veterans up to 9 months of educational assistance for the purpose of pursuing retraining or refresher courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 13848. A bill to provide for the selection of candidates for President of the United States in a national presidential primary election, and for the election of a President and a Vice President by direct vote of the people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURLISON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 24 through 29, 1972, as "National Auctioneers Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (for himself, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H. J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution authorizing the Preisdent to proclaim the month of May as "Clean Waters for America Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. J. Res. 1112. 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. ROBINSON of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 1113. 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. WHALLEY:

H. J. Res. 1114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment XX to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination of individuals for election to the offices of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H. Con. Res. 561. Concurrent resolution providing for the recognition of Bangladesh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 562. Concurrent resolution supporting the United States delegation to the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. ZION):

H. Con. Res. 563. Concurrent resolution congratulating Earl L. Butz on his nomination to the office of Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 13849. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kenneth C. Ozojiofor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS of Washington:

H.R. 13850. A bill for the relief of Tait Stevedoring Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 13851. A bill to provide for the free entry of five carillon bells for the use of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 13852. A bill for the relief of James E. Bashline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VALUE-ADDED TAX

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, according to recent reports, the President is considering the proposal to establish a value-added tax—a kind of national sales tax—in order to alleviate the burdens of the property tax and educational financing.

I support the concept of tax reform on all levels of Government. But the guiding principle of that reform must be that those who are most able to pay shall pay the most, while the poorest of our society shall pay less. This principle is embodied in our graduated income tax system, and it is only compromised by our complex and undesirable system of loopholes and special benefits.

The value-added tax does not solve this inequity. Instead of making our tax structure more progressive, it is merely one more regressive revenue system. Instead of easing the burden of the people hardest hit by the property taxes, the value-added tax merely makes them pay the same amount in a different manner, under the guise of reform.

The following article by Dr. Douglas Beasley from the Rossmoor News of February 23 provides an excellent summary of the critique of the value-added tax:

VALUE-ADDED TAX

(By Douglas Beasley)

There is presently much discussion by politicians of the proposal to replace the property tax by the value added tax (V.A.T.) to finance the nation's schools.

The V.A.T. is equivalent to a national sales tax now widely used in Europe. In essence the tax is computed on the value added to a particular product by each manufacturer.

He pays tax on the difference between his total sales and total purchases, this includes everything from raw materials to machinery and office equipment even though the V.A.T. has already been paid by someone else.

The manufacturer bills his wholesale customers for the tax on the sales price of the articles sold. The wholesaler does the same on his sales to the retailer, this is repeated again by the retailer on his sales to the consumer who ultimately pays all the bill for the value added taxes.

Opposition to V.A.T. is growing in Europe and in this country due to its unfairness and inherent weakness, it is a regressive tax, as is the property tax, both hit the poor harder than they do the rich. The tax is paid entirely by consumers and does not take into account the ability to pay and thus falls more heavily upon low income families for they would pay a higher percentage of their income for this new tax than would the wealthy.

This tax is also inherently inflationary due to ease with which it can be collected and the rate increased at the will of the law makers.

The administration of the V.A.T. system would be cumbersome and very costly to service and would add another unnecessary bureau.

It is obvious that a new method of school financing is desperately needed but V.A.T. is not the answer. An income tax surcharge and a closing of the many loop-holes in the present laws would be far better and would produce more net revenue than V.A.T. as the financial burden of a new bureaucracy would be unnecessary. At the same time it would recognize "ability to pay" and would provide the means to bring about equal opportunities for all students and at the same time relieve home owners and renters of the unfairness of property taxes.

ECONOMICS & FINANCE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This new column in the News is devoted to investments, taxes, savings, economics, finance, money and how to make and save it. The chairman of the column is Douglas Beasley, retired vice-president of the Wells Fargo Bank, but the writers of the column will be many. Anyone in Rossmoor who is willing to contribute a column on these subjects that may be helpful or entertaining to Rossmoorians at any time is asked to contact Mr. Beasley, either by sending him a column, or by phoning him for discussion. The several investment clubs here may be particularly interested in contributing. We are generally more interested in a column that can wind up saying something like "a good thing for you to investigate doing is . . ." or "a bad thing to do, it appears is, . . ." rather than a column which simply comments on a national scene.)

(By Douglas Beasley)

An article in the Chronicle of Feb. 17 quotes Secretary Connally as saying it would be "sheer folly" for the United States to resume convertibility of the dollar before there is convincing evidence that the nation's underlying balance of payments situation has improved. However, some method of restoring the world's confidence in the dollar must be undertaken at the earliest possible moment, otherwise a more serious crisis than experienced recently can plunge the whole free world into a depression rivaling that of the 1930s.

We can heal this incipient illness by taking the following actions: Notify the World Bank that the U.S. will sell at auction 20 million ounces of gold to the highest bidders among the world's Central Bankers, and that additional auctions will be held monthly until further notice.

Rules of governing these auctions would be: 1. The lowest bids or combinations of bids accepted on this first auction would be for $1 million. 2. A minimum bid price of $50 an ounce for this auction. 3. Terms of future auctions would be announced monthly until gold and dollar values stabilize. 4. The highest bids only, working down from the top, would be accepted to cover the 20 million ounces offered. 5. Settlement of all contracts in U.S. dollars would be through the International Monetary Fund within 30 days. 6. Future auctions would be subject to appropriate current market conditions.

The U.S. presently holds approximately $10 billion in gold valued at $35 an ounce (to be raised to $38, if approved by Congress). This hoard weighs approximately 285,714,286 ounces and at the approximate free market quotation of $50 an ounce is actually worth $14,285,714,300.

This positive action by the world's largest holder of gold would allow the precious metal

to establish its true value in dollars and other world currencies, and will tend to prevent new runs on the dollar and thus give us time to balance our international payments' account. It will also allow us to "sop up" a considerable amount of excess dollars circulating overseas, and at the same time will, almost surely, increase the dollar value of our remaining gold reserves. Of course this action would also be expected to bring "windfall" profits to all nations and individuals holding gold. We, however, having the largest hoard, would profit handsomely so why complain about the profits that would accrue to the Russians, the gold mining companies or others? Is gold so different from platinum, silver, or oil that we do not want its price to be established by the Law of Supply and Demand! Let's grow up and face realities.

If you agree with these thoughts get in touch with the law makers and the President so they will know how You want them to act. A simple way to do this is to clip this column and send it on with your endorsement.

ECONOMICS & FINANCE

(By Douglas Beasley)

It is income tax time again and through the courtesy of the California Society of Certified Public Accountants we will pass on to the residents the following tax tips.

1. If your tax for the current year increased substantially over the previous four years you may be able to average your income and lower your taxes. Refer to schedule G federal form 1040, state 540.

2. If you are unmarried and maintain your home as the principal place of abode for a dependent, or your dependent parent is in a rest home, you are entitled to use lower rates.

3. Use schedule R if retired and over 65 even if as a widow you have not earned $600 a year for 10 years but provided your husband qualified.

4. Don't forget your self employment tax if you are a professional person or a proprietor of a business. See Schedule S.E. form 1040.

5. If your adult son or daughter is a full time student for at least five months of the year and you provide one half of his support, you can claim a dependence for him. If he is not in college but you are providing over one half of his support, you can still claim a dependency exemption if he is not yet 19 and has less than $675 gross income. If you provide over one half the support of your dependents you can deduct expenses paid on their behalf.

6. If you itemize deductions, list the 5 percent California sales tax (1½ percent for residents of rapid transit districts) and the 7 cents per gallon gas tax. The instructions to form 1040 contain these tables. If you bought a new car last year deduct the sales tax.

7. The joint return is generally an advantage, however, if both spouses have some income and one has high medical expenses, separate returns might be desirable to prevent these expenses being absorbed by the 3 percent limitation, also it should be remembered that capital loss carryovers from years prior to 1970 may be deducted against ordinary income up to $1000 on each return if filed separately.

8. Federal gift tax returns must now be filed quarterly on or before the 15th day of the second month following the close of the calendar quarter in which the gifts were made.

9. If you incurred moving expenses you should consult your tax accountant as you may qualify for a deduction.

10. Don't forget the loss on security sales can be taken as a deduction.

WHAT IS KILLING THE CITY?

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Newsweek magazine for March 20 contains an excellent column by the economist, Dr. Milton Friedman.

The column is largely devoted to an analysis of the financial and general governmental problems of New York City, but much of what Dr. Friedman has to say about New York can be applied to the Federal Government.

The columnist observes that all too little of what is spent for social programs actually reaches the needy, and that increased government spending has not solved the major problems of New York City.

I think this can also be said of many Federal programs, and certainly Dr. Friedman's observation that "government spending is the problem, not the solution" is just as true for the United States as it is for New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "What Is Killing the City?" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WHAT IS KILLING THE CITY?

(By Milton Friedman)

In two remarkable columns, Stewart Alsop has explored "The City Disease" that is killing the South Bronx area of New York City (NEWSWEEK, Feb. 28 and March 6). He summarized his findings as follows: "Well-intentioned and liberal-minded people (including this writer) have assumed that the way to cure conditions like those in the South Bronx is to spend a lot of money in the slums. A lot of money has been spent in the South Bronx and other New York slums. New York's expenditures for 'social services' have tripled since John Lindsay became mayor, and Federal spending for social purposes has also vastly increased. All the time, the city disease has got worse—and worse and worse."

PARADOX?

This result seems a paradox. How can it be that more spending is accompanied by worse results?

One standard explanation is that the disease has gotten worse despite the increase in spending, that it would have gotten still worse if there had been less spending, and that we need still more spending by New York City and the Federal government. Though this explanation has produced a massive and continuing increase in Federal, state and local government spending for "social services," its plausibility has worn thin as spending has mounted and the disease continued to get worse.

A second explanation is that the fault is not with the amount of government spending but with the way government has spent the money. In housing, this explanation has led to stress on rehabilitation instead of new construction, on small-scale scattered public housing instead of gigantic housing projects, on rent supplements instead of public housing. Unfortunately, despite the great fanfare and extravagant promises that accompany each new program, still the city disease marches on.

The right explanation, I submit, is very different. Mr. Alsop is simply wrong when he says, "New York's expenditures for 'social services' have tripled." They may not have changed at all—or may even have declined. What has happened is that expenditures by the *government* of the City of New York have tripled. But where has the money come from? Primarily from the people in New York City.

Where else can it come from? The money may take a detour via Albany or Washington—which will, of course, take their cut—but that only conceals, it does not change, the ultimate origin of the money. The citizens of New York City have spent more through their government and therefore have had less to spend themselves.

NOT TO BE EXPECTED

The total amount available for spending has not been increased by Lindsay's programs. On the contrary, it has been decreased as the deterioration of the city and ever-higher taxes have encouraged people and business to move out. Is it really a paradox that we get less for our money when government bureaucrats spend our money for our supposed benefit than when we spend our own money on our own needs?

But, you may say, government spending is for the poor; the money government spends comes from the well-to-do; hence private spending would benefit different people.

Wrong on both counts. The government program may be labeled "welfare for the poor," but that does not mean that very much of the money spent benefits the poor. Much of the money goes to buy land or buildings or services from the not-so-poor—as, most notably, in urban renewal programs—to provide amenities for the not-so-poor. Some of the rest goes to pay excellent salaries to bureaucrats. Even the part that does trickle down to the poor is largely wasted because it encourages them to substitute a handout for a wage.

As to who pays, the possibility of taxing the rich is strictly limited, especially in a city like New York. It is too easy for the rich to move. Whatever the rhetoric, the poor pay their full share of the taxes.

Government spending is the problem, not the solution. We do not need new government programs. We need to abolish the old programs and let people spend their own money in accordance with their own values. The city would then get better—and better and better.

For New York City, it is probably too late for this cure because so large a part of the voting population already consists of city employees and welfare recipients. But it is not too late for other cities to learn from New York's disease.

LACK OF REGULATION OF $6.5 BILLION COSMETIC INDUSTRY ENDANGERS PUBLIC

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment the FDA is deciding whether or not to accept a proposal put forward by representatives of the $6.5 billion cosmetics industry, which would sanction a so-called voluntary program of self-regulation. This proposal, unfortunately, completely fails to come to grips with most of the major deficiencies in the law regulating cosmetics. Presently, there are no requirements that cosmetics manufacturers carry out any safety testing of their products, label

their ingredients, or open their complaint files to inspection by FDA. Therefore, in effect, the consuming public is the guinea pig that tests the safety of cosmetics. Because of these voids in the law, the products of unscrupulous, incompetent, or negligent cosmetics manufacturers will almost inevitably reach the market and cause injuries before FDA becomes aware of the problem and is able to act.

The industry proposal presently before FDA cannot and will not close these vast loopholes in the law. This proposal fails to expand FDA's present powers. In fact all the proposal does is exhort the cosmetics manufacturers to voluntarily register with FDA and to send to FDA the listing of their ingredients of their various cosmetics formulations.

However, this proposal in no way compels any company to comply, and if a company refuses to register or divulge the desired information, no sanctions can be brought against it. Furthermore, it is the very companies whose business practices are most questionable who are the least likely to comply with a voluntary program.

Such elemental and essential information should long since have been available to FDA. No company under the guise of voluntarism should be allowed to suppress information which is vital to the protection of the public.

Therefore, today I am reintroducing H.R. 13417, the Cosmetics Act of 1972. This legislation requires that all cosmetics companies register with and divulge their cosmetic formulations to FDA. It further requires that these companies carry out safety testing of their products, label their ingredients, and open their complaint files to FDA. It also increases the penalties for selling defective cosmetics.

In reintroducing this legislation I am joined by 17 cosponsors: HERMAN BADILLO, PHILLIP BURTON, JOSHUA EILBERG, DONALD FRASER, SAM GIBBONS, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, HENRY HELSTOSKI, LOUISE DAY HICKS, PATSY MINK, PARREN MITCHELL, DAVID OBEY, THOMAS REES, PETER RODINO, Jr., LLOYD MEEDS, JOHN DOW, and TOM GETTYS.

Mr. Speaker, I am also placing in the RECORD articles by Nancy Ross of the Washington Post, Richard D. James of the Wall Street Journal, and an article in Chemical Week which illustrate the need for this legislation:

EYES: MICROBES IN THE MAKEUP

(By Nancy L. Ross)

For the past two years, hundreds of women from teen-agers to grandmothers have been batting their eyelashes at Louis Wilson.

Louis Wilson? He is not a pop idol or a movie star. He's an ophthalmologist. As such, his interest in eyelashes is clinical, not romantic. Louis A. Wilson, M.D., as he is more properly known at the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, has been studying along with three colleagues the correlation between eye makeup and eye diseases.

Eye injuries from microbial contamination of makeup are one of the most common complaint cosmetics manufacturers receive along with skin reactions to bubble baths containing harsh detergents, and hair and scalp damage from shampoos and other hair preparations.

While no breakdown is available, the National Commission on Product Safety estimates that cosmetics in general injure 60,000 persons seriously enough each year that they must see a physician or be restricted in their activities for at least one day. The Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act does not require premarketing tests for safety of cosmetics.

Dr. Wilson's study grew out of his private practice, he reports, he treated many women with ocular abnormalities caused wholly or in part by makeup. His findings were verified in independent research performed at the London Institute of Dermatology and the University of Miami School of Medicine.

The study, as reported in the June 1971 issue of the American Journal of Ophthalmology, concludes that microorganisms present in mascara, eyeliner and eye shadow "constitute a potential hazard" because they can invade a scratched eyeball and cause infection or even loss of vision.

Since July, Dr. Wilson has been under contract to the Food and Drug Administration to continue and expand his research in this virtually untouched field to determine how large, and serious, a problem may exist and the causes of it. A spokesman for the American Association of Ophthalmology said he knew of no other studies in progress on eye makeup.

Four hundred twenty-eight eye cosmetic samples from 235 women aged 18 to 52 were cultured in Wilson's study. Potentially dangerous fungal contamination was found in 12 per cent and bacterial contamination in 43 per cent. There was no evidence to suggest one form or brand of eye cosmetic was worse than any other. Expensive makeup could be just as contaminated as cheap.

Dr. Wilson, incidentally, said he received no cooperation from manufacturers, who refused to divulge their ingredients.

Cosmetics fresh from the factory were found generally pure. Contamination, Wilson said, can come from keeping the makeup a long time, letting someone else use it, and mixing saliva or even tap water in mascara to thin it. Heat, body chemistry and the type of preservative used in makeup are also determining factors. A high incidence was observed in nurses wearing eye makeup in germ-filled hospitals.

The resulting bacteria, Dr. Wilson found, can invade a cornea which has been scratched by a contact lense or other foreign matter, cause crusting of the eyelids and even a loss of eye lashes. Two cases of loss of vision have been reported, according to the Augusta physician. But the FDA has not positively pinpointed the cause as contaminated makeup.

Besides correcting the makeup habits of women, Dr. Wilson believes the answer to this problem lies in packaging "one-shot" cosmetics designed to be thrown away after one application and improving the preservative. The most commonly used preservative, called parabens, he found to be ineffective because they tend to disperse in emulsified cosmetics. This point is disputed by some cosmetic chemists.

Dr. Wilson has proposed, and the FDA will soon sanction, the use of a stronger preservative, phenyl mercuric acetate, in eye makeup. According to Dr. Robert M. Schaffner, director of the FDA's office of product technology of the Bureau of Foods, the very small amount of mercury—up to .005 per cent—cannot be considered dangerous.

At the same time the agency is preparing to regulate certain skin bleach creams where the amount of ammoniated mercury, the active ingredient, can reach as high as 5 per cent. Mercury can cause bad skin reactions, such as numbness. The bleaches have already been reclassified as drugs and may either be banned or reformulated.

Prior to the mercury scare occasioned by tainted swordfish and tuna, 18 companies used mercury in their products, according to the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Association, a trade group. As of February 1971, seven had ended its use and the remaining 11 will have eliminated it by January 1973. CTFA, however, speaks only for its members, who represent fewer than half of the cosmetic manufacturers in this country, although they do 90 per cent of the volume of business.

How many other manufacturers do use mercury in their products? How harmful is mercury in certain concentrations? How many products now sold as cosmetics should rightly be considered drugs and be subject to more stringent rules governing drugs? How many cases of eye disease can be attributed to which eye makeup?

At present the FDA doesn't know the answer to any of these questions. Perhaps it will begin to get a clearer picture with the introduction next year of a voluntary information program.

The cosmetics section has always been the poor relation of the FDA's food and drug divisions. The cosmetics bureau, for example, has only 30 people, compared to 800–900 in the drug bureau. At present it does not know—or have the power to require information on—how many cosmetics manufacturers there are in this country and what they put in their products.

Earlier this year CTFA, at the urging of Virginia Knauer, the presidential assistant for consumer affairs, petitioned the FDA to institute voluntary registration of producers and their formulations, the latter on a confidential basis. Schaffner estimates 1,000 manufacturers with 10,000 formulations exist.

The highly-competitive cosmetics industry is reluctant to have trade secrets divulged to competitors and to the public. For this reason, labeling of ingredients—requested by consumer groups—is not yet acceptable to industry, and the FDA has abandoned the notion as premature.

At a Dec. 7–8 seminar of the Food and Drug Law Institute, industry representatives voiced objections that ranged from the argument that formulations are too long and complicated for the public to understand, to the argument that the public would compare the ingredients of an expensive, heavily promoted brand with a substantially cheaper product and realize they were essentially the same preparations.

Industry also objected to "arbitrary" reclassification of some cosmetics as drugs, a move proposed by FDA commissioner Charles C. Edwards. Those products that would have been affected are eye lotions, nail hardeners, douches, depilatories, hormone creams, bleach creams, wrinkle removers, bronzers and suntan preparations. The reclassification was based on the products' claim to effect a physiological change in the body rather than simply mask a condition.

Thus, for example, a suntan lotion which purports to cure sunburn is a drug, whereas a product with an identical formula which only claims to make the user beautiful is a cosmetic.

The next effect of reclassification as drugs would have meant premarketing clearance for the aforementioned products on the basis of both safety and effectiveness—a procedure bound to either increase the price of products or drive some products from the market.

The FDA, in response to industry pressure has agreed instead to consider products on a case by case basis as complaints arise. This would undoubtedly enable the suntan lotion maker to change his pitch and avoid regulation.

A third proposal by CTFA is also meeting opposition from some of its members and will not be included in the initial set of voluntary regulations to go into effect early in the new year, although CTFA and FDA are both optimistic it will eventually be adopted.

