted, was greatly stimulated by our heavy investment in foreign branches.

Machinery installation abroad was unfortunately destined to shrink our exports of a wide variety of other goods. The exports of these many industries other than machinery as we saw were less than half as high in 1971 (Jan.–Aug.) as were our exports of machinery and transportation equipment alone. In fact we suffered a deficit of some $7 billion in our exports of manufactured goods other than machinery and transport equipment in 1970.

While our total manufacturing employment, including machinery and transport equipment grew by 15.4% during the 1960–70 decade employment in machinery manufacturing, including electrical, grew 31.6% or twice as rapidly as the combined total. The gain in employment in this sector was 931,000 during the decade. We may extrapolate this increase backward through the successive stages of manufacture and attribute some 2 million additional jobs to machinery manufacturing.

Two observations are in order. One, to repeat, is that our heavy machinery exports contributed to the foreign productivity gain that in turn shrank our foreign market for other goods and at the same time rendered our industries in general more vulnerable to imports, including machinery itself. The other is that our lead in machinery exports has narrowed greatly since 1960. At that time our exports of machinery were 4.7 times as high in value as our imports. By 1965 this ratio had shrunk to 2.4, and in 1970 the ratio of exports over imports had narrowed to 1.6. In a few years the surplus may disappear and we will be left with the gaping deficit in the export of all the other manufactured products that is now concealed.

In other words, we are steadily losing our lead in the field of sophisticated and "high technology" goods. When this lead disappears our trade deficit will rise to unprecedented proportions. Even as it is, our true trade deficit, as distinguished from the balance of payments deficit, is some $5 billion higher than the official statistics issued by the Department of Commerce make it appear.

This divergence comes from the practice of including foreign aid, food for peace and similar shipments as exports whereas they do not move because we are competitive but because of the governmental assistance.

Also the Department of Commerce tabulates our imports on their foreign value, point of shipment. This practice leaves out freight, insurance and other charges incident to moving such goods to this country. The discrepancy has been estimated by the Tariff Commission at approximately 10%. On an import volume of $45 billion, the undervaluation would be $4.5 billion.

Added to this undervaluation is the overvaluation of our exports, as noted above. This is in the range of $2.5 to $3 billion. The total discrepancy is therefore in the magnitude of $7 billion.

The principal conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis is that United States trade is in a critical position. It came into such straits because the facts have been concealed by years of false officials reporting and by the failure of the press to disseminate to the public the true state of affairs to which it was privy. Our present international competitive defeat represents the accumulation of trends that have long been visible. The highly emotional attachment of this country to the philosophy of free trade, inculcated in our universities and by the press, so thoroughly blinded us to available facts that nothing short of the boiling-over that has now occurred, could penetrate the hypnosis. Even now the wailing of theorists over their broken idol fills the air.

REMEDY

The sensible remedy lies in the restoration of the conditions under which our productive system was nurtured to its high peak. This proposal does not contemplate deprivation of other countries nor a reversal of their lusty advance in productivity. We need only to preserve our market for the development of new industries and innovations of existing or established products to the point of bringing them to the mass market and then expanding the market through lower costs. Thus will we find new sources of employment not cut off by goods produced abroad which transfer our potential employment abroad. As it is we have all but lost the benefits in terms of employment that patents previously bestowed on our entrepreneurs.

As our economy depends on production of nonessential rather than essential goods it cannot rely on a stationary market. For good or evil we are geared to an expanding market. Like a little kitten that has learned to climb a tree or a post our economy is no more able than the kitten to effect a descent without a crash landing. Yet imports, which we did not need as a stimulant or motivation in building our system, are now poised offshore ready to deny us the fruits of invention, leaving us to sit on a relatively stagnant economy.

Our abject dependence on the production of nonessentials may best be appreciated when we compare our per capita gross national product with that of other countries. Our per capita income in 1968 was $4,379. In India the share was $80, in Indonesia, $96, Brazil, $329, Argentina, $672, in the United Kingdom, $1,861, etc.

In other words, we could live without 95% of our income! It is being done in the world. If we permit unlimited exposure of our system to competition from lower-cost countries, we will find our level far below our present height. There are those who believe that we can descend to lower price levels without rising productivity and still maintain our system. They look to rising imports to point the way. Yet, the impossibility of executing such a descent must be visible from the suffering, discon-

tent, and rebelliousness caused by a mere depression such as the one of 1930–33 in this country.