This proposal would urge manufacturers to send the FDA records of their "consumer experience," i.e., complaints. At present the FDA receives only about 250 complaints a year on cosmetics. Many large companies are thought to receive an equal number.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 14, 1972]

SKIN DOCTORS COMPLAIN SOME INGREDIENTS IN SOAPS, SHAVE LOTIONS CAUSE USERS TO BE ALLERGIC TO SUN

(By Richard D. James)

CHICAGO.—The cosmetics industry, already under fire because of potential health hazards from the widely used germ-killer hexachlorophene, is coming under attack from a new direction.

A number of physicians specializing in skin disorders report that they are seeing an appreciable number of people who have been made allergic to sunlight by some of the big-selling after-shave lotions and by the deodorant toilet soaps that contain germ-killing chemicals other than hexachlorophene. The doctors aren't certain what ingredients in the lotions cause the allergy, but with the soaps they claim that a chemical known as tribromosalicylanilide (TBS) is the main offender.

Most people who use the products aren't bothered by them, but those who are bothered develop scaly, itchy sores on their faces, hands and other parts of the body when exposed to sunlight, the doctors say. The reaction, similar to that caused by poison oak, usually stops when the patients stop using the soaps and lotions, but some sufferers remain allergic to sunlight for years afterward and have to remain indoors virtually all the time. In a few cases they can't even sit near a closed window because light coming through the glass will trigger the reaction. Sometimes light from a fluorescent lamp is enough to cause trouble.

MANY CASES IN HAWAII

The allergy occurs most frequently in parts of the country that receive a lot of sunlight. "Not a week goes by that I don't see one new patient with this problem, and on the average I probably see two new cases a week," says Dr. Harry L. Arnold, a Honolulu dermatologist.

In other areas the number of new cases follows a seasonal pattern, swinging up in warm-weather months and down in the winter, except that there is an upturn around Christmas, the time when people go south for vacations and receive new after-shave lotions as gifts. The allergy also seems to hit men over 40 more frequently than others. The doctors don't understand why.

Some dermatologists have stopped using the soaps and lotions and are recommending that their patients follow suit. They maintain that antibacterial agents in soaps aren't needed. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration says it has received a small number of complaints of photoallergy, as it's called, connected with the soaps and lotions and is keeping an eye on the situation, but it doesn't plan any immediate action.

Companies that manufacture the products generally say they are aware that the products have caused some people to develop the allergy, but they contend that considering the millions of users, the problem is so rare that they consider their products safe and useful. "We take the view that the risk is small and that there are many people who want such a product, so we make it available. My conscience doesn't bother me," says J. David Justice, assistant research director at Lever Brothers Co., a deodorant soap maker.

NOT MONSTROUS, BUT SIGNIFICANT

Doctors agree that the number may be small, but they argue that even a small number is unneeded and unacceptable. "I understand that the companies believe they really aren't harming many people, but who are they helping?" asks Dr. John Epstein, a dermatologist at the University of California medical school.

No count of the number of persons afflicted is available, but the dermatologists estimate that nationally they see between 500 and 1,000 new cases a year, and some say perhaps four times that number never come to doctors' attention. "We really don't know how big the problem is. It can't be monstrous, but it is significant," says Dr. Frederick Urbach, head of the dermatology department at Temple University.

The problem could become worse, some experts believe. They point out that the troublesome chemical in the soaps soon may be used even more widely than it is now because it is a logical substitute for hexachlorophene. The federal government recently proposed restrictions regarding use of hexachlorophene. The proposed restrictions resulted from research showing that hexachlorophene—used widely in shampoos and deodorants—can cause brain damage under certain circumstances.

About half of the two billion bars of toilet soap sold annually contain an antibacterial agent, and there are some 115 million bottles of after-shave lotion sold each year, trade sources estimate.

The deodorant soaps that cause the most trouble, the doctors say, are Lifebuoy and Phase III, made by Lever Brothers Co.; Zest and Safeguard, made by Procter and Gamble Co., and Cuticura, made by Purex Corp. After shave lotions cited by doctors are Hai Karate, made by Pfizer Inc.; English Leather by Mem Co.; Swank Inc.'s Jade East, and Brut by Faberge Inc.

LIME OIL SUSPECTED

Although the doctors aren't certain what ingredients in the lotions cause the trouble—mainly because the companies generally refuse to disclose the products' contents, even for medical research—they believe the trouble lies with the various oils that are used to give the lotions their fragrance. "We know, for instance, that in the oil of limes there is a powerful photo-sensitizing agent, and I suspect it is lime oil that causes the trouble in lotions such as Hai Karate," says Dr. Harvey Blank, dermatology professor at the University of Miami in Florida.

The doctors say synthetically produced fragrances, which don't utilize the natural oils, don't produce the allergy; the doctors recommend that their patients use cheaper lotions, which generally contain the synthetics.

Most of the companies that make lotions containing natural fragrances say they are unaware of any photoallergy problem with their products. But at least one lotion-maker, Faberge, tends to confirm the doctors' suspecion. "We think the agent (that causes the allergy) might be one of the oils in it," says Phillip Brass, executive vice president. "We've been working on that oil, attempting to find a substitute for it." In the meantime, he says, the company is reducing the amount of that oil in the lotion. Mr. Brass didn't identify the oil.

In the case of soaps, the manufacturers say they are unaware of any current problem. They say that the few photoallergy cases of which they are aware occurred several years ago when TBS—the ingredient doctors believe causes the problem—contained impurities and that it was the impurities that caused the trouble. Today, they say, the TBS used in soaps is almost 100% pure and presents no problem. They go on to argue that if cases of the allergy are still occurring, they are among a tiny number of people who were once sensitized by the old impure TBS and now also react to the pure chemical.

Lifebuoy, Safeguard, Zest, Phase III and a new toilet soap, Irish Spring, being test-marketed by Colgate-Palmolive Co., all contain TBS. It is included in the soaps to kill skin bacteria that produce body odors.

Most of the dermatologists believe that the germ-killing soaps aren't needed by the general public. "They're probably a good idea for prison chain gangs, soldiers and others who have a high risk of contracting skin infections, but most people aren't in that category," says a New York City dermatologist.

The doctors also point out that there's growing evidence that normal skin bacteria, which every person has and which are the type killed by the deodorant soaps, probably play a protective role in fighting off disease-causing bacteria. "Those of us who are studying the skin bacteriology have stopped using them (deodorant soaps). I once used them myself, but I've stopped, and I discourage their use among our staff," says Dr. Blank from Miami University medical school.

Some, but not all doctors think that TBS should be removed from soaps. "I think it is dangerous. It's not fair to say that percentagewise the risk is small. If you've got a thing like this, you shouldn't expose anybody to it," says Dr. Arnold of Honolulu.

Dr. Urbach of Temple University adds: "It's a question of relative worth. If you're going to save someone's life by using a poisonous chemical, you can take a higher risk. But if you simply want someone's armpit to smell good, you have less of a trade-off."

Some doctors also point out that a few years ago Denmark ordered TBS withdrawn from soaps after a large number of people developed reactions to the chemical. U.S. soap companies, however, respond that the amount of TBS used in Denmark was more than double the amount being used in U.S. soaps.

Doctors who don't favor banning the chemical say that at least it should be listed on the package. Some deodorant soaps do presently list their contents, but not all.

SWEDES TELL IT ALL—APRIL 7, 1971, CHEMICAL WEEK

A major Swedish cosmetics company, Barnaengen AB, has begun listing its products' ingredients on the packages. Purpose: to enable customers to avoid substances they may be allergic to.

Barnaengen launched the program by listing ingredients of Vademecum toothpaste, has now extended it to Shantung cosmetics. "We feel this kind of consumer information is necessary these days," says Peter Edstroem, information director of Barnaengen. "But it's too early to say whether project has helped sales."

The labels list the chemicals and the purpose of each in the formulation. Complex chemical names or trade-names are simplified by a basic description of the ingredient. On large packages (box, tube or bottle), identification of ingredients is printed directly on the labels. While brochures are inclosed with small packages such as lipsticks.

The company is the first cosmetics maker to join a growing number of Swedish companies that list product ingredients. For example, detergent maker AB Helios gives materials and formula percentage on labels.

All Quiet on U.S. Front: Barnaenger's new policy has not been extended to include its U.S. marketer of toothpaste. Vademecum-Barnaengen (Chaska, Minn.). And it's a good bet that U.S. cosmetics companies won't follow the Swedish firm's lead.

At present, the cosmetics industry is not required to list product ingredients. Under the Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act of '38, only food and drug companies must do so.

Late last month the cosmetics industry sent two petitions to FDA that outline a voluntary registration program. Cosmetics makers would be registered, and they in turn would list their product ingredients with FDA. The data provided would be confidential, for FDA use only, says the Cosmetic, Toiletry and Fragrance Assn. (the new name adopted by the Toilet Goods Assn. in February).

UNITED TRANSPORTATION CONSUMERS STRIVING TO KEEP CONSUMER PRICES DOWN

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, we often hear that the objectives of business and the objectives of the consumer sharply clash. But this is not always the case.

I learned that last November, a group of businessmen gathered to form a new organization to work with consumers in an effort to keep prices down. They called the organization the United Transportation Consumers.

Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the United Transportation Consumers is comprised of some of America's most prestigious corporations—Allied Chemical Corp., Continental Can Co., Inc., Dow Chemical Co., E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., Georgia-Pacific Corp., PPG Industries, Inc., St. Regis Paper Co., Union Camp Corp., U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Inc., and the Weyerhaeuser Co. These companies put the weight of their resources behind this effort, yet few people are aware of the billions of dollars they pay every year to subsidize inefficient transportation operations?

Transportation costs are a major factor in the cost of virtually every item we buy—food, clothing, housing, electricity.

With respect to food, the Department of Agriculture is predicting that food prices will likely rise by at least 3.5 percent in 1972. How much of this increase can be attributed to inefficient transportation? How much does the consumer pay in higher prices as a consequence of inefficient transportation?

No one really knows the answers to these questions today. But the United Transportation Consumers say they are going to find out and inform the American public.

Only when the American consumer is aware of the magnitude to which inefficiencies in transportation force him to pay higher prices for nearly everything he buys, will remedial action come about.

Mr. Speaker, the companies that belong to the UTC tell me that if they can keep transportation prices from rising, consumer prices can be kept down as well.

To my knowledge, no one has ever attempted to relate the cost of transporting goods to the prices we must pay for them on as broad a scale as the UTC proposes.

I commend this group of concerned businessmen for their initiative in this vital area, and look forward to their findings with great interest.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962—A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY (PART I—THE 87TH CONGRESS)

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today, on March 15, 1962, John F. Kennedy signed into law Public Law 87-415, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. In the ensuing 10 years, MDTA, with its subsequent amendments, has become the basis for one of the largest programs entrusted to the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, on one of the most far-reaching and significant programs enacted by the Congress in that decade.

Literally millions of Americans have had their lives touched by and improved by the manpower training programs authorized under this very important piece of legislation. It has provided new hope and new skills for those whose skills are no longer relevant in times of changing technology. It has provided basic work orientation and skill training for those whose skills had never been enough to bring them into the mainstream of the economy. It has given new hope and new purpose to the displaced and to the disadvantaged, the underemployed, and the employed. It has been a piece of legislation which is a credit to everyone who has been connected with it.

The executive branch, as is only right and proper, is conducting an observance of this 10th anniversary this week. But since MDTA was largely a creation of the legislative branch, and since its development in the years since has been in no small part of a result of legislative initiative, I think it only proper that the Congress have its own "Happy Birthday, MDTA" observance.

I have, therefore, had compiled an unofficial and informal documentary history of the Manpower Development and Training Act, beginning with the first consideration of that act by the 87th Congress, and going through to the most recent amendments, in 1969.

This compilation, Mr. Speaker, is not a formal and authoritative "legislative history". It consists of excerpts from the floor debates in both bodies, excerpts from the reports of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate's Committee on Public Welfare, and the texts of the successive amendments as considered and as enacted. Since it is a very lengthy product, I shall ask unanimous consent to have one segment of this history appear in the RECORD today, and continuing segments on the days immediately following.

Each reader of this compilation, Mr. Speaker, will draw his own conclusions from it. But to me the single thing that stands out as I reexamine this document is the fact that MDTA began as a bipartisan undertaking, and that the degree of unanimity in the Congress grew steadily from 1962, when the original legislation passed with ease, to the last amendments, which were able to secure the unanimous approval of both Houses. I will not run the risk of offending anyone by leaving anyone out, so I will not try the enormous task of listing all the Members of the Congress who had an important part to play in the development of this legislation. Suffice it to say that the list includes ex-Members, present Members, Representatives and Senators, Democrats and Republicans. MDTA, Mr. Speaker, has had a very productive first decade. I trust it will continue to develop, in a bipartisan manner, to meet continually changing needs.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the first installment of this documentary history, "MDTA in the 87th Congress."

The first installment of the documentary follows:

[87th CONGRESS, 1st session, Senate Report No. 651]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

July 31, 1961.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. Clark, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following report together with Individual views—to accompany S. 1991.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill S. 1991, relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and ultilization, having considered the same, unanimously report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

BASIC OBJECTIVES OF THE BILL

S. 1991 was proposed in a message to the Congress by the President on May 29, 1961. It seeks to deal with one major aspect of the problem of unemployment in the United States by enabling workers whose skills have become obsolete to receive training which will qualify them to obtain and hold jobs. Its provisions will also contribute to the upgrading of many employed persons, so that they can make a greater contribution to the national economy.

No one can state with accuracy exactly what proportion of the current unemployment level of 5,600,000 can be attributed to the various causes of unemployment—cyclical, seasonal, structural, and frictional. But there is agreement among all who have studied the problem that a substantial portion of our unemployment exists because idle workers cannot be matched with available jobs. This structural unemployment will persist even when recovery from the recent recession is complete and we are approaching maximum employment and production as defined in the Employment Act of 1946.

There are a number of reasons why unemployment continues even during the boom phase of the business cycle. One is the concentration of large numbers of unemployed in a relatively few depressed areas; the Area Redevelopment Act, passed by the Congress earlier this year, was designed to help guide some of our economic growth into those areas. A second major reason is the absence, in many hundreds of thousands of the unemployed, of any skill which is needed in the present-day economy.

The more rapidly our economy advances, the more rapidly do skills become obsolete. With the growth of automation, we can anticipate that the need for continuous retraining of the labor force will become more and more pressing. Much of this retraining is now carried on by public educational authorities, assisted by the Federal Government's vocational education program, and much is done by private schools. But it is clear that this combined Federal, State,

local, and private effort falls far short of the total need, and that without an intensive, nationwide program to provide opportunities for retraining, tens of thousands of worthy men and women will never be able to obtain the skills which will enable them to be self-supporting and to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's productivity.

S. 1991 establishes such a program. It directs the Secretary of Labor to take the lead in determining the training needs of the Nation, in consultation with local authorities. It provides funds for establishing training programs, primarily through the existing public educational authorities. It authorizes the payment of subsistence allowances to unemployed persons, who have had 3 years work experience and who are heads of families, during the time they are enrolled in training. It provides that the Secretary of Labor shall report annually on the Nation's manpower requirements and resources, and that the President shall report annually to the Congress.

Safeguards are included to prevent its benefits from being used in the "pirating" of industry from one location to another; to require that States maintain existing levels of expenditure for vocational training from their own funds; and to encourage prospective trainees to accept training at the first opportunity rather than remain on unemployment compensation.

PART A—BACKGROUND

The need for training of the structurally unemployed has become widely recognized and publicized.

Every comprehensive study of the unemployment problem conducted in recent years has identified training, or retraining, as an essential remedy.

The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, in its report dated March 30, 1960, said:

"The committee recommends cooperation by all levels of government to provide greatly expanded facilities for preparing young people to enter the employment market and for assisting older workers whose skills have become unmarketable to obtain retraining. The committee recommends:

"* * * Institution of a nationwide vocational training program through Federal grants-in-aid to the States, including specialized courses for youth who have dropped out of school and for older workers who require retraining."

The minority of that committee, in its separate statement of views, said:

"We further recommend retraining allowances for those who are able to take advantage of retraining opportunities and to maximize such opportunities we recommend that facilities for the retraining of older workers be established where needed."

The 1961 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress points out that:

"While rapid technological progress increases the Nation's productive capabilities and standard of living, it does cause large-scale displacement of workers whose productive efforts and creative abilities are lost to the Nation if not trained for the jobs to be done in an advanced society. Congress and the administration ought to develop immediately the program for large-scale cooperative efforts for retraining workers * * *."

On this issue, the views of the minority were similar. The minority stated:

"Continued economic growth of the wholesome kind creates two major problems. And the more rapid the growth the more aggravated these two problems become. The first problem is that of technological employment and unemployment. Technological advancement, by its very nature, while creating a need for new skills makes obsolete various ways by which men have been making their livelihood. Those ways of making a livelihood most affected are concentrated in the unskilled and semiskilled occupations. * * *

"The problem lies in the process of training and retraining for the skills which are constantly being created. This is a happy problem to deal with, though by no means an easy one or one that does not require considerable effort upon the part of the individuals within our society who must buckle down and start using more of their brains and less of their brawn."

The Committee for Economic Development, in its report on depressed areas released June 4, 1961, expressed strong support for a program of retraining of the unemployed.

The Area Redevelopment Act, enacted in April 1961, authorized a training program, with provisions similar to those in S. 1991, limited to areas eligible for assistance under that act.

Approving editorials have appeared in an unusually large number of leading newspapers and other periodicals throughout the country. A recent public opinion poll disclosed that of all the proposals specified by the President in his second "state of the Union" message, the proposal to train the unemployed was cited by 67 percent of those replying as one for which they were willing to make sacrifices. This was more than twice the degree of support given to any other item listed.

Many feature articles and syndicated columns have likewise discussed the possibilities and prospects of a nationwide effort in this regard.

Bills to establish a nationwide program of training, centering upon the retraining of the unemployed, were introduced in the 86th and early in the 87th Congress.

During subcommittee hearings, held both in Washington and in six cities in three States, a wide range of witnesses endorsed the conception underlying the bill, and supported the bill itself. Not a single witness opposed it.

It is against the backdrop of general recognition of the widespread need that the committee has acted unanimously to support the President's program.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

The manpower problems to which this program is addressed include the need of our complex society for employees with more sophisticated skills; the dilemma of the unemployed whose skills have been made obsolete by automation and other changes in the structure of the economy; and the fate of the unskilled, whether employed or not, in a market with diminishing demand for unskilled labor.

The problem is intensified by the enormous increase in the numbers of youth, many of whom are entering the labor market without sufficient levels of training and education to meet the complicated requirements of jobs that are and will be available in our highly advanced industrial society.

In good times and bad there is a hard core of unemployed persons whose identity changes only slowly—those whose skills have become obsolete; the unskilled especially those without high school education; older workers; minority groups; and the youth. For many months now, approximately 900,000 American citizens have been out of work more than 6 months.

A key problem to which the bill is addressed is automation and other technological advance, an essential and desirable process for augmenting the strength of the United States and the viability of its economy. We must have a strong, progressive, and technologically powerful economy to meet the demands that press on us from inside and outside our borders, to maintain and improve our Military Establishment, and lead the forces of freedom in a divided world. Our Nation cannot fully realize its technological potential unless our work force is given the opportunity to acquire the new skills that are required by the changes in technology.

Moreover, it is patently unfair to permit the burdens of higher productivity to fall disproportionately on a few among us—those whose jobs are eliminated. The nation which benefits from increased productivity has the responsibility to provide the means by which employees who are displaced can acquire new jobs by which they can sustain their living standards.

As President Kennedy stated in his message on urgent national needs:

"* * * The Government must consider additional long-range measures to curb * * * unemployment and increase our economic growth, if we are to sustain our full role as world leaders. * * *

"I am therefore transmitting to the Congress a new manpower development and training program, to train or retrain several hundred thousand workers, particularly in those areas where we have seen critical unemployment as a result of technological factors, in new occupational skills over a 4-year period, in order to replace those skills made obsolete by automation and industrial change with the new skills which new processes demand. * * *"

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, referring to the structurally unemployed in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on March 7, 1961, said:

"Actions best suited to helping these groups would appear to include more training and retraining to develop skills needed in expanding industries; provision of more and better information about job opportunities for various skills in various local labor markets. * * *"

Some of the causes that have rendered the skills of many persons obsolete were pointed out by Secretary of Labor Goldberg:

"During the postwar period, productivity in the soft coal industry nearly doubled, rising from 6.4 tons per man-day in 1947 to 12.2 tons in 1959. During this same period the number of coal miners fell by 262,000. Productivity in the Nation's railroads during this same period rose by 65 percent. In physical terms freight ton-miles (including their equivalent passenger miles) rose from 530,300 per employee in 1947 to 719,900 in 1959. The number of workers employed by the railroads fell enormously, by 540,000. Many of the so-called depressed areas in the Nation can be traced to these declines in employment in the coal-mining and railroad industries.

"Employment opportunities have declined markedly in many industries which formerly provided steady work, good wages, and a secure future for millions of American workers. In many centers of these industries, abandonment of older plants, or shifts in methods of production have caused the discharge of workers with long employment records, despite the protection of seniority rights.

"Production and related jobs in the auto industry have been declining almost steadily, from 767,100 in 1953 to 612,600 in 1960. In the basic steel industry, technological changes, at present, are moving ahead rapidly and the trend in the number of production and maintenance jobs is downward. The electrical machinery industry is undergoing a period of rapid technological change. Production and maintenance jobs in this industry have dropped. Indeed, the total number of factory production and maintenance jobs has actually declined by 1½ million over the last 7 years."

Productivity increases in agriculture have also been reducing manpower needs in that field at about twice the rate this process has been proceeding in nonagricultural employment. And yet, as Secretary Goldberg pointed out:

"At the same time that old jobs are being wiped out, new ones are being created. To-

day's unemployed are faced with want and calling for persons engaged in transistorized circuitry, inertial guidance, ferret reconnaissance, human factors science, gyrodynamics and data telemetry, job titles all but unknown a half dozen years ago."

THE IMPORTANCE OF RELATING TRAINING TO JOBS

Throughout our hearings, witnesses emphasized the importance of relating training to actual job opportunities in the rapidly changing labor market. Training which does not lead to employment is not only a waste of money but also a cause of frustration for the person trained. This bill has, therefore, been drawn to insure that the person undertaking training will do so with a strong likelihood of obtaining a job related to his training.

In this connection, Mr. J. T. Hammond, chairman of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, testified that:

"Our experience has made it evident that training and retraining programs are desirable and productive only if there is a reasonable potential for employment in the field for which the applicants will be trained. Retraining is not a substitute for employment and unless the latter is a result of retraining our goal is not achieved. The primary problem in developing our training program is to determine, on a community basis, the areas in which retraining will result in employment for the trainee."

While witnesses before the subcommittee pointed out that retraining can be most effective in an expanding economy in which new job opportunities are being rapidly created, they were agreed that even in times of serious recession, with great numbers of unemployed, large numbers of jobs remain unfilled because people with adequate skills cannot be found.

Kenneth E. Carl, Director of the Williamsport (Pa.) Technical Institute, told the subcommittee that:

"In 14 major labor market areas of Pennsylvania, I compiled a list of 228 occupations for which there were jobs open at that time (1959). All of these occupations were listed with the Pennsylvania State Employment Service. Jobs were going begging at that time (1959), just as they are today, for the lack of skilled and trained people. But I emphasize, they are skilled, technical, and professional jobs; jobs for which education and training are a must."

J. Fred Ingram, State director, vocational education for the State of Alabama, testified:

"* * * we have the peculiar situation whereby there are shortages of workers in certain particular occupations and areas of work.

"I have in my hand a complete full page of ads that appeared in the Birmingham News of yesterday, ads that were paid for by firms that are seeking qualified workers in many occupations. Yet in the State of Alabama we have 90,000 people who are hunting jobs.

"The shortages are due to the fact that there are no workers presently available with the necessary training and experience for these jobs. Furthermore, there are other areas of the country outside of our own State which could absorb to advantage many of our present unemployed workers if they could be retrained in new skills that are in demand * * *."

The committee also heard testimony to this effect from Michigan, West Virginia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Louisiana, and Ohio.

While the number of unskilled jobs in the economy remains approximately constant, the demand for skilled and semiskilled workers is constantly rising. According to the Department of Labor's projections, the number of professional and technical workers needed by 1970 will be at least 40 percent higher than in 1960; there will be 20- to 30-percent increases in the number of proprietors and managers, clerical and sales workers, skilled workers and those in service occupations. It thus is clear that the greatest opportunities for employment will be in those occupations requiring the most education and training, and such new jobs are continually becoming available.

A word of caution is necessary. Training for the unemployed is not a panacea for the problem of unemployment nor a cure for the malfunction of our economy. Training does not of itself produce jobs, except in extraordinary cases. To bring unemployment down from the current figure of 6.8 percent of the labor force to tolerable levels will require many other kinds of public and private action. Training will, however, raise the productivity potential of the economy and thus raise the potential limitations upon economic growth. It will provide a measure of hope for those with newly acquired skills that they will be considered for employment, along with others, when jobs are available—in short, it will remove a disability, a qualification, under which many jobseekers of today find gainful and stable employment unavailable.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The manpower problems to which this bill is addressed are national problems. While significant accomplishments have been made by industry, labor, and local government in dealing with dislocations that have occurred in certain areas, the total problem is too great for local capacities alone. Moreover, the labor market is a national market and if its needs are to be met national leadership is required.

The competition for the education dollar at the State and local level is already intense. Indeed, many of the criticisms leveled at vocational education can be directly traced to inadequate funds for competent instructors and for modern equipment upon which to learn up-to-date skills.

Although funds allotted to the States under the Federal vocational education acts could in theory be used for the training of unemployed persons, only a few States have made such use of these funds and then only to a negligible extent. Federal funds allotted to States under the Federal vocational education acts, the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, are so completely used by schools with long established programs of vocational education for young people that a new program entirely independent of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden programs is necessary in order to provide the type of training for older workers who need jobs.

The success of a program to train the unemployed is not simply a question of funds for training expenses. Experience has clearly shown the necessity of supplementing such training with training allowances. In most States an unemployed person taking training is considered unavailable for employment and thus disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. The bill reported would remedy this defect by providing training allowances from Federal appropriations when unemployment insurance was not available. It is estimated that more than 50 percent of the funds authorized by this program will be expended on training allowances, and Federal leadership is the only practicable means for starting such a program.

The Federal responsibility for assisting States in providing training opportunities for the unemployed or underemployed is likewise clear. In its declaration of policy, the Unemployment Act of 1946 states:

"The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purposes of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

S. 1991 is one method by which the Federal Government can meet the obligations imposed upon it by the Employment Act of 1946.

Past programs of occupational training have been in specified or well recognized occupational areas such as nursing, agriculture, distributive trades, etc. The program authorized by this bill, emphasizing relatively short term training, will cover every possible occupation for which there are opportunities for gainful employment. Despite the priority given training for employment within a State, no one State can determine national skill development needs or judge the adequacy of the national skill development effort. American labor is mobile. It crosses State lines to seek employment opportunities. Training, therefore, unless it is to be wasted or duplicated, must be undertaken in the context of national skill needs and employment opportunities.

PART B—MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL—MANPOWER APPRAISAL

Title I of the bill makes more specific the responsibilities of the Federal Government in matters of manpower.

To a considerable degree, title I of the bill is a restatement of existing responsibilities of the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor now possesses the authority to evaluate the impact of automation, the mobility of labor, and conduct research and information activities in the manpower field. What is added is a specific directive "to appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development effort" as a whole and analyze manpower requirements, resources, and use to provide a sound basis for public and private training efforts throughout the country.

That the Secretary undertake these tasks is in the interest of avoiding waste, providing a focus for the coordination of Government activities affecting manpower requirements development and utilization, and making it possible for the Nation to meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom.

The Secretary will report to the President on manpower matters, and the President will transmit an annual manpower report to the Congress.

ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS AND SELECTION OF TRAINEES

Based upon his analysis of manpower requirements and resources, the Secretary is given the responsibility for promoting the development of training programs, and for the selection of trainees and referral of them for training.

The Secretary testified that his expectation is to use the existing offices in the field; thus, the State employment services throughout the United States will, under the general guidance of the Secretary, be directly responsible for carrying out this program.

The person desiring training will apply to his local employment office. He will be interviewed and tested. He will be counseled on the possibilities of employment for which he seems fitted. Then he will be formally referred to the appropriate training program. Upon completion of the program the employment office will endeavor to find him employment. As noted earlier, training courses will be used to the fullest possible extent on actual job opportunities.

It is evident that the large-scale program envisaged by this bill will require extensive upgrading, both in quality and in quantity of the personnel of these State employment offices. In too many States and localities, these institutions are weak, and preoccupied with the mechanics of recordkeeping and paying unemployment benefits. Frequently the employment offices are not suitably located for handling white-collar occupations. The committee has taken notice of the many studies surveying the employment services,[1] which invariably recognize their weaknesses. These must be corrected if the tasks provided by this bill are to be performed.

Preliminary to a training program in any locality, it is necessary to ascertain what employment opportunities in what occupations are, or are likely to be, available. The area skill survey is the standard technique for this purpose (an example has been included at p. 43 of the hearings). But the schedule of such surveys will have to be substantially speeded. For example, the area skill survey program in Michigan at its present rate would not be completed for 10 years. It should be finished in not more than 3 years, if the training program is not to become an empty promise, and thereafter it should be continually rechecked to be certain that it is up to date. It is the hope of the committee that sufficient funds for these purposes will be provided.

The Secretary of Labor, testifying before the committee, made an eloquent summation of the task before him:

"Let me tell you now of some of the problems with which we must come to grips in making the proposal work and something of the methods we intend to use.

"We must make an assessment of where the Nation stands with respect to the adequacy of our human resources. We must measure our future manpower requirements and our future manpower supply on an occupational basis. In short, we must do the things necessary to know our automation and other changes in our economy are likely to affect the demand for specific skills in the future.

"In general, we already know that the labor market will demand of workers more basic education and more thorough training, but we need more specific information. We need to know, for example, how the technological changes which are now occurring in the construction industry are likely to affect the demand for plumbers, electricians, civil engineers, etc. We also need to know how technological changes in office operations will affect white collar workers, particularly office workers. We must find out how changes in technology, consumer demand, and foreign competition are likely to affect the location of various industries and needs in different occupations. We must know the specifics of labor demand and supply area by area. We must determine how workers can best adjust to the geographical shifting of industries and what methods we can use to enhance their occupational mobility.

"Before individuals are selected for training, we need to know not only the needs of our industries, but also a lot about each individual worker. We have to know, for example, how much basic education he has had, the amount and kind of his previous skill training, and his aptitude for different kinds of work. The obvious need for this kind of information and other facts bearing on the individual's occupational potential suggests that this first step is a job for professionally trained counselors. In this initial step in the training program, we will utilize to the fullest the counseling facilities of the local State employment service offices. Although such services already exist, they will have to be greatly expanded to do the kind of job that will be necessary. We have already launched a program of expanded services at the direction of the President, but even more will have to be done.

"But even after the occupational potential of the trainee is established, a second important step must be taken before actual training can begin. Assessment must be made of the employment prospects in the field for which the unemployed person is best suited for training. This calls for an analysis of the long-term prospects in particular occupations and particular areas, as well as the outlook immediately ahead. Realistically, we must also consider the demand for the skills which we can give the trainee in areas other than his own hometown. In this country where mobility of the labor force is so great, this is a particularly important consideration.

"Having established the individual's needs and capacity for training the job world into which his needs and capacities must fit, we must then determine the kind of training best suited to his individual situation. Vocational training will often prove to be the best, but in many cases a completely different type of training might be called for. We intend to use every available resource and facility that can equip a trainee with the necessary skill to enable him to take his place again in the Nation's work force. Experience may teach us that new training methods and facilities need to be developed to insure that each individual gets the kind of training that is best for him.

"I should like to stress that the retraining program for each unemployed person will be determined by examining his or her needs. Unemployed persons will be counseled to assess what they already have to offer on the job market; their potential for retraining. For some workers the retraining may be very simple. In other cases, the task of retraining and placement may be difficult. Older workers with low levels of education and deep roots in their own communities are likely to be severe problems.

"In any case, the training or retraining prescribed will match the individual's needs. It is for this reason we are proposing that a wide range of training institutions be used to meet our retraining objectives. Sometimes a few weeks of on-the-job instruction may make the unemployed worker reemployable. Sometimes a course in drafting or electronics will turn the trick. In a few cases perhaps the 4 or 5 months needed to complete work for a high school diploma would be worthwhile to enhance permanently the employability of an unemployed worker. In still other cases, apprenticeship or technical school instruction may provide the best answer."

TRAINING ALLOWANCE

The unemployed person whose skills suddenly become obsolete faces special hardships. He may have spent a number of years in his old job and become accustomed to better than average pay, bringing with it a high standard of living for himself and his family. He will find difficulty in finding a new employer because many companies have age limitations in hiring. He probably has made commtiments for payments on his home, life insurance, and other household goods. He may have prepared his children for a college education.

His hopes and his self-respect are in jeopardy—in jeopardy not because of his own shortcomings or because of a temporary recession, but because his employment relationship has been severed permanently. If he is a coal miner, the consumer's need for coal may have been met by other fuels; if a semiskilled factory hand, his firm may have failed or may have been relocated many miles away. Foreign competition displaces domestic producers. Machinery and automated equipment eliminate whole employee classifications. These are examples of structural unemployment—unemployment caused by some structural change in the economy—and studies have shown that such unemployment is likely to be of long duration.

The person who is structurally unemployed is confronted with an immediate reduction in his payscale if he can find work, or dependency on unemployment insurance.[2]

Unless such a laid-off person receives financial assistance, he will probably be unable to afford retraining. The incentive for abandoning training when even odd jobs are available will disrupt his plans for completing his occupational rehabilitation, and in most States, he will be disqualified from unemployment insurance when he takes training.

For all these reasons, S. 1991 authorizes training allowances at levels in each State equal to unemployment insurance benefits. In the event the training program includes part-time on-the-job training for which the employer pays learners' wages, the training allowance will be reduced proportionately.

Under some circumstances training for certain jobs will be available only in a location far removed from a trainee's residence. Some courses which require relatively heavy investment in teaching equipment, for example, may be given at only one location in a particular State. The bill provides modest living and transportation expenses for the individual certified for training if he lives beyond commuter distance of the training center.

With the exception of limited amounts for supplementing earnings of youth undergoing on-the-job training, training allowances will be limited to persons not receiving unemployment insurance who are heads of families and who have had a minimum work experience of at least 3 years. As a further safeguard against abuse, the committee further provided that an individual who fails to avail himself of training when it is offered to him will be disqualified from receiving benefits for 6 months. The committee believes the Secretary, under his rulemaking authority, may further restrict the payment of training allowances when he has reasons to believe a given individual has postponed his training period in order to protect the period of insurance benefits before availing himself of the training allowances. The committee does not intend, however, to limit in any way the amounts paid under the unemployment insurance program, nor in any way to compel a person to take training against his wishes.

TRAINING RESPONSIBILITIES

The assignment of responsibilities under the bill to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been carefully defined. Existing facilities for training will be used to the extent they are available. To the extent that new programs are contemplated, the bill outlines the relationships between the two departments. Both departments have been consulted and endorse the assignment of functions made by the bill. There is sufficient flexibility in the provisions to permit hitherto untried methods of training when this seems appropriate.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be responsible for providing through the State boards of vocational education the training programs especially designed to provide training for the unemployed and underemployed so thatthey may be more readily fitted to immediate or likely employment prospects. The experience of several State boards for vocational education, es-

[1] See, for instance, "Studies on Unemployment Service in a Changing World," William S. Haber; "Readings on Unemployment," pp. 1081–1134, both published by the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, S. Res. 196, 86th Cong.

[2] See "Too Old To Work—Too Young To Retire," a study of the Packard Motor Co. shutdown, Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, S. Res. 196, 86th Cong.

pecially that of Pennsylvania and to a lesser extent those of Michigan, Connecticut, and West Virginia, has contributed materially to the formulation of the committee's bill.

The kind of training contemplated by the bill differs in important respects from traditional vocational training under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. Under those statutes, categories of occupation for which training is to be given are either specified by law or have become stabilized by custom; the allotment of funds to States is made on the basis of formulas unrelated to the distribution or volume of unemployment; in most instances training is provided by local school districts to school-age youth on fairly regular schedules, and the flexibility needed for retraining the unemployed in temporary employment needs is not available.

Under S. 1991, as amended, if a State board finds the training facilities in any given area to be inadequate, or not suitable for the training requested by the Secretary of Labor, the State board may then make arrangements with private educational or training institutions to provide the instruction requested.

If the State board is not in a position to carry out the training and retraining responsibilities in the bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has the authority to make an agreement with public or private educational or training institutions either within the State or convenient thereto to provide such training under the same conditions as would apply if the State boards for vocational education in that State were to assume responsibility.

The committee assumes that a high degree of flexibility in program content will be maintained. The funds provided under the bill will permit rental of buildings for temporary or mobile training programs. The committee recognizes that it would not be feasible to require a specific percentage of employment from a training course in which a given employee is trained. Some training will be of a broader scope than that which would be limited to a specific job opportunity in order to fit the trainee for a wider range of employment. Nor did the committee believe it wise to impose a time limitation on employee placement, as a condition to continuing the course. During periods of recession, job opportunities become increasingly scarce, and to curtail the program sharply to accord with curtailed job openings would result in serious administrative difficulties and loss of instructor personnel. Then, as recovery progressed, it would be difficult expand training as fast as job opportunities developed. For these reasons, while training must be closely related to employment requirements, it should not be directly and exclusively tied to immediate job possibilities.

The Secretary of Labor will develop programs for on-the-job training. This is a function already the responsibility of his Department. To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary of Labor will secure the adoption of such programs by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations, and other industrial and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective on-the-job training programs. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with these groups and may make such provision for payment of the cost of providing necessary training as equitable in each case.

The bill requires a cooperative relationship between the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to insure that each agency will take full advantage of the information and techniques available in the other. In carrying out its on-the-job training functions, the Department of Labor will make the fullest possible use of training facilities which can be made available through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In carrying out its responsibilities for vocational education and training, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will rely upon the information developed by the Department of Labor as to occupational needs of the Nation and particular labor market areas and the potential of individuals selected for training.

A successful program will require maximum effort and close cooperation by the State employment service and education agencies, not only at the Federal level but at the State and local levels as well. The experience in those States, such as Pennsylvania, which have worked out effective cooperative programs, furnishes a pattern which will be useful for other States.

The ultimate success of this program, however, will depend upon the extent to which individual workers accept the opportunity to participate and develop their potential. The training programs authorized by this bill are, therefore, geared both to the skill needs of the economy and the occupational potential of the individuals to be trained.

YOUTH

S. 1991, as proposed by the administration and introduced, would have provided training to all unemployed persons including new entrants into the labor force. S. 2036, also proposed by the administration and under consideration by the committee, would likewise have authorized a program for occupational training for young people between the ages of 16 and 21. Because the overlapping of the two bills gave rise to questions as to their relationship, the committee decided that the training activities for youth should be included in the bill here reported.

Because the problems of training youth, especially those in the younger age bracket who have dropped out of school, are different to some extent from those of adult training, the committee believed it desirable at several points in the bill to provide the Secretary of Labor with special authority in this field. For this reason, the Secretary was given the authority "wherever appropriate" to provide a special program for the testing, counseling, and selection of youth "for occupational training and further schooling."

Testimony before the committee in its consideration of S. 2036 demonstrated a remarkable variety of techniques utilized by many communities in their attempts to ease the transition of teen-age youth from school to adult employment. The transition is reasonably successful for those who complete school and go on to technical or college training. But for those who do not complete school, the problem is acute. This is true not only because such young people are often already unable to adjust to society, but also because the number of jobs available to unskilled workers is a steadily decreasing proportion of the total.

Under these circumstances, various programs involving a combination of employment and formal instruction—sometimes called work-study programs—have been successfully tried on a limited scale. These programs are especially needed in the 10 or 15 largest urban centers where unemployment rates, according to the testimony before the committee, run as high as 70 percent in the 16 to 21 age bracket in some underprivileged neighborhoods.

The committee believes that the Secretary in providing special guidance and counseling programs for such youth should not necessarily limit himself to utilizing U.S. Employment Service facilities. He will find that some local agencies are already providing limited programs of the kind contemplated in this bill. He will have authority to provide special programs in a variety of circumstances and with a variety of techniques. He will be able to promote and encourage further schooling and training combined with different amounts of part-time on-the-job training. Under unusual circumstances he will be able to provide training allowances, where necessary to promote the occupational training envisaged by the program. Great care, however, must be exercised that the amount of such training allowances will be minimal. It is not the committee's intention that the equivalent of a scholarship-type program be available for teen-age unemployed youth who have dropped out of school.