Permanent economic stagnation, even on a high level, would require a complete reversal of public attitude toward material abundance, comfort, and the yeasty dedication to personal advancement. There are those who visualize just such a regimen but they have not been tested in this country by anything more oppressive than the late Great Depression, and many of them by anything less oppressive than a per capita income of $4,379 per year.

The simplest and most effective remedy lies in limiting both the speed and the extent of market penetration by particular imports while permitting them to grow yearly in proportion to the growth of our domestic consumption of the same products. Our economy could then resume its job generation as it did before imports could rob us of the fruits of our inventive and entrepreneurial genius.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR BASIC HOUSING PROGRAMS

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing with 26 cosponsors legislation to provide supplemental funding for five important housing programs for fiscal year 1972. I introduced the original bill, H.R. 12425, on January 18. The five programs are urban renewal, model cities, rent supplements, section 235 home-ownership assistance program, and section 236 rental assistance program.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring the appropriation levels or the authorizations available for contracting up to their fully authorized levels.

For urban renewal this legislation provides an additional $1,337,500,000 to bring the appropriation up to its fully authorized level. For model cities, the bill provides $887,500,000; for rent supplements, $98,000,000; for section 235, an additional $55,000,000; and for section 236, an additional $25,000,000.

These programs are essential to providing a decent home for every American. While the Congress passes well-thought-out legislation and talks of its commitment to decent housing for every American, in fact the Congress has failed to provide sufficient funds for these programs. It is clear that without substantial Federal funds adequate housing within the financial reach of low- and moderate-income families will not be built.

The circumstances of the section 236 program illustrates the need for Federal funding. The section 236 program was enacted as part of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act. It provides assistance to moderate-income families for rental or cooperative housing. This assistance is in the form of periodic payments to the mortgagee on behalf of the mortgagor. These payments may be used to reduce interest costs on a project down to that which would have to be paid if the mortgage bore an interest rate of as little as 1 percent. The tenant must pay at least 25 percent of his income per month for rent.

This program is critical to meeting the housing needs of New York City and New York State. State and city Mitchell-Lama programs rely heavily upon this assistance. New York City alone needs over $40 million of section 236 funds for fiscal year 1972. However, thus far in 1972, the New York City area has received $13,954,762.

Even if the full $25 million to be appropriated under the legislation for section 236 were provided, New York City and virtually all other urban areas would still need far more than the amounts they will receive. Thus we must also attempt to increase substantially the authorization level for this program. This same analysis applies to the other housing programs covered by my supplemental funding legislation.

There is no more fundamental responsibility that a government has than to provide adequate housing for all of its people. So far we have not done this. Providing this supplemental funding is a step toward this goal.

The following Members have joined me in cosponsoring this full funding housing supplemental appropriation bill:

Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SCHEUER. and Mr. STOKES.

LEGISLATION TO REFORM SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCE SYSTEM

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

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1971, I introduced a bill to reform the social security finance system and provide substantial benefit increases. The bill provides for—

A 20-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits;

An increase to $100 in the minimum benefit;

Expansion of the taxable wage base to $15,000; and

Assumption of one-third of the total costs of maintaining social security by the Federal Government.

I am reintroducing that bill today on behalf of myself and 20 cosponsors.

When I first introduced this bill 2 months ago, I spoke of the desperate situation facing our senior citizens one-fourth of whom live in poverty. There is no need for me to repeat the litany of ills—economic and physical—which confront America's elderly in 1972. We are all too familiar with them. It is generally recognized, I believe, that social security benefits are inadequate and that the level of benefits must be raised substantially if the program is really to meet its goal of providing financial security for retired persons. Our bill would do this.

But, as most Members also recognize, under the present finance structure a benefits increase is inevitably accompanied by a payroll tax increase. The payroll tax is regressive. It is a tax which falls most heavily on lower- and middle-income workers, and it is a burden that is fast becoming intolerable. In 1972, millions of wage earners will find anticipated gains from reduced income taxes all but eliminated by increases in their payroll taxes. If present trends continue—if the payroll tax increases contemplated under H.R. 1 take effect—future years will find many Americans paying more in social security payroll taxes than they do in income taxes.

Clearly, the present social security finance structure makes it difficult, if not impossible, to increase benefit payments enough to insure a decent standard of living for all senior citizens. We cannot continue to rely on the payroll tax as the sole source of revenues for social security. The finance mechanism must be reformed. Our bill would reform it.