THE UNDEREMPLOYED

The bill gives a priority in training to workers actually unemployed over those who hold jobs but who need their skills upgraded. The committee discussed the possibility of giving a similar priority to underemployed persons, especially when their employment was parttime and at a bare subsistence level.

Because of the difficulty of distinguishing among the various levels and causes of underemployment and the difficulty of defining unemployment, the committee decided against a priority for such individuals and against providing them with training allowances during periods of training.

A special and definable problem exists, however, in the case of rural areas of low-income, subsistence agriculture. Under these circumstances, the committee determined that workers in families whose family income does not exceed $1,200 per year shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of the program.

PRINCIPAL CHANGES IN THE BILL AS INTRODUCED

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute does not change the purposes of the bill as introduced. It nevertheless contains many refinements and important changes which were suggested by witnesses during the hearings or by the members of the committee.

The principal changes are as follows:

"1. The relationships between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were clarified and the functions to be performed under the general supervision of each was more precisely defined.

"2. The Secretary of Labor was given special duties of job counseling and the promotion of training in connection with youth 16 to 21 years of age. The functions authorized here are similar to those recommended by the administration in title I of S. 2036, except for additional flexibility in the choice of programs."

"3. In addition to the manpower reports to be prepared by the Secretary of Labor, an annual manpower report by the President is required.

"4. A requirement for 50–50 State matching of funds after the second year was added.

"5. A proposal for financial assistance in the form of moving expenses to persons relocating in other communities was removed.

"6. For the purposes of the bill, persons in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income are to be considered unemployed.

"7. A number of safeguards against possible abuses were added, including an anti-pirating provision; a requirement for the maintenance of State training effort; a disqualification from receiving training allowances for persons declining training opportunities; limitations on transportation and subsistence allowances; and requirements for detailed reports on the training program.

"8. A National Advisory Committee is created.

"9. An apportionment formula sets forth four criteria to be used in determining an equitable allotment of funds among the States.

"10. Specific ceilings are set upon appropriations for each of the 4 years of the program."

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

I voted to report out S. 1991, as amended, because I believe that this legislation should

have an opportunity to be debated at length on the Senate floor.

While I support the basic aims of this legislation, I reserve the right to offer and support floor amendments which I believe will strengthen this legislation.

BARRY GOLDWATER.

[87th Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 879]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

August 10, 1961.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following report—To accompany H.R. 8399.

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 8399 is designed to provide broad and integrated programs to help workers to adjust to the problems which arise out of automation, rapid technological advances, and other changes in the structure of the economy. It is also designed to provide for the effective development and use of the Nation's manpower to meet the skill requirements of our highly advanced and constantly changing industrial society. Through the development of new on-the-job and vocational education training programs, this bill will provide the unemployed and the underemployed, including those employed persons whose skills are inadequate and need upgrading with the opportunity for training in skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market.

The bill thus seeks not only to deal with a major aspect of the Nation's problem of unemployment, but also to assist in achieving the goal of maximum employment and a more fully productive work force. It recognizes that a large share of the unemployment problem represents not the inability of the economy to create jobs but our failure to train people with the proper skills to qualify them for jobs.

The bill is based on H.R. 7373 which embodied the proposals of the President in this area.

There is agreement among all who have studied the problem that a substantial proportion of our unemployment exists because idle workers do not have the skills necessary to enable them to undertake existing jobs. Many hundreds of thousands of unemployed lack the skills which are needed in our present-day economy. Unless these people acquire new skills, their unemployment will persist even when recovery from the recent recession is completed.

The more rapidly our economy advances and becomes automated, the more rapidly do skills become obsolete, and the need for continuous retraining of the labor force more and more pressing. It is clear that present Federal, State, local, and private efforts fall far short of the total need, and that without an intensive nationwide program to provide opportunities for retraining, all too many men and women will never be able to obtain the skills which will enable them to be self-supporting and to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's productivity.

This bill establishes such a program. Briefly, it directs the Secretary of Labor to take the lead in determining the training needs of the Nation, both on a national basis and on a local basis, in consultation with local authorities. It provides funds for establishing training programs and authorizes the payment of subsistence allowances to unemployed persons during the time they are enrolled in training. The training programs will be provided largely through existing public vocational educational authorities, and also through on-the-job training, a combination of both, or by new methods that may be developed and found effective.

BACKGROUND

The problem

This bill fully reflects the findings made after 2 months of public hearings and another month of gathering additional data by the Holland Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

It was almost unanimously accepted by those who testified before the subcommittee that the present high level of unemployment is the most pressing domestic problem facing the American economy in 1961. Although this legislation is being considered when the economy appears to be on the uptrend, unemployment is still high.

Department of Labor figures for July showed that for the seventh straight month the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment had not dropped below 6.8 percent, and indeed had risen to 6.9 percent as it was in March and May. Total unemployment in July was 5,140,000. In addition, there are some 3.2 million persons who work only part time through no choice of their own.

The Department of Labor figures for July also show, significantly for this legislation, that the number of workers who have been unemployed 6 months or longer has risen from approximately 928,000 in June to 1,026,000.

The evidence also shows that the rate of unemployment for the poorly trained, poorly educated, unskilled workers is about three times as great as for the well trained. It shows that jobs are available, but that for the most part they require more education or skills, or different skills, than many of the unemployed and underemployed now have. Almost three-fourths of the unemployment is among those workers who stopped short of completing high school.

It was shown that agricultural manpower needs are being reduced twice as fast as in the nonagricultural fields. This is due to the increased productivity through the use of mechanization on the farms. This bill authorizes retraining for the underemployed farmer.

In testimony before the Holland subcommittee it was shown that—

"The United States is the first nation in the world where total output (production) continued to rise while employment of production workers continued to decrease.

"Production rose 43 percent—employment of factory workers decreased 10 percent—and our population increased 19 percent during the years 1950–60.

"During the last three recessions, each increased in severity * * * and * * * each prosperity period, following the recession, decreased in length.

"The rate of unemployment grew with each recession * * * and * * * the rate of hard-core unemployment (structural) also grew during the prosperity peaks.

"The 1962 estimated rate of unemployment, under present conditions, will be over 5 percent."

The need for training the hard-core structurally unemployed has become widely recognized and publicized. Every comprehensive study of the unemployed conducted in recent years has identified training or retraining as an essential remedy.

The 1961 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress points out that—

"While rapid technological progress increases the Nation's productive capabilities and standard of living, it does cause large-scale displacement of workers whose productive efforts and creative abilities are lost to the Nation if not trained for the jobs to be done in an advanced society. Congress and the administration ought to develop immediately the program for large-scale cooperative efforts for retraining workers * * *."

On this issue, the views of the minority were similar. The minority stated:

"Continued economic growth of the wholesome kind creates two major problems. And the more rapid the growth the more aggravated these two problems become. The first problem is that of technological employment and unemployment. Technological advancement, by its very nature, while creating a need for new skills makes obsolete various ways by which men have been making their livelihood. Those ways of making a livelihood most affected are concentrated in the unskilled and semiskilled occupations * * *.

"The problem lies in the process of training and retraining for the skills which are constantly being created. This is a happy problem to deal with, though by no means an easy one or one that does not require considerable effort upon the part of the individuals within our society who must buckle down and start using more of their brains and less of their brawn."

The Committee for Economic Development in its report on depressed areas released June 4, 1961, expressed strong support for a program of retraining of the unemployed.

The Area Redevelopment Act, enacted in April 1961, authorized a training program, with provisions similar to those in H.R. 8399, but on a very limited basis and only for areas eligible for assistance under that act.

A large number of leading newspapers and other periodicals throughout the country have recognized the need for a national training effort such as that embodied in this bill. A recent public opinion poll disclosed that of all the proposals specified by the President in his second state of the Union message, the proposals to train the unemployed was cited by 67 percent of those replying as one for which they were willing to make sacrifices. This was more than twice the degree of support given to any other item listed.

In the light of this general recognition of the widespread need for a comprehensive program of training and retraining, the committee has acted to support the President's program.

The manpower problems to which this program is addressed include the need of our complex society for employees with more sophisticated skills; the dilemma of the unemployed whose skills have been made obsolete by automation and other changes in the structure of the economy; and the fate of the unskilled, whether employed or not, in a market with diminishing demand for unskilled labor.

Automation and other technological advancement is an essential and desirable development for maintaining the strength of the United States. We must have a strong, progressive, and technologically powerful nation to meet the demands that press on us from outside our borders; to maintain our great military establishments and lead the forces of freedom in a world divided among men whose technical knowledge has far outstripped their ability to resolve dispute issues.

Our Nation cannot fully realize its technological potential unless our most valuable asset, our work force, is given the opportunity to acquire the new skills that are required by the changes in technology. It is essential to the well-being of our economy that we provide our workers with the training necessary to exploit fully technological advances.

It is just as essential to the welfare of the individual worker who finds it difficult to adjust to the changing needs of a rapidly advancing technology that he be trained. Automation and technological change can make obsolete the skills and impair the livelihood of individual displaced workers.

This bill is designed to provide the means by which those who through no fault of their own have lost their jobs and their hard-won skills, or who early in life have entered the labor force without adequate skills, can acquire skills which will give them the opportunity to become productive members of their communities.

We must not expect the workers who are displaced to bear the whole burden of higher productivity. The whole Nation which benefits from increased productivity has the responsibility to provide the means by which the employees who are displaced can acquire new skills that are needed and will be useful in the economy.

The number of unskilled jobs is constantly declining and the demand for skilled and semiskilled workers is constantly rising. According to the Department of Labor's projections, the number of professional and technical workers needed by 1970 will be at least 40 percent higher than in 1960; there will be a 20 to 30 percent increase in the number of proprietors and managers, clerical and sales workers, skilled workers and those in service occupations. It thus is clear that the greatest opportunities for employment will be in those occupations requiring the most education and training.

Some of the events that have caused the skills of many persons to become obsolete were forcefully pointed out by witnesses before the Holland subcommittee.

"In the steel industry, production and shipments for the years 1950 and 1960 were almost identical, but production worker employment showed a drop of 80,000 workers and a decline in the workweek of 3.3 hours (David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO).

"In the soft coal industry, from 1947 to 1959, productivity doubled but there were 262,000 less jobs for the coal miners (Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers of America).

The computers that are the brains of automation can perform a hundred thousand tasks, from rolling steel to deciding how many frankfurter rolls a bakery driver should leave at a Third Avenue delicatessen on a rainy summer Friday.

They design, in an hour, a new chemical plant that would take a platoon of engineers a year—monitor space vehicles on their way to the moon—coach baseball players—govern switches and signals on 35,000 miles of railroad track from a single remote control center—collect eggs in an electronic henhouse—refine oil—issue insurance policies—operate acres of industrial machinery—and provide the guideposts for billions of dollars in corporate decisions.

One thing the computers cannot do, however, is tell how many workers have been added to the Nation's hard core of unemployment by the technological progress they so strikingly exemplify (A. H. Raskin, New York Times).

Each computer installation affects 140 jobs and, in 1961, there are 10,000 such installations to be made. Therefore, 1,400,000 clerical workers will feel the effect of this.

A machine was demonstrated to the American Bar Association that did 7 man-hours of legal research in a matter of minutes (Howard Coughlin, president, Office Employees International Union, AFL–CIO).

In the canning and preserving industries there has been a very substantial rise in output since 1947, but the rise in productivity has been even steeper. As a result, even in this very rapidly expanding industry, the total of jobs has dropped from 211,000 in 1947 to 193,000 in 1960 (P.E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO).

"We seem to have automated our country sufficiently to supply all of the basic demands and a good many luxuries and still involve only 93 percent of our work force.

"We can't argue that technological change and automation are not labor-saving processes. Of course they are. They do cause displacement of people. In fact, to do so is one of their major purposes. They may also upgrade people or increase the prosperity of an industry so that more are employed. Nevertheless, we do have more unemployment than we can tolerate today and some of it has come from technological change and automation.

"The problem before us, however, is not whether to block technology. The problem is how to block unemployment (Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of IBM Corp.).

"Productivity in the Nation's railroads increased 65 percent from 1947 to 1959, but 540,000 railroad workers' jobs were gone (W. P. Kennedy, president Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen).

"Because of the shift from airplanes to missiles, it has been estimated that the aircraft industry alone has eliminated 200,000 production jobs in the past few years even though the industry's dollar volume has continued to rise (A. J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO).

"In the production of electrical appliances, output jumped tremendously and employment dropped 50 percent since 1953 (James B. Carey, president, International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO)."

Other witnesses who testified before the Holland committee stressed the employment implications of automation, technological change, and the large number of new entrants into the labor market that can be expected in the decade of the 1960's and urged governmental action to deal with this problem.

"Some idea of the immediate problems ahead can be seen from the fact that, even if all we do is increase our production at the same rate as we have been doing during the past dozen-odd years since the end of World War II, a total of 1.8 million persons will feel the impact of the technological changes just in the year ahead. In other words, we are going to need enough output increases between now and next year to take care of 1.8 million people affected by productivity change.

"This decade will seen an unparalleled 26 million new young workers coming into the job market—and if current levels prevail, 7½ million of them will be dropouts, without a high school diploma and very ill-fitted for the job world ahead which will see major advances on the technological scene (Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor).

"During the 1960's it will be necessary to create an even greater number of job opportunities—perhaps as many as 4 million a year to provide employment for the average yearly growth in the labor force and the possible annual displacement of workers from rising productivity (Stanley Ruttenberg, director of research, AFL–CIO).

"If, in spite of the best planning we can do, some people are temporarily unemployed because of technological change, both industry and government have a recognized responsibility to help families through any such period of transition (Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board of General Electric).

"It is the responsibility of the Government to anticipate and to identify those trends which will create chronic unemployment problems in the future, and it has the responsibility to participate in the solution of those problems once they occur.

"It is the Government's responsibility for objectively and thoroughly identifying and studying the problems presented by chronic unemployment and then developing reasonable and practical plans of action to relieve them.

"There is a delicate balance here between rushing into a situation before adequate plans are made and the other extreme of procrastinating until the problem is virtually beyond hope. It, therefore, becomes apparent that the problem of organizing to meet this problem is a critical one.

"A number of possible solutions have been suggested, including a high-level Federal agency which would coordinate Federal activities and would work closely with State and local governments. There are some people who would insist that the Federal Government stay out of the picture. You and I know that is impossible, because there are certain aspects of the problem, certain critically distressed areas, for example, that will require the kind of massive support that only the Federal Government can provide.

"It seems to me that these are the remedial steps that can be taken:

"1. An objective and thorough study to determine the extent, locations, and underlying cause of chronic unemployment.

"2. A greatly strengthened program of vocational training, to train the untrained and to retrain those whose original skills are no longer needed.

"3. More effective career guidance for young people.

"4. Better information about employment opportunities in other portions of a given State, or elsewhere in the country (Mr. Don G. Mitchell, vice chairman of the board of General Telephone & Electronic Corp.)."

The need for Federal assistance

Since 1946, the Federal Government has been charged with the responsibility "to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power." The Full Employment Act of 1946 states:

"The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practical means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

In order to permit the Federal Government to carry out these obligations and responsibilities, this committee feels that the passage of this bill is necessary.

The manpower problems to which this bill is addressed are national problems. While significant accomplishments have been made by industry, labor, and local government in dealing with dislocations that have occurred in certain areas, the total problem is too great for local capacities alone. Moreover, the labor market is a national market and if its needs are to be met national leadership is required.

No one State can determine national skill development needs or judge the adequacy of the national skill development effort. American labor is mobile. It crosses State lines to seek employment opportunities. Training, therefore, unless it is to be wasted or duplicated, must be undertaken in the context of national skill needs and employment opportunities.

The success of a person to train the unemployed is not simply a question of funds for training expenses. Experience has clearly shown the necessity of supplementing such training with training allowances. In most States an unemployed person taking training is considered unavailable for employment and thus disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits. The bill re-

ported would remedy this defect by providing training allowances from Federal appropriations when unemployment insurance is not available. It is estimated that a large part of the funds authorized by this program will be expended on training allowances, and Federal leadership is the only practicable means for starting such a program.

Training for the unemployed is, of course, not a cure-all for the problem of unemployment and the malfunction of our economy. Training will, however, raise the productivity potential of the economy and thus raise the potential limitations upon economic growth. It will give those with newly acquired skills the knowledge that they will be considered for employment, along with others, when jobs are available.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Manpower appraisal

One of the important elements of this proposal is the assignment to the Secretary of Labor, in order to further the broad training purposes of the bill, of additional responsibilities in the overall manpower field.

Title I of the bill will enable the Secretary of Labor to establish a continuing review of the national skill development effort and to recommend actions needed to achieve improved balance between occupational resources and requirements. Combining these manpower functions in one agency will give much needed overall unity to the Federal Government's responsibility for leadership in the field of skill development. It will also more effectively relate the separate activities of the various agencies in this field to an overall program of optimum development and employment of manpower resources.

To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological programs, while avoiding or minimizing the harsh and tragic consequences of labor displacement, title I also requires the Secretary of Labor to evaluate the impact of automation on the utilization of the Nation's labor force, to appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs, and to arrange for the conduct of such research investigations as give promise of furthering the purposes of this proposal.

Many of the beneficial practices that have evolved as a byproduct of labor-management relations (e.g., pension plans and other fringe benefits) here introduced rigidities that impeded labor force adjustments and mobility, thus contributing to unnecessary unemployment. Title I, therefore, directs the Secretary of Labor to make intensive factual studies of what causes lack of occupational mobility and to encourage the voluntary adoption of equitable means by which these impediments might be removed. It also directs the Secretary of Labor to study and report on how the gradual retirement of long-service workers, the vesting of pension rights, and the development of other devices freeing the laid-off workers from equity losses incurred by moving might be encouraged by Government and private actions.

Title I authorizes the Secretary of Labor to develop, compile, and make available information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, the labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, or other area or appropriate basis. This is in effect an inventory of the occupational resources and needs of the Nation which will be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under other provisions of this act.

Finally, title I will require the Secretary of Labor to report to the President on manpower matters, and the President to transmit an annual manpower report to the Congress.

Selection of trainees

Under title II of the bill, the Secretary of Labor is given the responsibility for promoting the development of training programs, for the selection of trainees through testing and counseling, and for referral of them for training.

The committee recognizes the fact that the ultimate success of this program depends upon individual participation and the desire of the individual to develop his potential. For this reason, the bill specifies that the Secretary of Labor institute programs for testing, counseling, and selecting individuals for training in skills which, when acquired, can reasonably be expected to enable them to secure full-time employment. It is expected that the facilities already in existence to perform testing, counseling, and placement, as well, will be expanded rather than establishing new facilities to perform these functions.

The person desiring training will apply to his local employment office. He will be interviewed and tested. He will be counseled on the possibilities of employment for which he seems fitted. Then he will be formally referred to the appropriate training program. Upon completion of the program the employment office will endeavor to find him employment.

The Secretary of Labor, testifying before the committee, gave an excellent summary of the task before him:

"Let me tell you now of some of the problems with which we must come to grips in making the proposal work and something of the methods we intend to use.

"We must make an assessment of where the Nation stands with respect to the adequacy of our human resources. We must measure our future manpower requirements and our future manpower supply on an occupational basis. In short, we must do the things necessary to know how automation and other changes in our economy are likely to affect the demand for specific skills in the future.

"In general, we already know that the labor market will demand of workers more basic education and more thorough training, but we need more specific information. We need to know, for example, how the technological changes which are now occurring in the construction industry are likely to affect the demand for plumbers, electricians, civil engineers, etc. We also need to know how technological changes in office operations will affect white collar workers, particularly office workers. We must find out how changes in technology, consumer demand, and foreign competition are likely to affect the location of various industries and needs in different occupations. We must know the specifics of labor demand and supply area by area. We must determine how workers can best adjust to the geographical shifting of industries and what methods we can use to enhance their occupational mobility.

"Before individuals are selected for training, we need to know not only the needs of our industries, but also a lot about each individual worker. We have to know, for example, how much basic education he has had, the amount and kind of his previous skill training, and his aptitude for different kinds of work. The obvious need for this kind of information and other facts bearing on the individual's occupational potential suggests that this first step is a job for professionally trained counselors. In this initial step in the training program, we will utilize to the fullest the counseling facilities of the local State employment service offices. Although such services already exist, they will have to be greatly expanded to do the kind of job that will be necessary. We have already launched a program of expanded services at the direction of the President, but even more will have to be done.

"But even after the occupational potential of the trainee is established, a second important step must be taken before actual training can begin. Assessment must be made of the employment prospects in the field for which the unemployed person is best suited for training. This calls for an analysis of the long-term prospects in particular occupations and particular areas, as well as the outlook immediately ahead. Realistically, we must also consider the demand for the skills which we can give the trainee in areas other than his own hometown. In this country where mobility of the labor force is so great, this is a particularly important consideration.

"Having established the individual's needs and capacity for training and the job world into which his needs and capacities must fit, we must then determine the kind of training best suited to his individual situation. Vocational training will often prove to be the best, but in many cases a completely different type of training might be called for. We intend to use every available resource and facility that can equip a trainee with the necessary skill to enable him to take his place again in the Nation's work force. Experience may teach us that new training methods and facilities need to be developed to insure that each individual gets the kind of training that is best for him.

"I should like to stress that the retraining program for each unemployed person will be determined by examining his or her needs. Unemployed persons will be counseled to assess what they already have to offer on the job market; their potential for retraining. For some workers the retraining may be very simple. In other cases, the task of retraining and placement may be difficult. Older workers with low levels of education and deep roots in their own communities are likely to be severe problems.

"In any case, the training or retraining prescribed will match the individual's needs. It is for this reason we are proposing that a wide range of training institutions be used to meet our retraining objectives. Sometimes a few weeks of on-the-job instruction may make the unemployed worker reemployable. Sometimes a course in drafting or electronics will turn the trick. In a few cases perhaps the 4 or 5 months needed to complete work for a high school diploma would be worthwhile to enhance permanently the employability of an unemployed worker. In still other cases, apprenticeship or technical school instruction may provide the best answer."

Priority in placement for training

The bill requires that a priority in referral for training must be extended to unemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without retraining. The committee discussed the possibility of giving a similar priority to underemployed persons, especially when their employment was part time and at a bare subsistence level.

Because of the difficulty of distinguishing among the various levels and causes of underemployment, the committee decided against a priority for such individuals and against providing them with training allowances during periods of training.

However, the Secretary of Labor is specifically authorized to refer qualified persons, including the underemployed, for training or retraining programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills.

The committee wishes to emphasize that training not geared to employment opportunities is wasteful and demoralizing to those persons participating in the program. The Department of Labor is expected to operate the selection program so that workers undertaking training will do so with the strong likelihood that jobs will be available in the area in which they live. If adequate job opportuntiies, after training, will not be available in their home areas, training will be given first to those individuals who indicate that they voluntarily and without any

compulsion desire to relocate to areas where the skills they are to learn are in demand.

Training Programs; Cooperative Effort

The Committee on Education and Labor found it was best to coordinate the training programs envisaged in this proposed legislation so that the full efforts, expertise, talents, and facilities of both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could be fully utilized. The bill strengthens the cooperative relationship between these Departments and each will have full advantage of the information and techniques available to the other.

Title III specifies the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor for on-the-job training while title IV specifies the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for vocational education programs. Title V, in addition to establishing criteria which the Secretary of Labor should consider in allocating funds to the States, also pertains to the duties and responsibilities of both the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare to keep the Congress informed, and contains a provision that the individual States must not slacken their own efforts in the training field because of the initiation of the Federal program.

The development of programs for on-the-job training is already a function of the Department of Labor. To the maximum extent possible, the Secretary of Labor will secure the adoption of such programs by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations, and other industrial and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective on-the-job training programs. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with these groups and may make such provision for payment of costs of providing necessary training as is equitable in each case.

Vocational education programs are presently a responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For the purpose of carrying out his training mission under this bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is thus authorized to enter into agreements with the States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide the vocational training or retraining needed to equip individuals referred by the Secretary of Labor for the occupations specified in the referrals. Training is to be provided by the State agency through public education agencies or institutions or, if the facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. If a State does not enter into an agreement or does not provide the particular training needed, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

A successful program will require maximum effort and close cooperation by the State employment service and education agencies, not only at the Federal level but at the State and local levels as well. The experience in those States, such as Pennsylvania, which have worked out effective cooperative programs, furnishes a pattern which will be useful for other States.

Existing facilities for training will be used to the extent they are available. To the extent that new programs are contemplated, the bill outlines the relationships between the two Departments. Both Departments have been consulted and endorse the assignment of functions made by the bill. There is sufficient flexibility in the provisions to permit hitherto untried methods of training when this seems appropriate.

The committee believes that a high degree of flexibility in organizing and content of programs should be maintained. The bill will permit rental of buildings and facilities for temporary or mobile training programs. Furthermore, while training must be closely related to employment requirements, it should not have to be tied directly or exclusively to immediate job possibilities. In order to fit the trainee for a wide range of employment, some training will be of a broader scope than that which would be limited to a specific job opportunity. During periods of recession, job opportunities become increasingly scarce, and to curtail the program sharply to accord with curtailed job openings would result in serious administrative difficulties and loss of instructor personnel. Then, as recovery progressed, it would be difficult to expand training as fast as job opportunities developed.

The ultimate success of this program, of course, will depend upon the extent to which individual workers accept the opportunity to participate and develop their potential. The training programs authorized by this bill are, therefore, geared both to the skill needs of the economy and the occupational potential of the individuals to be trained.

Training allowances

The unemployed whose skills are obsolete are generally unable to undertake a training program without financial assistance. This bill, therefore, authorizes the payment of training allowances to such people while they undergo training. The amount of such payment is geared to the amount of weekly unemployment compensation paid in the State in which the unemployed workers reside and can be paid for a maximum of 52 weeks.

This bill contemplates some of the unemployed selected for training will be referred to on-the-job training programs where the employer pays a learner's wage to the trainee while he is learning the job. For individuals undergoing such training, the amount of any training allowance will be reduced by a proportion equal to the ratio that the number of compensated hours a week bears to 40 hours.

Under some circumstances training for certain jobs will be available only in a location far removed from a trainee's residence. Some courses which require relatively heavy investment in teaching equipment, for example, may be given at only one location in a particular State. The bill provides modest living and transportation expenses for the individual certified for training if he lives beyond commuter distance of the training center.

Training allowances will not be paid to persons who are receiving or who are eligible for unemployment insurance. The committee intends that, to the extent possible under various State laws, those who are eligible to receive unemployment compensation while undergoing training should do so. To assure that all trainees receive the same allowance while they are undergoing training, i.e., the average weekly unemployment insurance compensation payment in the State, the committee has provided that a trainee whose unemployment compensation payment is less than that amount may receive a supplementary training allowance not to exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average unemployment compensation payment in the State.

The committee recognizes that at present only 11 States consider a person to be eligible to receive unemployment compensation if he is undergoing the type of training contemplated by this bill. In the rest of the States a person undergoing such training is not considered "available for work" and so is not eligible to receive unemployment compensation to which he might otherwise be entitled. The problem presented by this lack of conformity and eligibility standards among the States was recognized as being a subject outside the jurisdiction of this committee. The Ways and Means Committee has before it proposed legislation which will correct this situation. We note, however, that more and more States are recognizing the importance of permitting unemployed workers to continue to receive unemployment compensation when they enter a training program. Until this year only six States had such laws. Now five more have been added, the 11th just a month or so ago.

As a safeguard against possible abuse, however, the committee has provided that an individual who fails to avail himself of training when it is offered to him shall not for 1 year thereafter be entitled to training allowances.

COSTS

For the 2-year program contemplated in this proposed legislation, the committee provided spending ceilings for each title of the bill and for each year of operation. For the fiscal year 1962, the ceiling was set at $100 million, over 90 percent of which would be allocated to the payment of training allowances and the operation of vocational education programs. For the fiscal year 1963, a ceiling of $163 million was set and allocated roughly with the same emphasis. The Department of Labor estimated that a total of some 160,000 would be trained the first year; 50,000 in on-the-job programs, and 110,000 in vocational education programs, of which 80,000 would be from unemployed workers and 30,000 from the underemployed. In the second year, it is estimated a total of some 250,000 would be trained—90,000 on the job and 160,000 in vocational education, with more than 120,000 from the unemployed and 40,000 from the underemployed. The cost estimates submitted by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare were based on the payment of training allowances to 65,000 long-term unemployed in 1962 and 110,000 in 1963 as well as to 20,000 on-the-job trainees the first year and 40,000 the second year.

In title V of the bill the committee sets forth certain criteria which the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare shall consider in effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States. The language of the bill clearly indicates that the respective Secretaries are not bound by these criteria but these criteria are to be a guide in policy determinations as to expenditures.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

(a) *Purposes of H.R. 8399*

H.R. 8399 has three purposes:

1. To achieve "maximum employment and purchasing power," recognizing that rapid technological progress is essential to accomplishing this.

2. "To assist in the development of policies and programs which will result in the adequate development, preparation and productive use of the manpower resources of the Nation * * *."

3. "To appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of automation and with technological and other types of persistent unemployment and provide for the adequate training and retraining of the Nation's labor force."

(b) *Existing conditions requiring action*

H.R. 839 recognizes six conditions existing in the country which require Federal action if these purposes are to be achieved.

1. "The skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation and other technological developments. * * *"

2. "Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment."

3. "Improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men and women will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs."

4. "Many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for full employment, must be provided with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market."

5. "The skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to participate in the mainstream of the Nation's economy."

6. "It is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet requirements of the space age."

(c) *Means of accomplishing the objectives*

The Secretary of Labor shall—

1. Make studies of the impact of technological changes, develop techniques for predicting the impact in advance, develop solutions, and publish the findings.

2. Promote or directly engage in programs of information and communication to reduce or prevent undesirable effects of technological changes, appraise the Nation's efforts to meet manpower needs, recommend needed adjustments, and arrange for research to further these objectives.

3. Make studies to encourage greater labor mobility in industry, and

4. Report on these studies to the President who, in turn, shall transmit to Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session (beginning in 1962) a report on the Nation's "manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training."

(d) *Training and skill development*

The Secretary of Labor shall—

1. "Develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training" for those who need it.

2. Accomplish this through the maximum utilization of all possible resources for skill development available to industry, labor, public and private educational and training institutions, State, Federal, and local agencies, and other appropriate public and private organizations and facilities.

3. "Provide a program of testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training" for those persons who need it to secure appropriate full-time employment and

4. Provide original placement and later counseling services for those who complete such courses.

(e) *Training allowances and payments to States*

The Secretary of Labor may make payments to the States for the purpose of paying weekly training allowances to those unemployed persons selected for training under this act. Such payments shall not exceed 52 weeks and the amount paid in any week "shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available." To those people who receive unemployment compensation, where it is permitted while undergoing training, and it is less than the average for a week of total unemployment, a supplemental training allowance may be paid. This shall not exceed the difference between the actual unemployment payment and the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above. Training payments shall also be reduced proportionately to people engaged in part-time compensated employment (taking 40 hours as full time). In no case shall the training payment, when added to the employee's wages, exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation to which the employee would be entitled if fully unemployed.

The bill provides the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare with four criteria which they shall consider in effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States. These criteria are indicia of the incidence of the unemployment problem within each State.

Training allowances may be supplemented by the Secretary of Labor to defray transportation to and from training facilities and when the facilities are not within commuting distance of the regular place of residence, both transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance may be paid.

In order to qualify as an approved training program, on-the-job training must be compensated by the employer at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations hereinafter authorized, considering such factors as industry, geographical region, and trainee proficiency.

No training allowance shall be paid to anyone during any week in which he has received, or is eligible for, unemployment compensation. Any person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this act shall not, for 1 year thereafter, be entitled to retraining allowances.

The Secretary of Labor shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure appropriate agreements with all kinds of qualified private and public agencies to carry out the purposes of this act. Adequate provisions are included in the act to give the Secretary of Labor authority to carry out the purposes of the act, promote effective administration, protect the Nation against losses, and insure a proper division of responsibilities among the various agencies involved.

(f) *Vocational training*

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall enter into appropriate agreements with the various State vocational agencies which will undertake to provide the vocational training or retraining needed to carry out the purposes of this act. If public institutions or facilities are not adequate for the purpose, the State vocational agencies shall make appropriate arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such agreement may provide for payment to the State agency of up to 100 percent of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed people and up to 50 percent of the cost with respect to other people.

Adequate provisions are included here also to provide the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with authority to carry out the purposes of the act, maintain adequate efficiency of administration and quality of programs, cooperate with the Secretary of Labor, and protect the Nation against losses.

(g) *Maintenance of State effort*

No training program financed in whole or part by the Federal Government under this act shall be approved unless the appropriate Secretary is satisfied that neither the State nor locality in which training is carried out has reduced or is reducing its own level of expenditures for any kind of vocational education and training.

(h) *Reports*

The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are both required, under this proposed legislation, to report to the Congress prior to March 1, 1963, giving an evaluation of the programs undertaken and recommendations concerning their continuance.

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned members of the committee, are opposed to the enactment of H.R. 8399. This is not the time for additional experimental and costly legislation which, even in normal times, would have very doubtful value. There are presently in effect four extensive and costly Government-operated vocational education and training programs. These programs are overlapping and uncoordinated, and the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has admitted that the Federal vocational education program is a hodgepodge. There is a grave question as to whether the very people which this bill will undertake to train are either interested in or capable of being trained for the skills which are presently needed. Finally, this bill, coupled with H.R. 8354 (Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961) and other legislation would place massive powers in the hands of the Secretary of Labor and would, for the first time, make him a commanding figure in the education field.

BAD TIMING

This country is faced with a life or death challenge from the Communist nations, headed by the Soviet Union. President Kennedy has called for extensive additional defense expenditures to meet this challenge, and has specifically stated that "* * * to help make certain that the current deficit is held to a safe level, we must keep down all expenditures not thoroughly justified in budget requests." Notwithstanding the seriousness of this threat and the President's plea, this bill as reported calls for the expenditure of $263 million within the next 2 years even though the need for the bill under normal peacetime conditions has not been adequately established. Social legislation of this type is a frill which we can ill afford in peacetime. During the perilous period just ahead, this bill, added to others of a like nature, could spell disaster.

HODGEPODGE OF CONFLICTING PROGRAMS

At the present time there is extensive Federal participation in vocational education and training. There is the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946.

The veterans have their vocational rehabilitation and vocational education programs under present veterans' legislation.

The Department of Labor is operating an apprenticeship program and there is even a provision for vocational training in the Area Redevelopment Act. Moreover, in the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, a special program for the training of the youth of America is established.

The following résumé is sufficient to indicate the scope and the extent of the Federal participation in the vocational education and training field:

Enrollment in Federal-State vocational education programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, totaled 3,768,149. Of this number, 1,588,109 were in home economics, 938,490 were in trades and industry, 796,237 were in agriculture, 303,784 were in distributive occupations, 101,279 were highly skilled technicians, and 40,250 were in practical nurse training.

As of December 31, 1960, there were 161,128 apprentices in training under the Department of Labor's apprenticeship and training program.

Under the Veterans' Administration, 615,332 veterans of World War II have been afforded vocational rehabilitation training, and at the present time 5,967 Korean veterans are receiving such training. In addition, 210,293 Korean veterans are presently receiving educational and vocational assistance.

Under the recently passed Area Redevelopment Act, it is estimated that many thousand individuals will receive some type of vocational training.

Finally, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 would provide training for an estimated 218,000 youths during the next 3 years. It should also be remembered that

this is only a so-called pilot program and it can be expected that the cost and scope of this program will increase sharply after the third year.

Duplication of effort and unnecessary costs cannot be avoided whenever, as in this case, a number of similar programs are enacted. However, no attempt has been made to identify this overlapping or to harmonize the old programs with the new. The seriousness of this omission is demonstrated by the fact that Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, agreed that the present Federal vocational education program is a hodgepodge and that it would be the better part of wisdom to defer further action in this field until such time as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has completed his major study on vocational education. Notwithstanding this testimony, and the existence of the many and varied programs. Congress is now being asked to dramatically add to the hodgepodge by the enactment of this bill.

For example, title II calls for the counseling, testing, and placement of 1,200,000 individuals and the payment of relocation allowances to 175,000, at a total cost of $176,460,000. Title III would encourage, develop, and secure adoption of on-the-job programs at a cost of $7,600,000, and title IV would provide vocational training for 200,000 unemployed and 70,000 underemployed at a cost of $70,500,000. And this, of course, is just a pilot program with undoubtedly increased costs after the first 2 years.

NOT WORKABLE

Over and over again it has been emphasized that H.R. 8399 would be used to attack the so-called hard core of unemployed. Allegedly, under its provisions, these individuals, many of whom have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, would be trained and equipped with the new skills which our changing industrial processes desperately need. The hard, cold truth of the matter is that this stated purpose apparently cannot be achieved for the new skills lie almost exclusively in the technical and semitechnical fields. A substantial educational background is required before an individual can be trained for such jobs. In addition, the individual must have certain aptitudes, the motivation to undertake rigorous and difficult training, and then be willing to move to an area of the country where such a skill is required.

Recently conducted studies illustrate this point. For example, according to Prof. Robben W. Flemming, executive director of the Armour Automation Committee only 170 of the 400 workers laid off by the closing of the Armour plant in Oklahoma City took advantage of the employment tests and counseling offered by the Oklahoma Employment Service. Of these 170, only 60 gave evidence of being able to benefit from educational training. Fifty-eight enrolled for such training, and only seven found work in their new skill.

Last November, when auto industry layoffs were just beginning to hit the Michigan economy, the Michigan Employment Security Commission had applications on file from 160,000 jobseekers. Of these, 104,000 had not completed high school, 53,000 had not even begun high school, and 20,000 had not completed elementary school. Only 2 percent were college graduates.

Finally, a study of the trainability of relief recipients just completed under the auspices of the Detroit Public Welfare Commission reflects the following: The study committee selected a random sample of 761 family heads who were physically able to work. Of this total, 216 could not take employment aptitude tests because they were illiterate. Another 299 who completed the examinations failed to meet the minimum requirements for training in any of the 23 occupational aptitude patterns established by the Michigan Employment Security Commission. The illiterates and those who failed all tests accounted for two-thirds of the original group. The committee concluded that—

"A substantial number of those classified as employable and presently receiving relief are not capable of participating in retraining programs of the kind thought of to date."

BUILDUP OF POWER

This Congress has witnessed an unprecedented reach for power by a Cabinet officer. The Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, has made approximately 60 appearances before Congress this session in support of various pieces of legislation. It is a conservative estimate that in at least 90 percent of the legislation which he has proposed and supported additional power would be placed in his hands. This power is generated by the fact that the authority of the Secretary of Labor would be substantially extended, both in old and new fields, tremendous additional appropriations would be placed at his disposal, and many, many more employees would be required to administer the programs.

Again and again the Secretary has stated that he is speaking for the present administration, and that there is no need to call the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, Interior, or Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Attorney General, for he is authorized to speak for them. This has been the case even though the particular bill in question would normally fall within the area handled by another Secretary.

This bill is a dramatic example of the Secretary of Labor extending his jurisdiction into the educational field. By all of the normal rules of the game, it should be considered inappropriate and inadvisable for the Secretary who represents and advocates just one segment of our society to be responsible for an educational program which will, in fact, affect all segments. In the past, those responsible for our educational programs, both public and private, have jealously guarded their historic and exclusive rights in this field. Apparently, the New Frontier allocation of power and influence has called for a new assignment of leadership in the educational field and such leadership is to be exercised by the Secretary of Labor.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, we are opposed to the enactment of this bill. There is every reason to believe that extensive additional studies must be made before legislation of this type can be considered. Even under what could be termed normal times this bill would be inappropriate and harmful rather than helpful. Under today's conditions, it cannot be justified unless it is the intent of Congress to promote the dramatic extension of Federal control under the leadership of the Secretary of Labor into the fields of vocational training and education.

EDGAR W. HIESTAND.
DONALD C. BRUCE.
JOHN M. ASHBROOK.
DAVE MARTIN.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

The undersigned Republican members of the committee endorse the principle of training unemployed workers in order that they may rejoin the productive mainstream of our economy. We believe the Federal Government shares a responsibility in this field. However, Federal activities must be carefully coordinated with private, State, and local efforts to solve the problem.

We have supported this bill as it was revised in subcommittee and the full committee because we believe that the objective it seeks is desirable. There is, however, one factor which we feel justifies special mention in this report. The training allowance provision in this bill must be made to dovetail with the present unemployment compensation system.

The training program provides an all-Federal payment to the trainee in the amount of the average unemployment compensation payment in the State. Only 10 of the 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, presently permit an unemployed person to enroll in a training program while continuing to collect unemployment benefits. Unless present provisions of the Unemployment Compensation Act are changed, this bill may seriously undermine the present Unemployment Compensation Act. Since training allowances will be paid entirely by the Federal Government, while unemployment allowances are paid from the unemployment compensation fund, this legislation could be a substantial step toward federalizing the entire unemployment compensation system.