There is another, pressing argument for reform of the system's financial machinery. There is an ominous trend developing in our entire tax structure, away from the principles of progressive taxation—away from the concept that individuals should be taxed according to their respective abilities to pay. State sales and property taxes are increasing. They are levied at flat rates and their burden falls most heavily on those with the least income. Through the so-called Tax Reform Act of 1971, the Federal Government has decreased its reliance on the relatively progressive personal income tax and the administration is considering a national "value added," or sales tax to raise new revenues. Like State property and sales taxes, it would fall most heavily on those who could least afford it.

Increasing the flat-rate social security payroll tax only serves to compound the problem of the growing regressiveness of our overall tax structure. It is time to reverse this trend and return our tax system to principles of equity and fairness. Reform of social security finance methods is a good place to begin.

This bill would begin by making the payroll tax itself more equitable. It would raise the ceiling on taxable wages to $15,000, insuring that nearly all wage earners would contribute the same percentage of their earnings to social security. The burden of social security would be shared more widely, and more evenly. But the bill goes still further by providing general revenue financing for one-third of the system's costs. Not only would the burden of the payroll tax be more widely distributed; for most wage-earners it would actually be reduced—even in the face of substantial benefit increases. The brief table following this speech graphically illustrates this point.

General revenue financing for social security is not a novel concept. It has been around as long as the system itself. It has received the endorsement of noted economists, the AFL–CIO, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the White House Conference on Aging. The late Walter Reuther called it a "rational, and reasonable, and equitable" way of building and paying for an adequate social security program. It is also, we believe, the only way.

Our proposal for financing part of the

cost of social security from general revenues will mean that significant benefit increases can be achieved with reduced strain on the budgets of lower- and middle-income families. It will also mean that the substantial burden of the benefit increases we have proposed will be shared more widely and more fairly than would be possible through the payroll tax alone. It will build in flexibility for more benefit increases—when needed—in the future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 11394, U.S. district judgeships, passed by the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNGATE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER, on Thursday, February 3, for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HARRINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FULTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an article.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. HORTON.
Mr. QUILLEN.
Mr. FREY.
Mr. CONABLE.
Mr. HUNT in two instances.
Mr. HARVEY.
Mr. SCHWENGEL.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. BOB WILSON in three instances.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in three instances.
Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. LANDGREBE.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.
Mr. SCHMITZ in two instances.
Mr. RAILSBACK.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. COLLIER in five instances.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI in 10 instances.
Mr. ROUSH.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. JOHNSON of California.
Mr. BEGICH in five instances.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. DRINAN in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. WALDIE in two instances.
Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.
Mr. METCALFE in two instances.
Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.
Mr. KEE in two instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. RONCALIO in six instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.
Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. BOGGS in three instances.
Mr. DENHOLM.
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 3, 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:

1539. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the meeting of the Judicial Conference held in Washington, D.C., on October 28–29, 1971 (H. Doc. No. 92–243); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1540. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the number of Air Force officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of government as of December 31, 1971, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 8031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1541. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1542. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1544. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report of the General Accounting Office for Fiscal Year 1971, pursuant to section 312(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8382. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Buffalo National River in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 213. A bill to repeal the "coolie trade" laws (Rept. No. 92–808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6420. A bill to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12207. A bill to authorize a program for the development of tuna and other latent fisheries resources in the central and western Pacific Ocean; with amendments (Rept. No. 92–810). 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. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 12838. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 12839. A bill for the relief of residents of Northern Ireland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON):

H.R. 12840. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne-

Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself and Mr. FLYNT):