Prior to the final vote in the full Education and Labor Committee, an understanding was unanimously reached that this serious loophole should be closed. The matter could not be resolved in our committee because the Ways and Means Committee exercises jurisdiction over the Unemployment Compensation Act. It was understood by the members of our committee that every effort would be made to reach an agreement whereby the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would, on behalf of the membership of that distinguished committee, present an appropriate amendment to this bill to close this loophole and thereby protect the present unemployment compensation system. If such an amendment is approved by the Ways and Means Committee, the Rules Committee should be asked for a rule making it in order to offer such an amendment on the floor.

It is our sincere belief that unless substantial impact on the unemployment compensation system is eliminated, this bill will be unsound. We would regret being forced to withdraw our support for the bill which, under proper circumstances, could benefit many Americans.

CARROLL D. KEARNS.
PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.
WILLIAM H. AYRES.
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.
ALBERT H. QUIE.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.
PETER A. GARLAND.

[Congressional Record, Senate, Aug. 23, 1961]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair. The bill, S. 1991, sponsored by the Kennedy administration and reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is an effort to give further legislative authority to the policy directive contained in the Employment Act of 1946, from which I quote in part:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

That retraining is an essential tool in the

effort to find jobs for idle workers is, I think, admitted by all, and certainly is elaborately established in the extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Public Welfare of which I have the honor to be the chairman.

The importance of retraining has also been stressed by the President of the United States in the message on this subject which he sent to Congress earlier this year.

Let me stress at the outset that the bill proposes no utopia. If the bill should be enacted, it will not solve the unemployment problem which continues to plague us. It will, I am confident, result in the retraining of many Americans in skills which will enable them to get jobs which are not available to them at present. But we shall have to do much more than to pass the bill in order to reduce unemployment in the United States to acceptable levels. The bill will, however, start a program to provide new skills for some of the unemployed, so that they can go back to work.

The President stated last fall, and it has been reiterated by many others since, that it will be necessary to find 25,000 new jobs each week for the foreseeable future, in order to bring unemployment down to acceptable levels. That is a gigantic task. The bill, if enacted, will help significantly.

The need for the new jobs arises from two major factors: The first is automation and technological developments, which displace the jobs of many workers; the second is the very substantial increase in the labor force due to the increase in births and the decrease in deaths which have occurred since the end of World War II. The bill would attack this problem in the following way:

First, the Secretary of Labor is directed to find out where job opportunities are. This is a most important part of the proposed legislation and is set forth in full in title I. We do not really know today what our manpower requirements are. We do not know really what skills are in short supply. We do not know what the requirements for everything from ditchdigger to nuclear physicist are likely to be in the years ahead. In short, we do not know how to staff freedom, man our economy to meet the worldwide challenges it faces. Title I of the bill directs the Secretary of Labor to find out how to staff freedom. Having found where job opportunities are likely to exist, the Secretary will then set to work to find people and to train them to meet those employment opportunities. Through tests, interviews, and guidance, he will develop a corps of workers whose skills can be upgraded. He will provide skills for those who do not have them at present. He will retrain unemployed and underemployed workers in skills where his studies have shown that job opportunities are available.

Having done that work, he will turn to his colleague, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the State Vocational training agencies and will ask them to create training courses to give those people the skills they need in order to fill the job opportunities, either actual or potential, which he has discovered.

Having done that, priority for training under the bill goes to those who have lost their jobs and are seeking work. But under the bill others are eligible, including those who wish to upgrade their skills, so as to become more useful members of the labor force.

The bill also provides although at a lower priority than the one for those who have lost their jobs and are seeking to find new ones—for the training of younger people. The testimony before the subcommittee indicated the critical nature of the category of our younger citizens who no longer are in school, but have not been able to find jobs. One of the most shocking bits of evidence in this regard was produced in the course of a speech made by Dr. James B. Conant, who has devoted many years of his life to the development of our educational system in the primary and the secondary schools. His statement was with respect to a number of special studies he had made in large metropolitan areas. The studies indicated that the lack of job opportunities was demoralizing to those in many sections of our large cities; juvenile delinquency was on the increase; and young men and young women were roaming the streets, seeking work which they could not find. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of this part of the bill, although I repeat that this is what may be called a secondary objective, the primary objective being to retrain and find job opportunities for older members of the labor force who either are chronically unemployed or underemployed.

Let me explain what I mean by "underemployed." Much of real underemployment is in rural areas where adults, and youths, too, are living and working on family farms where the total cash income annually is $1,200 or less. We must move these people into the labor force; there is no future for them where they are. So the bill provides that, for the purposes of this act, individuals living on farms or in rural areas in economic units with a total annual cash income of less than $1,200, shall for the purposes of this act be considered underemployed.

I turn now to the weekly retraining allowances called for by the bill. This was a sensitive subject to which the subcommittee and the full committee gave very careful consideration. The administration had recommended a wide, across-the-board provision for retraining allowances. The committee was more conservative; and the bill provides that—with one exception, about which I shall speak later—retraining allowances shall be confined to payments to adult workers who are the heads of families and have been members of the labor force for 3 years or more, such payments to be in the nature of retraining allowances substantially the equivalent of the average payment of unemployment compensation which the same workers would have received if they had been drawing unemployment compensation in the State in which they reside.

The exception to which I refer is that when the Secretary of Labor finds it necessary, and I stress the word "necessary," under the bill he has limited authority to make retraining payments to unemployed youths. I can say on the authority of the Secretary of Labor that he intends to use this privilege sparingly. It is not thought that the total expenditures in this connection would exceed 5 percent of the total authorized allowance appropriations called for by the bill. But, Madam President, it is important that the Secretary of Labor have this flexibility; otherwise, the training opportunities for unemployed youth will, in the opinion of the committee, be unduly restricted.

Madam President, the bill provides a substantial program of on-the-job training to be developed by the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary is very hopeful that this will turn out to be one of the most important aspects of the bill. The Secretary will solicit the cooperation of employers across the country, in industries in which there are job opportunities for development. It is hoped this on-the-job training can be provided to many thousands of Americans, as a means of retraining them in employable skills.

The bill also provides that to the extent that on-the-job trainees receive compensation from their employers, their retraining allowances shall be proportionately decreased. So, in no event in such cases could they receive in excess of what would have been the unemployment compensation in their States if they had been drawing unemployment compensation.

The bill provides for a 4-year life; it would phase out of existence on June 30, 1965.

The cost of the bill would be met, during the first 2 years, entirely by the Federal Government. Although the administration originally recommended that the cost of the program be met throughout its life entirely by the Federal Government, the committee felt otherwise; and the committee bill provides that during the last 2 years there shall be matching funds from the States, on a 50–50 basis, which we hope will more than double the number of individuals who can be trained and retrained in the third and fourth years.

Madam President, I stress the importance of a 4-year program. I understand that later an effort will be made to cut the program to 2 years. I believe that would be unacceptable to a very large majority of the committee, and I hope it will be unacceptable to the Senate. My reasons for making that statement are that if the time for the expiration of the bill were changed from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1963, the effect would be practically to kill the program just as it is getting off the ground. The effect would be to require our committee and our subcommittee to start at the next session of Congress with new hearings, in order to develop more testimony to establish the need to continue the program further, at a time when the evidence will be slim indeed as to how effective the program has been. So I would urge my colleagues not to support an amendment to curtail the life of the program.

Appropriations to be authorized by the bill will be $90 million the first year, $165 million the second year, and $200 million the third and fourth years.

I stress that these authorized appropriations have the approval of the administration, which I am confident has given adequate consideration to the possibility of a deficit in the budget resulting from this particular authorization.

The bill contains an antipirating clause, intended to prevent the training provisions under the bill from making it possible for industry to move from one area to another.

There is a clause providing for maintenance of State effort.

There are incentives to encourage trainees to take retraining, instead of continuing to draw unemployment compensation.

There are standards laid down by which the Secretary of Labor can determine how to distribute the funds available for retraining among the various States. These standards, briefly, include the percentage of the total labor force in each State, and the percentage of total unemployment in the country and in each State, as criteria which the Secretary shall use in determining how to distribute the funds, under the program, among the States.

In conclusion, I stress again that this bill promises no Utopia. Its enactment would not solve the unemployment problem. The bill is not going to result in the retraining of all the citizens of the United States of America. But the bill will result in training and retraining enough to make a really significant start.

I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to say I think this is one of the most constructive bills that has been reported out of our committee during this whole session of the Congress. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is entitled to great credit for his leadership in bringing out the report, because I think it goes to so fundamental a problem of our times, which is the urgent need to materially increase our productivity, and the fact that we are counseled by the Commissioner on Labor Statistics and other experts in this field that we need 25 percent more highly technical people, as of yesterday, if we are really to do the job which needs to be done.

Also, the great problem which we face in the world, aside from the security problem, is the problem of porductivity. The

real challenge is, Can we or the Russians bring about material improvements in the standards of living, health, housing, and education of the peoples of the world?

Those who stand on the floor and say we just cannot do it, we just do not have the money, we just do not have the resources, are not really talking in terms of dollar bills or pieces of gold. They are talking about production.

Here is a bill designed to materially increase the productivity of the United States. I think, in all fairness, it should be put to the country, not as another proposal that merely spends money and contains a Federal program, which some people like and some do not like, but as a measure directly pointed at the ability of our democratic, free society, to deal with a matter which is a maxim in totalitarian societies, and that is the effective training of our operatives, our people, for the productivity job which must be done.

We are very much behind in this effort. Apprenticeship training has not managed to keep abreast of the problem. Vocational high schools and the whole complex of that kind of training activity in the country have not kept abreast of the problem. This is one of the real major lags in the whole industrial area of our economy.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to note for the record the very great contribution that the Senator from West Virginia has made in bringing the bill out of the subcommittee into the full committee and to the Senate. The Senator from West Virginia was diligent in his attendance at hearings, and was outspoken in our executive sessions. His ideas were intelligent and were received perceptively by Senators. His interest on this subject goes back many years before consideration of the bill. He introduced a bill in the last Congress very similar to this bill. I know of no Senator who has made a greater contribution than has the Senator from West Virginia in respect to the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I am grateful for the gracious words of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. It is our belief that the end product—S. 1991, the manpower and training bill—is a worthy, and, more importantly, it is a workable measure. I subscribe to the facts and the logic which characterized the opening statement so capably and forthrightly presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I join in underscoring these pertinent views of our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its report on S. 1991:

"There is agreement among all who have studied the problem that a substantial portion of unemployment exists because idle workers cannot be matched with available jobs. This structural unemployment will persist even when recovery from a recession is complete. The more rapidly our economy advances, the more rapidly do skills become obsolete. It is clear that combined Federal, State, local and private effort falls far short of the total need. Without an intensive nationwide program to provide opportunities for retraining, tens of thousands of worthy men and women will never be able to obtain the skills which will enable them to be self-supporting and to make their maximum contributions to the Nation's productivity. S. 1991 establishes such a program.

"Although the number of unskilled jobs in the economy remains approximately constant, the demand for skilled and semiskilled workers is constantly rising.

"Training for the unemployed is not a panacea for the problem of unemployment nor a cure for the malfunction of our economy. Training does not of itself produce jobs, except in extraordinary cases. Training will, however, raise the productivity potential of the economy and thus raise the potential limitations upon economic growth.

"The manpower problems to which this bill is addressed are national problems. While significant accomplishments have been made by industry, labor, and local government in dealing with dislocations that have occurred in certain areas, the total problem is too great for local capacities alone. Moreover, the labor market is a national market and if its needs are to be met national leadership is required.

"The Federal responsibility for assisting States in providing training opportunities for the unemployed or underemployed is clear. It is inherent in the declaration of policy spelled out in the Full Employment Act of 1946. S. 1991 is one method by which the Federal Government can meet the obligations imposed upon it by the Full Employment Act of 1946."

Madam President, this bill represents a conscientious desire to cope with one of the most serious domestic problems which presently faces this country; namely structural unemployment. We know it to be a virulent and persistent type of unemployment which condemns millions of Americans to joblessness and privation, even during periods of national prosperity.

It is true that this legislation is being considered at a time when our economy appears to be recovering from a period of recession. But despite significant increases in the tempo of business activity and in the volume of total production, millions of workers continue to be unable to find employment.

Data by the U.S. Department of Labor indicates that during the month of July approximately 5,140,000 persons were unemployed. In addition, 3,200,000 individuals, although employed, worked only part time through no choice of their own.

They had a desire to work full time. They were working part time because full-time jobs were not available to them. For the eighth consecutive month the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment—6.9 percent in July—was not significantly changed.

Perhaps the most important, and yet the most discouraging of all known facts is that the number of persons jobless for more than half a year continues to rise. In June, approximately 928,000 individuals had been unemployed continuously for 6 months or longer; in July that number had increased to 1,026,000.

There seems to be general agreement among those experts who have studied the problem that a substantial proportion of unemployment exists because idle workers do not have the skills necessary to enable them to qualify for available jobs. It is a fact, too, that these individuals do not have the financial resources to pay for whatever training they may need to equip themselves for different jobs. And even if they did, it would appear to be wasteful of money and effort for these persons to make unguided decisions concerning fields of endeavor in which to seek training.

Of course we know that a substantial number of those in the ranks of the unemployed never possessed any skills.

Certainly we know that automation and technological changes have made obsolete the skills of literally hundreds of thousands of Americans who desire to work. The same difficult problem is basic in both instances. The workers do not have any skills which are salable in 1961 under the type of economy that we have developed.

Unless persons in these categories acquire new skills the vast majority of them will remain jobless. The future of these individuals is extremely bleak unless constructive plans and programs are developed by which they can obtain the training and work experiences needed to acquire skills which will enable them to qualify for the types of jobs that are and will be available in our highly industrialized and ever-changing economy.

The pending proposal is designed to provide broad and integrated plans to help workers obtain the qualifications which will enable them to be self-supporting.

Madam President, the cost of unemployment cannot be measured solely by calculating the production lost to the Nation's economy because a given number of persons cannot find work, nor by totaling payments to the unemployed and their families, although these costs are high. A strong and prosperous country such as ours can afford these financial outlays, perhaps, but to do so without making affirmative efforts to solve the problem is to foster a shameful waste. Our country can and must become even stronger economically. We must attempt to make our jobless employable in places which fit their talents and, wherever possible, seek to help our unemployed broaden their skills; we must endeavor to place the absolute maximum number of our citizens in places of gainful employment in the United States.

Can we afford to see large numbers of our citizens doomed to economic failure, unable to share in the Nation's prosperity because they have not the opportunity to acquire skills which will permit them to share fully in the Nation's growth and well being of our people in general?

In my judgment, it is morally wrong and economically indefensible to tolerate these conditions. If we enact S. 1991 I believe we will have started a program which when fully developed will give a successful answer to the unemployment problem of this country.

Mr. PROUTY. Madam President, first I should like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for the courtesies he has extended to me and for reporting a bill which I believe is much better than the one originally introduced. My purpose in speaking today is twofold. First I wish to point out the need for the program in the proposed legislation, and also to justify an amendment which I shall offer later to reduce the program to a 2-year period instead of the 4-year period provided in the bill at the present time.

Madam President, there are today 5.1 million unemployed Americans. The seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment—6.9 percent in July—remained practically unchanged for the eighth straight month.

Unemployment rates for married men remain at high levels. There were 1.5 million married men without jobs in July 1961—4.2 percent of all such men in the labor force, as compared with 3.3 percent a year ago and 2.3 percent in 1957. In July 1961, about two-fifths of the jobless married men had been out of work for 15 weeks or longer.

PROBLEM OF LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT

Long-term unemployment or continuous joblessness for half a year or more is one of the gravest parts of our present economic situation.

Long-term unemployment—15 weeks and over—was 1.6 million in July, nearly one-third of the jobless total. Among the long-term unemployed were 1 million persons who have been seeking work for more than half a year. This total was 600,000 more than a year ago and about equal to the postwar high reached in August 1958.

GROUPS HARD HIT BY LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT

Among those with very prolonged spells of unemployment—27 weeks or longer—several groups stand out. Five may be noted in particular:

First. Men 45 years and over represented 30 percent of those out of work more than 6 months as compared with 25 percent of the civilian labor force.

Second. Semiskilled operatives, and unskilled nonfarm laborers made up about half

of the very long-term unemployed in contrast to one-quarter of the civilian labor force. On the other hand, although white-collar workers constitute 40 percent of the labor force they make up only 18 percent of the long-term unemployed.

Third. Workers last employed in durable goods manufacturing represent only 13 percent of the labor force and yet they constitute 27 percent of the very long-term unemployed. The proportion of steel and auto workers out of work for 27 weeks or more was nearly four times their proportion in the labor force—11 percent as compared with 3 percent. Construction workers also represent a serious unemployment problem.

Fourth. Nonwhite workers accounted for 25 percent of the very long-term unemployed but they make up only 11 percent of the labor force.

Fifth. Persons with no previous work experience were 7½ percent of the very long-term unemployed although they represent only about 1 percent of the labor force. These are chiefly young workers seeking their first job.

These figures are a cold statistical profile of the problem of hard core unemployment that continues through good times and bad because the occupation may be dying, the skill no longer needed, the industry no longer competitive.

AUTOMATION

The story of America is filled with revolutionary changes in our industrial and economic life. Big problems follow in the wake of new industrial changes. It is one of these problems—the challenge of training men for a new industrial age—with which we are concerned today.

One of the forms of technological advancement that portends both good and evil is automation.

What is automation?

John Diebold, who coined the word "automation," has this to say, "when machines do a man's work, that's mechanization. When they do his work and control their own operations as well, that's automation.".

Placing emphasis on instrumentation, electronics, and other precision operations, automation seems destined to create many new technician positions.

The first half of the 20th century brought into our society mass production methods which reduced the need for unskilled manual labor and created a demand for semi-skilled workers to feed or manipulate machines. Now electronic devices can perform such tasks with greater speed and greater accuracy.

AUTOMATION IN MANUFACTURING

Production workers in manufacturing industries have been the hardest hit by automation. From 1948 to 1959 manufacturing production showed an increase of 53 percent. Yet, during the same 11 years, factory production workers decreased from 12.7 to 12.2 million.

It should be noted that in the last few years the threat of employee displacement from automation or technological change has been the focal point of disagreement in most major labor disputes—including those in the meatpacking, steel, longshore, and railroad industries.

Although I have spoken here principally of industry, I do not disregard the effect of automation upon agriculture. The development of synthetic fertilizers and growth regulators and the mechanization of farms have resulted in nearly a doubling of production per man-hour in agriculture in the last 10 years. More and more food and fiber are being produced by fewer and fewer people each year.

As we make the shift from manual and semiskilled employment to highly skilled work we must take every precaution to do so without undue hardships.

Nothing would contribute more to the moral of workers than their being freed of necessary but monotonous repetitive operations.

As Dr. Vannevar Bush once said:

"We should hold as a great social gain industrial changes that abolish inherently dangerous, burdensome, or monotonous jobs and replace them with jobs having variety and judgment."

NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Madam President, an Office of Automation and Manpower has been set up within the Department of Labor to examine unemployment by area, occupation, and industry and to keep track of present and anticipated technological changes. It will consider and develop:

"Education and guidance programs to allow workers who may be displaced by automation to find new employment, without suffering a long period of unemployment. It will develop proposals for both training and retraining, for both placement and replacement of workers coming into the new economy, and of those who must change their places within it."

Of course, the U.S. Employment Service has the major responsibility for matching the jobless man and the manless job. An effective service would hold a great deal of potential for the economy.

It is said that we can, by filling four million jobs 10 days faster on the average than they would otherwise be filled, contribute the equivalent of 160,000 additional full-time jobs to the economy, which means the indirect contribution of still another 250,000 jobs. The Department of Labor contends that it would take $2 billion of capital investment to have a comparable effect in terms of direct jobs alone.

A simple way of stating this situation would be to say that if we get a job to a man or a man to a job 1 day earlier than would normally be the case, we make the same contribution to our economic system as we would in investing $50 in a new plant.

We must have an effective U.S. Employment Service. When the Service fails, when workers and employers lose confidence in it, the job and the man are not matched, and unemployment and hardship result.

A study conducted for the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems a little more than a year ago revealed that skilled people generally shun the Employment Service. The highly skilled professional and white collar fields generally look upon the Employment Service as a "last resort." As a result, only a mere dent has been made in placement of professional, technical, and higher skilled trades.

In its report on the employment and manpower training bill now before us, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare acknowledges the weaknesses of the State employment offices and, in effect, concedes that if these weaknesses are not corrected the large-scale program envisioned by the training bill will be unsuccessful.

I believe a part of our difficulty today stems from the fact that we need a better understanding of the character of hard-core unemployment.

During the course of Senate hearings, I asked Secretary of Labor Goldberg:

"Do we really know how many structurally unemployed there are? How specifically can we locate them geographically?"

Secretary Goldberg replied, in part:

"We have no precise measure of the number and geographic location of the structurally unemployed."

Pointing to the jobless problem among Negroes, I asked the Secretary of Labor:

"Do we know what percentage of the structurally unemployed are Negroes? How specifically can we locate them geographically?"

Secretary Goldberg responded:

"Detailed information on the distribution geographically of unemployed nonwhites is not available."

If the Federal Government is to set up programs to train the unemployed, we should at the very least be able to indentify these people in terms of age, sex, race, education, training skills, and geographical location.

S. 1991 : AN EXPERIMENT

Today funds are allotted to the States under the Federal Vocational Education Acts and Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. Few States use these funds for the training of unemployed. By and large, the Federal money is used by schools with long established programs of vocational education for young people. It is for this reason that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported a bill designed principally to provide the types of training needed by older workers who seek jobs.

During the 86th Congress, as a member of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, I recommended that a new program for the training and retraining of workers be established. I voted to report the pending proposed legislation, and I do not shrink from the conviction I held a year ago that a new training program is desirable at this time.

Madam President, I digress to say that I believe this is the first time since I became a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the committee has reported a bill of this kind unanimously.

S. 1991, the manpower development and training bill, authorizes a 4-year program of training terminating on June 30, 1965. Ninety million dollars is authorized for fiscal 1962, $165 million for 1963, and $200 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Because of the lack of knowledge the Department of Labor possesses with respect to the characteristics of the unemployed and because we are instituting under the bill's provisions an entirely new training program for the structurally unemployed, I question the wisdom of setting up the program on a 4-year basis.

We are beginning an experiment; and as a Member of the Senate, I want to know whether it is going to succeed before we make it a long-term program.

During the course of committee consideration, I offered, and the committee accepted, an amendment which specifically requires the Secretary of Labor to develop information concerning:

First. The number and types of training and retraining activities conducted under the act;

Second. The number of unemployed persons who secure full-time employment in fields related to such training or retraining; and

Third. The nature of such employment.

When the Secretary of Labor furnishes to Congress a year from now the information required by this provision, we will know what contribution the manpower and training bill has made to the unemployment and skilled shortage problems.

The Senate should have no part of any endeavor which builds up false hopes only later to dash them to the ground.

All training programs have not been successful. One of the most publicized was the program set up by the union and management at Armour & Co. after the closing of a meatpacking plant in Oklahoma City.

Armour's automation committee, consisting of company and union representatives, offered to finance the major part of training expenses for workers who could show an aptitude for a new job and who could demonstrate a reasonable chance of getting a new

job if retrained. The Oklahoma Employment Service was called in to give aptitude tests and to furnish a group of personnel experts.

According to Sylvia Porter, these are the results of the experiment:

"Of the 400 laid off at the Oklahoma City plant only 170 accepted the offer to be tested for retraining. Most of these had no jobs and no apparent prospects of jobs.

Of the remaining 230, some had obtained new jobs but the majority simply didn't care about going to school to learn new skills.

Of the 170 tested, the Oklahoma Employment Service found only 60 who showed the necessary aptitudes.

Of the balance—a majority of 65 percent—most just didn't have the basic intelligence or education to benefit from training and their best chance for employment, the Oklahoma Employment Service told them, was as common laborers.

Of the 60 who were found likely to benefit from retraining, 58 took advantage of the retraining offer and enrolled in a wide variety of courses ranging from typing to welding to real-estate procedures."

Miss Porter pointed out that while a few of the employees who were retrained obtained jobs in the fields of their choice, the overall results were far from satisfactory. She brought sharply to focus the plight of others who had gone through the training program:

"Many, though, haven't been able to get work in the new fields and instead are working as janitors or in similar occupations at pay far below what they were receiving from Armour. Still others remain unemployed because there aren't enough jobs to go around in Oklahoma City."

The Armour experience is ample evidence of what can happen if we do not proceed with the utmost caution. The Armour committee tried to undertake the task of fitting a group of unemployed workers with skills for which there was little demand. James Wishart, research director of the Amalgamated Meatcutters, and a member of the Armour automation fund committee, spotlighted one of the key problems, saying:

"Retraining for what? On a loose labor market you are just raising the educational level of the unemployed."

Samuel Lubell, nationally known political scientist and pollster, recently made a tour of nine cities in which he talked with unemployed workers about the bill to reduce hard-core unemployment by giving workers training. After his trip, Mr. Lubell concluded:

"Some tough human and economic problems will have to be overcome if President Kennedy's proposal to retrain jobless workers is to succeed."

Mr. Lubell contends that most of the hard-core unemployed do not wish to be retrained. This is particularly true, he said, of those who have some seniority with their old companies. He quotes an older worker as saying:

"If I went to work for a new company I'd always be the first one fired. This way, if I can hold on long enough, I'll get enough seniority to work steady."

Mr. Lubell cited examples of persons who wasted time and money retraining for jobs that did not exist. One 27-year-old worker told Mr. Lubell of the failure of his own retraining effort, in these words:

"Last year I took $160 of my savings and enrolled in a night course in handling IBM cards. When I finished the course it turned out the tire companies were shifting from IBM cards to computers. Everything I was taught was worthless."

In a speech in the House of Representatives on July 10, Representative CURTIS of Missouri spoke about the Holland subcommittee hearings which he contends have brought out the inadequate performance of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out functions in the areas of training and retraining that have been their responsibility for years. I quote from his statement:

"The two Departments have not been performing or coordinating their responsibilities—the one, for identifying, classifying, and providing word descriptions for the new skills that our dynamic economy is constantly creating, as well as the jobs that it is making obsolete; the other, for utilizing this data and assisting the vocational educational programs throughout our society to gear themselves to this rapid and ever-changing incident of progress."

No Member of Congress wishes to send to school a man with obsolete skills, simply to have him, at the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, acquire another set of obsolete skills.

It has been said that 25 percent of the long-term unemployed are on the edge of illiteracy. Mr. Lubell refers to these persons as misfits in a technological society.

In his testimony before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee, Mr. J. T. Hammond, chairman of the Michigan Employment Security Commission, stated:

"Unfortunately, while the employability of workers would undoubtedly be improved by retraining, there simply are not enough job opportunities to make an appreciable reduction in the number who would be reemployed after being retrained."

Mr. Hammond pointed out at the subcommittee hearing that retraining would do little for the more than 20,000 unemployed in Michigan who had not completed grade school, or for the 33,000 more who had not had any education beyond grade school, or for the 51,000 others who had started, but not completed, high school.

We are undertaking a large-scale program which I hope will enable many Americans to find remunerative and useful employment. The dollar investment we shall be making will not be small, by any means; and we have to face the cold, hard facts I have attempted to bring to light.

Madam President, it may well turn out that the problem of upgrading the skills of the labor force is going to bring much more of a challenge as a result of the new technology than will the problem of displacement and unemployment. The new technology for defense and industry is going to require a higher order of skills than workmen have ever known.

I am very pleased that the Senate is addressing itself to the national manpower problem; but in view of the many uncertainties I have cited, I urge that we build slowly, but surely, a sound training and retraining program for the future.

I shall, therefore, offer an amendment which will make the training and retraining activities a 2-year program, rather than a 4-year program.

The situation we are in at this moment calls to mind a story which Under Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz tells of three stonemasons of Charters who were asked by a passerby what they were doing. The first answered that he was cutting stones; and the second that he was making a living; but the third replied, with a smile of quiet satisfaction: "I am building a temple."

I do not advocate that we take the near-sighted view; but I do suggest that before we contemplate building a cathedral, we must have a solid foundation.

The people who will enter the working population in the sixties have already been born, but many of the jobs they will obtain have not yet been created. Indeed, many of the skills of 10, 8, or even 2 years hence are not even known today. Let us have a 2-year program. Let us study the results and be prepared to accept whatever adjustments in our thinking later facts may require.

We are on the threshold of a new and different industrial age. By 1970 the labor force will increase from 73.6 million to 87.1 million. This jump in the number of workers will be by far the largest for any 10-year period in our history.

As we face the new age and the new challenges, we must recognize that research, engineering, and—yes—craft skills will be essential, not only to our prosperity, but also to our survival.

I urge the adoption of the pending measure with the amendment I have suggested and one or two others which I shall submit at a later time.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 25, line 8, to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided, however,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such allowance, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess."

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to correct what appears to be an inequity, or perhaps an oversight, in the presentation of the bill dealing with unemployment compensation for trainees. It provides, in some instances at least, that trainees would receive less for participating in the program than they would on unemployment relief. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I hope it will be satisfactory to the chairman of the subcommittee who is handling the bill on the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Michigan is correct. It is an oversight. I am happy that he has offered the amendment. He is a member of the subcommittee, and also the full committee, and is fully cognizant of our problems.

As he has said, the bill as presently drawn, through an oversight, might result in a person being penalized by taking training, because he would receive less while in training than he would if he stayed on unemployment compensation payments. Since we want to provide an incentive for workers to take training under the program, rather than a discouragement, I think the amendment is in order, and I am happy to accept it in behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 27, in line 5, to strike out the words

"six months" and insert in lieu thereof the words "one year".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment would prohibit an individual who refuses to accept retraining from receiving training allowances for 1 year after such refusal.

The language of the bill contains a loophole which would be closed by the adoption of my amendment.

Under the present language of the bill, a person refusing retraining could not receive training allowances for a period of 6 months following such refusal.

However, in most circumstances, a person refusing training would be drawing unemployment compensation and the 6-month limitation could be satisfied while the individual was receiving unemployment compensation benefits. Thus, in most cases, the penalty for refusing training would be meaningless.

By substituting "one year" for "six months", my amendment would prohibit for 1 year training allowances being paid to an individual who had refused training following such refusal, so as not to allow the period during which unemployment compensation benefits are received to completely satisfy the prohibition on receiving training allowances.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. While I am satisfied that the 6 months' penalty period as presently contained in the bill is really adequate for all practical purposes, nonetheless I concede that the Senator from Vermont is making a point, and I am happy, on behalf of the committee, to accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have another amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 25, line 13, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment would add a proviso to section 203(a), with respect to individuals undergoing on-the-job training.

The purpose of this amendment is to limit the training allowance paid to an individual undergoing on-the-job training to an amount, which, when added to the payment from the employer, will not exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation payment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. A few moments ago, while the Senator was temporarily out of the Chamber, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] pointed out that the bill as presently written, on page 25, refers to payments which shall be measured by the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the State. The phrase "average weekly unemployment compensation" is on lines 4 and 5. The Senator from Michigan pointed out that this might do an injustice to workers seeking retraining whose unemployment compensation payments were higher than the average, and might thus act as a deterrent rather than an incentive for taking training courses.

Accordingly, an amendment was adopted which provides that in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such allowance, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

The same phrase "average weekly unemployment compensation payment" appears in the proviso which the Senator has proposed as an amendment. I have no objection to his proposal, which I think is entirely in order. I am willing to accept it, but I ask the Senator to agree with me that staff representatives may confer to be sure that the use of that phrase in the Senator's amendment will not destroy the amendment previously adopted, sponsored by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall be happy to accede to the Senator's wish. I certainly do not desire to upset what has been done.

Mr. CLARK. Under those circumstances, I am happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr METCALF in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who now are on the floor, let me say I shall speak very, very briefly on this amendment.

Under the provisions of the bill as it now stands, the Secretary of Labor could use the entire $655 million for the payment of the equivalent of unemployment compensation to youths between ages 16 and 22 who, perhaps in many cases, never have worked a day in their lives. This is possible even though the bill is ostensibly directed to affording this quasi-unemployment compensation to the heads of families who have been in the labor market or have been part of the labor force for 3 years. But as I have said, the Secretary of Labor could, because of a loophole, spend—if he saw fit to do so—the entire amount on the youth programs. These young people will be entitled, under the provisions of the bill, to vocational training and other types of training. This is all right. But I do not believe they are entitled to receive unemployment compensation while they are taking such training courses. I feel very strongly that this unwise grant of authority should be eliminated.

It should be noted that the committee has already reported a bill relative to the Youth Conservation Corps, which contemplates an expenditure of $4,000 a year per man; and the committee has included provisions for another training program which will equip young persons to be game wardens, janitors, and so forth, for public agencies. These young people will receive their training at considerable expense to the taxpayers.

How many more youth training programs do we need at the present time?

Under my amendment, people between 16 and 22 years of age will be entitled to receive vocational education and on the job training, but they will not be entitled to receive compensation for taking the training.

That, in brief, is the essence of my amendment; and I hope very much that it will be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate a letter in connection with this matter, directed to me by the Secretary of Labor, and received by me late yesterday afternoon. The letter is dated August 22, and reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: In response to your request, I am happy to explain my intentions with respect to exercise of the authority vested in me by section 203(c) of S. 1991, to provide training allowances for youths.

As you know, this authorization is limited to instances in which the "Secretary of Labor finds such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training for youths". Otherwise the allowances are "limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than 3 years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families."

It is my firm conviction that priority and emphasis must be accorded the experienced unemployed heads of families. Their needs demand our attention and are the underlying reason for this legislation. It is in their own and the national interest that they be assisted to acquire new or improved skills which will enable them to obtain gainful employment.

However, some youths also need and deserve our assistance in acquiring skills which will permit them to take their rightful places in our labor force. It is for their special needs that the authority to provide training allowances where necessary, is contained in the bill.

I do not anticipate the need to expend much of the authorized funds for training allowances for youths. Careful review of the needs and the resources leads me to conclude that less than 5 percent of the total funds authorized for carrying out the purposes of this bill would be required for training allowances for youths. In administering the bill, I woud not expend more than this sum for this purpose.

I hope that this information will be helpful to you in considering this legislation.

Cordially,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question: In view of that letter from the Secretary of Labor, will the Senator from Vermont be willing to withdraw his amendment, and to rely on the legislative history we are now making, to the effect that it is the intention of the Senate that the Secretary of Labor be closely held to the letter which I have now read into the Record, and that it is the feeling of the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor and is also the feeling of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), a member of the subcommittee and a member of the full committee, who is proposing this amendment, that we wish these payments to youths to be held down, and in no event to be more than 5 percent of the total amount appropriated?

I hope the Senator from Vermont will be willing to accept the assurance from the Secretary of Labor and from the Senator from Pennsylvania—namely, that we do not intend to have a large part of the money to be made available go for training allowances for youths.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I should like very much to go along with the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania. But it seems to me that to do so would be to establish a very dangerous precedent—if we began to pay unemployment compensation, which is what it really would be, to persons who have never worked and are not entitled to receive unemployment compensation.

My amendment will do nothing to prevent occupational training of these young people. I want them to have it, and I think they should have it.

But I do not think they should be treated in the same way as the head of a family who has been a member of the labor force, and is entitled to receive compensation, while he upgrades his skill. I regard the proposal in that part of the bill as very dangerous. So I do not think I can accept the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say that, as the Senator from Vermont knows, the testimony showed in ample detail the desperate plight of thousands of young men and young women who have dropped out of school, and do not have employable skills. They have no place to which to turn, and they cannot obtain employment, and they are on the streets, and all too frequently some of them are participating in acts of juvenile delinquency.

Surely the Senator from Vermont will agree that many of these young people must, if they are to be trained in adequate skills, leave their home communities, because of the fact that in or near their home communities there is no means of giving them such training. The Senator from Vermont will recall that in the testimony in regard to Pennsylvania there was reference to the training school at Williamsport, Pa. It is a very good school, as I am sure all will agree. That facility is in central Pennsylvania, and it is an important school in Pennsylvania for training in skills which many young persons, and also many older persons, would like to have made available to them. Therefore, those in Pennsylvania who wished to receive such training would have to go to Williamsport. It seems to me that, at the very least, the Secretary should have discretion—if such persons have no way to get to Williamsport, or have no way to support themselves, once they get there—to provide a modest training allowance.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is exaggerating the situation. I think in most of the places where these young people are located, there are high schools or other facilities which would be available for the training of these young people.

I feel very strongly about this particular feature of the bill, and I certainly could not go along with the Senator's thinking on it.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to accept a substitute to the amendment which would restrict the funds to no more than 5 percent of the amounts appropriated, which is a relatively small amount, in view of the total amount provided, so the Secretary of Labor would have some flexibility in dealing with this serious problem?

Mr. PROUTY. No; I do not think I could agree to that. If it were 1 or 2 percent, I might.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer a substitute to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, which, starting as does his amendment, on page 26, line 6, would substitute for the Senator's amendment the following words: "(c) Except where the Secretary of Labor finds such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training for youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age, and only to the extent of 5 percent of the total allowances under this section"—and then proceedings as in the bill at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, beginning on page 26, line 6, to insert the following language:

"Except where the Secretary of Labor finds such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training for youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age, and only to the extent of 5 percent of the total allowances under this section, such weekly training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in support of my substitute amendment, and then I shall be ready for a vote. It goes as far as the Secretary of Labor is willing to go, and puts into statutory form his assurance, as contained in his letter, that he does not expect to spend substantial sums of money in this regard, and is willing to limit it to 5 percent of the total authorization. I think it is a substantial solution to the problems raised by the Senator from Vermont. I respect him for raising it. I think large sums of money should not be used for this purpose. I think we should support the Secretary of Labor. I urge the adoption of my substitute for the Prouty amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my substitute to the Prouty amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think a real concession has been made, and I am happy we have accomplished at least that much, but I think we should go still further. I think the provision should be stricken from the bill entirely.

We must remember that the so-called Youth Conservation Corps program may go into effect next year, not with my support, but a majority of the Congress may see fit to approve it. That bill involves a good many thousands of young people. Also, many young people undoubtedly will be called into the Armed Forces as a result of the build-up in our military strength.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may I point out that if the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania prevails, a 16-year-old boy could receive an average of $32 a week for 52 weeks while he was going to school, perhaps in his own community, where most of the applicants would be taken care of.

I think we should also recognize that this program will not be subject to review for another year, at least, on any important feature, and we might as well postpone grandiose plans until we find out where we are going. I think if the Clark substitute is rejected and if my amendment is agreed to, it will not adversely affect the program.

During the course of a 2-year period we can examine the question of subsistence and then make judgments. I think the judgments should be those of Congress rather than the Secretary of Labor, because I think a great many unfortunate things could creep into an arrangement of that nature. I hope the Clark substitute will be rejected and that my amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 164]

YEAS—53

Anderson, Bartlett, Beall, Bible, Burdick, Byrd, W. Va., Hartke, Hayden, Hickey, Hill, Holland, Humphrey, Jackson, Javits, Johnston, Kefauver, Kerr, Long, Hawaii.

Cannon, Carroll, Case, N.J., Church, Clark, Douglas, Long, La., Magnuson Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, McNamara, Metcalf, Morse, Moss, Muskie, Neuberger, Pastore.

Eastland, Engle, Fulbright, Gore, Gruening, Hart, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Smathers, Smith, Mass., Sparkman, Stennis, Symington, Williams, N.J., Yarborough, Young, Ohio.

NAYS—39

Aiken, Allott, Bennett, Boggs, Bush, Butler, Byrd, Va., Capehart, Case, S. Dak., Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dworshak.

Ellender, Ervin, Fong, Hickenlooper, Hruska, Jordan, Keating, Kuchel, Lausche, McClellan, Miller, Morton, Mundt.

Prouty, Robertson, Russell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Scott, Smith, Maine, Talmadge, Thurmond, Tower, Wiley, Williams, Del., Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—8

Bridges, Carlson, Chavez, Cooper, Dodd, Goldwater, Long, Mo., Monroney.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read the third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 165]

YEAS—60

Aiken, Anderson, Bartlett, Beall, Bible, Boggs, Burdick, Bush, Byrd, W. Va., Capehart, Carroll, Case, N.J., Church, Clark, Cooper, Douglas, Engle, Fong, Gore, Hart.

Hartke, Hayden, Hickey, Hill, Humphrey, Jackson, Javits, Johnston, Keating, Kefauver, Kerr, Kuchel, Long, Hawaii, Long, La., Magnuson, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, McNamara, Metcalf.

Morse, Morton, Moss, Muskie, Neuberger, Pastore, Pell, Prouty, Proxmire, Randolph, Scott, Smith, Mass., Smith, Maine, Sparkman, Symington, Talmadge, Wiley, Williams, N.J., Yarborough, Young, Ohio.