H.R. 12841. A bill to provide a fair and effective means for the settlement of certain emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 12842. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to reorganize certain grant programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 12843. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to reorganize certain grant programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 12844. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that women who are 62 years of age or over and are eligible for cash social security (or railroad retirement) benefits shall also be eligible for hospital insurance benefits (and supplementary medical insurance benefits); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12845. A bill to establish a comprehensive manpower development program to assist persons in overcoming obstacles to suitable employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGAN (for himself, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. WHITE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HALL, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 12846. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a treatment and rehabilitation program for drug-dependent members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 12847. A bill to provide for the establishment of projects for the dental health of children to increase the number of dental auxiliaries, to increase the availability of dental care through efficient use of dental personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SHRIVER, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 12848. A bill to amend the Railroad Labor Act and Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FREY, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LENT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. THONE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 12849. A bill to amend the Railroad Labor Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 12850. A bill to amend the Railroad Labor Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to provide more effective means protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 12851. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Bridgeport Indian Colony certain lands in Mono County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12852. A bill to promote research and development of drugs or chemical compounds for use in the cure, prevention, or treatment of heroin addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12853. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax or payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residence by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINK (for himself, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. BERGLAND, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 12854. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for a definite standard in the establishment of railroad rates, charges, and practices on certain agricultural and horticultural commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 12855. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to permit employees who upon separation from the Federal service are entitled to deferred but not immediate annuities to continue their enrollment in Federal employees group health insurance plans upon payment of the entire cost thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12856. A bill to amend the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCCLORY (for himself, Mr. HUNGATE, Mrs. ABZUG, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. DENNIS):

H.R. 12857. A bill to establish a Commission on Penal Reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 12858. A bill to control the emission of noise detrimental to the human environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KEE, and Mr. SLACK):

H.R. 12859. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 12860. A bill to require the National Railroad Passenger Corp. to provide free or reduced-rate railroad transportation to retired railroad employees and their dependents on the same basis that such transportation was available to such employees and dependents on the date of enactment of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 12861. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 12862. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, and rent supplement programs, and the low-income homeownership and rental housing programs, for the fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 12863. A bill to provide supplemental appropriations and increased contract authority to fully fund the urban renewal, model cities, and rent supplement programs, and the low-income homeownership and rental housing programs, for the fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12864. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by providing for the release of information concerning certain aspects of the medical programs authorized by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 12865. A bill to amend section 127 of title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to regulate the issuance of permits and other authorities for the use of the Interstate System by vehicles exceeding certain weight and width limitations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 12866. A bill to amend chapter 81 of subpart G of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12867. A bill to restore to Federal civilian employees their rights to participate, as private citizens, in the political life of the Nation, to protect Federal civilian employees from improper political solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 12868. A bill to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12869. A bill to amend the age and service requirements for immediate retirement under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12870. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12871. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the costs of employees' health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DOW, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 12872. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board increase in benefits (with a $100 minimum primary benefit), to increase the earnings base to $15,000 for both benefit and tax purposes, and to provide that one-third of the revenues required for the social security programs be contributed by the Federal Government (with corresponding reductions in tax rates); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 12873. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage a higher level of forest resource protection, development, and management by small nonindustrial private and non-Federal public forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12874. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that uncompensated reserve service before August 16, 1945, not bar eligibility for non-Regular retired pay in certain cases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 12875. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 to discharge obligations under the Convention on Psychotropic Substances relating to regulatory controls on the manufacture, distribution, importation, and exportation of psychotropic substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself and Mr. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 12876. A bill to provide an immediate and effective response to the needs of older Americans for suitable housing and related services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 12877. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 12878. A bill to increase the contribution of the Federal Government to the cost of health benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12879. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 each year of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 12881. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. O'NEILL, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON Mr. CLARK, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DORN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 12882. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEE, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LINK, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 12883. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 12884. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 12885. A bill to provide for the regulation of ground waters within the United States and the subsurface disposal of wastes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 12886. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 12887. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require the presentation of full military honors at the burial of veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 12888. A bill to declare the south prong of the Wicomico River, Md., nonnavigable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 12889. A bill to amend section 1124 (c) of title 10 United States Code, to remove the restriction that a member of the Armed Forces must be on active duty to be eligible for the payment of a cash award for a suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12890. A bill to amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, title 39, U.S.C., to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12891. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt any nonmanufacturing business, or any business having 25 or less employees, in States having laws regulating safety in such businesses, from the Federal standards created under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 12892. A bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12893. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12894. A bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12895. A bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12896. A bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatus; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12897. A bill to extend for 3 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12898. A bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 12899. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to extend the provisions of that act to construction materials used in the interiors of homes, offices, and other places of assembly or accommodation, and to authorize the establishment of toxicity standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12900. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Control Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations providing for the placarding of certain vehicles transporting hazardous materials in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

H.J. Res. 1048. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.J. Res. 1049. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CÓRDOVA, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Con. Res. 516. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to motor vehicle insurance and an accident compensation system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress respecting Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. MINK:

H. Con. Res. 518. Concurrent resolution

providing for the recognition of Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to motor vehicle insurance and an accident compensation system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLACK:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress respecting Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BURTON):

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the current situation in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (for himself and Mr. SAYLOR):

H. Res. 795. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 18; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SISK (for himself and Mr. SMITH of California):

H. Res. 796. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1025, a joint resolution to provide a procedure for settlement of the dispute on the Pacific coast and Hawaii among certain shippers and associated employers and certain employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H. Res. 797. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the United States should recognize Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 798. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred to as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 12901. A bill for the relief of Raymond W. Whitemore, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 12902. A bill for the relief of Lee Shie-Chien Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 12903. A bill for the relief of Anne M. Sack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 12904. A bill to provide that Maj. Carvel de Bussy shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE—*Wednesday, February 2, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who adorns the earth with beauty, enter our lives and make them resplendent with devotion to beauty, goodness, and truth. May the Creator-Spirit fill life with new meanings and fresh insights. Lead us through the stresses and strains of the day with pure hearts and souls at peace. Keep us steadfast in devotion to the welfare of all the people and the quest for enduring peace. Give us clarity to see Thy will and courage for doing it. In our private lives and in public service help us this day and every day more nearly to live as we pray.

In the name of Him who went about with loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 1, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND—IN MEMORIAM

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, Adlai Stevenson once said:

> For a man to love his country truly,
> He must also know how to love mankind. . . .

Spessard Lindsey Holland believed in the promise of America because he believed in its people. He was a humble man, a man of the people, who felt more at home in Bartow than in the social circles of Washington, D.C. He was a scholar and a keen intellect; yet, he liked nothing better than to hunt and fish in his beloved Florida.

Spessard Holland's career in the service of his State and his country spanned half a century, but he never sought fame. Rather, he sought to do lasting good and to make this country and this world a better place for all of us.

Spessard Holland was a gallant soldier in defense of his country. When America entered the First World War, Spessard Holland went to Jacksonville to enlist in the Army. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the coast artillery in August 1917, and assigned to Key West. From there, he went overseas to France the following January where he volunteered as an aerial observer. In 30 days, he was at the front—flying. Several times, he was almost shot down and for his valor, Spessard Holland was honored with the Distinguished Service Cross.

Spessard Holland emerged from the war as a captain and he came home to marry his faithful and beloved, Mary Groover. She was an inspiration and source of strength to him for the rest of his life. A devoted wife and mother, Mary Holland was the perfect complement to her husband. Spessard Holland was prouder of his family than of any of his many legislative accomplishments.

Spessard Holland respected knowledge and learning and he fought to insure that each child would have a quality education. Both his parents were teachers, and he planned to be one when he enrolled at Emory University. After the war, he returned to his hometown and assumed the chairmanship of the local school district. Later, as Governor, he approved new tax laws which increased teachers' salaries an average of 40 percent.

Spessard Holland served his State and his country nobly and selflessly in all three branches of government—as a State legislator and U.S. Senator, as a prosecuting attorney and county judge, and as Governor. In the Florida Legislature, Spessard Holland assisted in drafting the Florida School Code, backed the Workmen's Compensation Act and old age assistance—all lasting achievements which moved the State forward.

Spessard Holland assumed the Governorship at the beginning of the wartime years when the State of Florida was close to bankruptcy. Within 6 months, Florida was on the road to recovery. Spessard Holland—a man of action—had begun to reform the tax system and soon Floridians would have a gas tax amendment which would reduce interest rates on road bonds. His love of nature and his native land prompted the creation of a strong game and fish commission, removed from political patronage. Moreover, he turned over State lands and money to the Federal Government for the establishment of the Everglades National Park, and as a U.S. Senator, he guided authorization and appropriations bills through the Congress for its continuing expansion and development.

Spessard Holland left the Governor's mansion as well liked and respected as when he entered it—a unique achievement in State politics. He loved the law and wanted to practice in Bartow and he also looked forward to having more time to enjoy his family and friends. However, U.S. Senator Charles Andrews' health was failing and he decided not to seek reelection. Florida and the U.S. Senate needed Spessard Holland and he was persuaded to run for election. He won the primary in May 1946 and was to have taken office in January 1947. Senator Andrews died in September of 1946 and Spessard Holland was appointed to fill the remainder of his term.

Spessard Holland came to Washington