NAYS—31

Allott, Bennett, Butler, Byrd, Va., Case, S. Dak., Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dworshak, Eastland, Ellender.

Ervin, Fulbright, Hickenlooper, Holland, Hruska, Jordan, Lausche, McClellan, Miller, Mundt, Robertson.

Russell, Saltonstall, Schoeppel, Smathers, Stennis, Thurmond, Tower, Williams, Del., Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Bridges, Cannon, Carlson, Chavez, Dodd, Goldwater, Gruening, Long, Mo., Monroney.

So the bill (S. 1991) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961".

TITLE I—MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION

Statement of findings and purpose

SEC. 102. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts

in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be provided with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

Evaluation, information, and research

SEC. 103. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods for detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereto;

(2) establish a pogram of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to affect mobility of workers, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance plans; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes;

(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for untrained and inexperienced youth;

(4) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning manpower requirements, development, and utilization, including prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from automation and other technological developments and improvement of the mobility of workers; and

(5) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

Skill and training requirements

SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, training activities, and employment trends on a National State, or area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in determining the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

Manpower report

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1962) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Part A—Duties of the Secretary of Labor General Responsibility

SEC. 201. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training and retraining programs, including on-the-job training designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are or will be required.

Selection of Trainees

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training those unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate fulltime employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling and selection of youths, sixteen years or older, for occupational training and further schooling. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed persons, the Secretary of Labor shall also refer other persons qualified for training or retraining programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to persons to be trained for skills needed within the State of their residence.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of referred persons, provide for their orderly selection and referral for training under this Act, and provide placement services to persons who have completed their training, as well as follow-up studies to determine whether the programs provided meet the occupational training needs of the persons referred.

Weekly Training Allowances

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States to make payment of weekly Federal training allowances to individuals selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 and undergoing such training. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for individuals undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided however,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such allowance, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

For individuals undergoing on-the-job training and amount of any payment by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by a proportion equal to the ratio that the number of compensated hours per week bears to forty hours: *Provided,* That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

(b) Such weekly training allowances may be supplemented by such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of individuals engaged in training under this title including compensated full-time on-the-job training, when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence: *Provided,* That the Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding the rate of $35 per week; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile: *And provided further,* That where due to the unusual circumstances the maximum per diem allowance would be more than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses the Secretary may prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis.

(c) Except where the Secretary of Labor finds such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training for youths over sixteen but under twenty-two years of age, and only to the extent of 5 per centum of the total allowances under this section, such training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) After June 30, 1963, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such allowances.

(e) No training allowance shall be made to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act of such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

(f) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

(g) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, as far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against

loss and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly Federal training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

On-the-Job Training

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall develop, and shall secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip individuals selected for training with the appropriate skills, including wherever appropriate special programs for youths over sixteen years of age. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption of programs by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective on-the-job training programs.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational educational programs conducted pursuant to the provisions of this title.

(c) In adopting or approving any training program under this part, and as a condition to the expenditure of funds for any such program, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards, including assurances—

(1) that wages paid to trainees are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to learners on the same job; and

(2) that adequate and safe facilities, personnel, and records of attendance and progress are provided.

(d) Where on-the-job training programs under this part require supplementary classroom instruction, appropriate arrangements for such instruction shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor.

National Advisory Committee

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall appoint a National Advisory Committee which shall consist of ten members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, education, and training, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(b) The National Advisory Committee shall encourage and assist in the organization on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis of labor-management-public committees and similar groups designed to further the purposes of this Act and may provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in effectuating such purposes.

(c) The National Advisory Committee may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs or for its general activities or for its responsibilities under subsection (b) of this section.

Reports on Operation of Training Programs

SEC. 206. The Secretary shall develop, compile and make available information concerning—

(1) the number and types of training and retraining activities conducted under this Act;

(2) the number of unemployed persons who have secured full-time employment in fields related to such training or retraining; and

(3) the nature of such employment.

State Agreements

SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the appropriate agency of the State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State or appropriate agency for services rendered for such purposes.

(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a satisfactory manner.

Rules and Regulations

SEC. 208. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this part.

Part B—Duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

General Responsibility

SEC. 231. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of this title, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide training or retraining needed to equip individuals referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals. Such state agencies shall provide for such training or retraining through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such agreement shall provide for payment to such State agency of 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and 50 per centum of the cost with respect to other individuals referred under this Act, and shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provision for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees and provision for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1963, any amount paid to a State to carry out an agreement authorized by this part shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of such cost. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section, and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

Rules and Regulations

SEC. 232. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this part.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Apportionment of benefits

SEC. 301. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under title II of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make such apportionment in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards shall consider only the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the amount of underemployment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployment within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State. For this purpose, the word "State" shall be defined to include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Maintenance of State effort

SEC. 302. No training or retraining program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under part A of title II, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under part B of title II, satisfies himself that the State and/or the locality in which the training is carried out is not reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except for reduction unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

Other agencies and departments

SEC. 303. In the performance of his functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in section 306(a). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

Appropriations

SEC. 304. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, such sums as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act. The total of such sums shall not exceed $90,000,000 for the fiscal year 1962, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963, and $200,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(b) Funds appropriated under the authorization of this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

(c) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased by a State or local vocational education agency with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of part B shall become the property of the State.

(d) No portion of the funds to be used under part B of this Act shall be appropriated directly or indirectly to the purchase, erection, or repair of any building except for minor remodeling of a public building necessary to make it suitable for use in training under part B.

(e) Funds appropriated under this Act shall remain available for one fiscal year beyond that in which appropriated.

Additional positions

SEC. 305. Subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the head of any agency, for the performance of functions under this Act, including functions delegated pursuant to section 303, may place positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by such Act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number of such positions authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to be placed in such grades: *Provided*, That not to exceed a total of ten such positions may be placed in such grades under this subsection, to be apportioned among the agencies by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Authority to contract

SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist establishments in relocating from one area to another. The limitation set forth in this subsection shall not be construed to prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that the assistance in the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

Termination of authority

SEC. 307. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1965.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, Feb. 27, 1962]

Mr. POWELL. 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. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

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. 8399, with Mr. MAHON 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. POWELL] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, in his January 11 state of the Union message, and again in his Economic Report, the President stressed that the task of reducing unemployment and achieving full use of our manpower resources remains a serious challenge which this country must meet in order to fulfill its responsibilities to its citizens and its responsibilities as a leader of the free world.

In setting H.R. 8399 No. 1 on his priority list for domestic legislation, the President pointed out that this country cannot "countenance the suffering, frustration, and injustice of unemployment, or let the vast potential of the world's leading economy run to waste in idle manpower, silent machinery, and empty plants."

There is overwhelming support for the immediate enactment of this legislation. The need for training the hard-core unemployed workers has become widely recognized and publicized. Witnesses before our committee from all segments of the economy—business, labor, education, and the public—testified almost unanimously as to the urgent need for the training program which this bill establishes. Every recent study—the one done by the Committee for Economic Development, and the Michael report for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions—has indicated the need for training and retraining as an essential remedy.

The policy of retraining and retooling our manpower resources has had bipartisan support in this Congress. The bill received the support of the ranking minority members on our committee.

The other body passed a similar measure by a 2 to 1 vote in the last session, after it had been reported out unanimously by their Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Republican study committee has produced a report endorsing the need for this type of legislation.

There is substantial agreement among all who have studied the problem that a major portion of our unemployment exists because most of our idle workers do not possess the skills necessary to equip them for jobs that are available in our highly industrialized economy. The more rapidly our economy advances, the more rapidly do skills become obsolete—and the need for training and retraining and for a continuing appraisal of skill needs and resources, such as this bill provides become more trouble.

Despite recent indications of some recovery from the recession and a decrease in the unemployment rate, there still remains large numbers of workers who have exhausted, even extended, unemployment insurance benefits—those whose skills have become obsolete; the unskilled, especially those without high school education; older workers; minority groups; and the youth.

The American people are well aware of the urgency of this legislation. A recent public opinion poll disclosed that of all the proposals specified by the President in his second state of the Union message, the proposal to train the unemployed was cited by 67 percent of those replying as one for which they were willing to make sacrifices. This was more than twice the degree of support given to any other item listed.

It is clear that present Federal, State, local and private efforts fall far short of the total need, and that without an intensive nationwide program to provide opportunities for retraining, all too many men and women will never be able to obtain the skills which will enable them to be self-supporting and make their maximum contribution to the Nation's productivity. This bill establishes such a program.

The fact that we are in the midst of the cold war only increases the need for the programs this bill will provide. The present struggle requires the maximum use of all our manpower, with no waste of the skills and ability to produce that are now available in the ranks of our long-term unemployed, and which can be fully exploited and utilized when these unemployed are trained for the skills needed today and tomorrow.

Most of us are faced in our districts with visible evidence of the waste of human resources caused by industrial relocation, technological advancement, and the increased application of automation.

The good men and women who have been displaced and cast aside—victims of technological progress—should be given every opportunity to once again become productive members of society.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot close my remarks without paying tribute to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. I can say that no bill in this Congress was proposed prior to this one, because on the morning after the elections in November, the gentleman from Pennsylvania called me and said:

"I would like a green light immediately to go ahead and study and bring forth legislation in this area."

So this legislation began the day after the elections. The homework has been good homework, despite the charge made by one of the Members of this body. It was bipartisan homework. We went out to get the best chief counsel we could get in this area. We hired a young man, Dr. Walter Buckingham, who had written a book on automation, dean of one of the graduate schools in the Georgia Institute of Technology. There has been considerable work done by the Republican group, and I want especially to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] for his great assistance in connection with this program.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Today this country is faced with a strange dilemma. On the one hand, unemployment continues to be our No. 1 domestic problem. Much of this unemployment is caused by automation, foreign competition, plant relocation and normal shifts in our economic production demands. However, at the same time millions are unemployed, and countless jobs go unfilled because men do not have the right kind of skills or those with the skills do not know that the job exists at some other location. It is in this area that the proposed legislation is intended to do its most effective work.

This legislation will not create jobs, nor will it prevent workers from losing their present job when this is caused by the factors that have been listed above. However, it is an affirmative step in the direction of providing a means whereby workers who are displaced, or who are about to be displaced, can upgrade their skills or acquire the necessary training to switch to a new field of employment. There is nothing more tragic than a situation where men sit around in idleness waiting for their old job to open up again when that old job has been forever eliminated. This legislation, and the program of training which it will initiate, can bring new hope and usefulness to this unfortunate group.

At the outset, title I of this bill will be the most important. Here the Secretary of Labor is authorized and instructed to survey the unemployment and employment situation as it exists today and as it will be developing in the future. With these statistics he should be able to determine which skills will become in short supply. Even more important, he should be able to predict what new skills will be needed as we enter into the space age which has now been opened up by Colonel Glenn's epoch-making orbital flight.

Next, the skills of our present workforce will be identified and made known to employers who are seeking such skills. In turn, existing job opportunities will be pointed out to those who are seeking work and who are ready to take the training which is necessary to qualify them for such jobs.

Under title II, the Secretary of Labor will have the authority to test and select individuals for training. This is the heart of the bill—its most important part. Wise and careful selection can insure the success of the program. On the other hand, careless selection motivated by political or other extraneous considerations can spell failure and even worse the discrediting of the whole idea of retraining. It is here that the Goodell substitute contains its most important provisions. Under the provisions of the substitute, the Secretary of Labor is given very specific guidelines and criteria which he must follow when making his selection. For example, priority shall be given to unemployed individuals, and before a person is selected there must be a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which he is trained or the Secretary has received assurance from the individual that he is willing to accept employment outside his area of residence. Also, there will be no referrals for training which takes less than 2 weeks unless there is an immediate job opportunity. Finally, if the trainee does not attend or progress satisfactorily he shall be dropped from the program.

We want to make it clear that this is not a gimmick to get people off the street—a meaningless make-work project. This is and must be a meaningful training program with a job waiting for the trainee once he successfully completes the course of training.

The training allowance provision contained in this section is also very important and again the Goodell substitute provides a number of essential safeguards. Training allowances will be limited to unemployed heads of families who have had at least 3 years' employment experience. It is not intended that this be in the form of a gratuity or spending money for professional trainees. Rather, it is intended to provide the means whereby a man can feed his family while he is being trained for a job which he would not otherwise be able to obtain. However, no training allowance can be paid to an individual who is taking a training course of less than 6 days' duration. The incentive for a quickie course must be an immediate job opportunity.

Finally, a training allowance cannot be paid to an individual for a year after he has received a training allowance under this act or any other Federal act. This, of course, is to discourage the professional trainee—the man who might be inclined or encouraged to go from one training program to another. This again emphasizes the point that this program is intended to train individuals for a specific job.

Title III establishes an on-the-job training program which will be administered by the Secretary of Labor. Training allowances may be given to supplement the pay which the trainee receives from his employer. In addition, classes provided by the Secretary of HEW may be utilized in the training. Again, the emphasis is on training for existing or soon to be existing jobs. An employer who is setting up a new plant or a new department in an old plant will be able to avail himself of this assistance. The trainees will be selected from the unemployed who have been tested and identified as having the requisite basic skill and ability by the Secretary of Labor.

Title IV, vocational training is placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of HEW. This is certainly appropriate and necessary for educational effort should be directed by the Secretary of HEW rather than the Secretary of Labor.

It is also provided that the Secretary of HEW shall utilize the States and the State's vocational education agencies.

Very quickly I would also like to mention two or three additional aspects of this bill which are most important.

The substitute provides that there will be matching by the States after 18 months. This is most important. Matching has always been an integral part of vocational training. It is absolutely essential that this important principle be incorporated at the outset. To do otherwise would be to unnecessarily federalize a program which should be carried on with the support and cooperation of the States.

It is also provided that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of HEW will report back to Congress once each year for the next 2 years. These reports are critical. This is a new program—we must follow it closely. In addition, there is much to be corrected in the present vocational education field. The Secretary of HEW is presently carrying forward a comprehensive survey. We must have the benefit of this survey as soon as it is completed. It is unfortunate but true, that the Assistant Secretary of HEW characterized the present system of vocational education as a hodgepodge when he was questioned by our committee. Hopefully, this can be corrected when the report and recommendations are received.

Finally, the substitute provides that training and placement under this program shall not be denied because of an individual's membership or nonmembership in a union. What could be more fair? Union membership or lack of union membership should have absolutely nothing to do with an individual's selection. It is his need for training and ability to be trained for a particular job that is all important. Those who would object to this provision would be permitting the injection into this program of a completely irrelevant and extraneous matter. In fairness to all future trainees this should not be done.

I urge that the manpower training bill as amended by the Goodell substitute be adopted. It is an important and necessary step. Training and retraining of workers, although now very important, will become even more important in the near future. Federal participation should be under a bill of this type and not in a piecemeal and inefficient manner. Although the administration appears to be headed in the direction of fragmentizing the Federal effort, we in this body and with this legislation have an opportunity to get it started in the right direction. If we do this, it will then be possible to insist that future programs follow the guidelines which we have established and be a part of this one overall training program.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished author of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Holland), 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the Manpower Development and Training Act, H.R. 8399, legislation we have found to be necessary if we are to get our unemployed back to work, our underemployed on a full-time workweek, our national economy on a healthy, stable basis, and our relief load reduced.

I must admit that this sounds like extremely broad coverage for one piece of legislation. However, our unemployment problem is so complex and interwoven with other segments of our society we found, as a result of our public hearings of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, this approach is the most practical as well as the most plausible.

Automation, our subcommittee found, is indeed the promise of the future, but it is also the problem of today.

Automation will create millions of jobs during the years ahead, but in so doing, it is now—and will continue—to eliminate millions of jobs held by those in our work forces.

We know we must have automation if we want our economy to grow and prosper, if we want to have an effective Defense Establishment, if we want to accelerate our space program, if we want to compete on the world market, and if we want to remain a leader in world affairs.

We also realized, however, at the conclusion of our hearings, that we could not sit back any longer and watch our unemployment increase.

We found that during the fifties, with each succeeding recession, more people were unemployed, and with each recovery period which followed, the rate of structural, hard-core, or long-term, or call it what you will, unemployment continued to grow.

In fact, the Department of Labor's latest report, for January of this year on the unemployment situation, shows that hard-core unemployment was holding at 1.25 million, about the same as 1 year ago.

We also found that the United States is the first nation in the world where output or production continued to rise, while employment of production workers continued to decrease.

It was almost unanimously accepted, by those who appeared and testified, and those who submitted statements before our subcommittee, that the present high level of unemployment is the most pressing domestic problem facing the American economy.

That was almost a year ago, and since then we have seen a considerable up-swing in our national economy—our gross national product—but our unemployment rate has not responded equally, for it has decreased but little—by only 1 percent.

During the hearings it was revealed that if we did not act quickly our rate of unemployment in 1962 would be between 5 and 6 percent. Unfortunately, this estimate seems to be apparently accurate.

Testimony from the Department of Labor disclosed that we could expect 1.8 million jobs a year to be eliminated even if our technological advancement and our expansion of automation were no more rapid than at the present rate.

As I said before, we know we must have technological advancement, but we also know that these advancements are responsible for the problems with which we are faced—socially and economically.

It was disclosed at our hearings that the Government has the responsibility to create conditions conducive to economic expansion. However, it has additional responsibilities.

Mr. Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board of General Electric, put it this way:

"If, in spite of the best planning we can do, some people are temporarily unemployed because of technological change, both industry and Government have a recognized responsibility to help families through any such periods of transition."

Mr. Don G. Mitchell, vice chairman of the board of General Telephone & Electronic Corp., said:

"It is the responsibility of the Government to anticipate and to identify those trends which will create chronic unemployment problems in the future, and it has the responsibility to participate in the solution of those problems once they occur."

Mr. Mitchell went on to say:

"A number of possible solutions have been suggested, including a high-level Federal agency which would coordinate Federal activities and work closely with States and local governments.

"There are some people who would insist that the Federal Government stay out of the picture. You and I know that is impossible, for there are certain aspects of the problem, certain critically distressed areas, that will require the kind of massive support that only the Federal Government can provide."

Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the IBM Corp., in his testimony said:

"The problem before us all is not whether to block technology. The problem is how to

block unemployment. Perhaps the thing that confounds us about unemployment is our insistence on calling it a problem. How can we permit able-bodied men or women who want to work to be a problem. America's unemployed, correctly handled, can provide a partial solution to the nation's real problem, that of learning to survive and triumph over communism.

"We must try to solve the unemployment problem—

And I am still quoting Mr. Watson—"by putting it in the setting of the Nation's problems as a whole. In this way we can accept the challenge of unemployment and convert it, through reemployment, into a source of increased national power.

"Admittedly, it is a tremendous undertaking which would have vast effects financial and otherwise on our country. However, learning to survive and triumph in the modern world is an even vaster problem which will only be solved by realism and action of the very boldest sort."

Mr. Watson concluded:

"I believe we are at war. As soon as all of us realize it, we can begin to use all our tools to win it. This is no time to debate whether such a plan will mean more governmental control of business and science. Of course it will * * * but * * * the stakes are too great to let this worry stand in our way."

The President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, in its recent report to the President on the unemployment situation, said:

"While employment has expanded in some industries, the net affect of rising output per worker—of the growing labor force—and of other factors—has been an increase in the volume of unemployment during the past few years, even as total employment has reached new heights. Proper retraining facilities, and a system of financial support for workers, while retraining, have been lacking."

The President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management is composed of Government officials, representatives of labor, and leading industrialists, including Elliott V. Bell, chairman of the executive committee of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Joseph L. Block, chairman of the board of Inland Steel Co., Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president of Reynolds Metal Co., and Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of IBM, whom I quoted earlier. The committee recommended:

"Support from both public and private organizations for retraining of workers who have been—and will be—displaced.

"Where it is not possible for the employer to reabsorb displaced workers, appropriately safeguarded public support, in the form of subsistence payments, should be available to industrial and agricultural workers who qualify for and engage in retraining."

Thus, their findings and recommendations concur with those of our Subcommittee on Unemployment and the impact of Automation and the full Committee on Education and Labor.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, H.R. 8399, we are now considering, is designed to provide training for our unemployed, and, in some cases, our underemployed, who through no fault of their own have found that their skills are now obsolete. Why? Because of the expanding use of automation and other technological changes in our industries.

I would like to emphasize again a fact brought out by Mr. Watson, of IBM—this is a national problem. Every section of our Nation—if it has not already felt the impact of this development—can rest assured that eventually it will experience it.

I would also like to point out that this is a nonpartisan proposal, for when a machine, a computer, a data processor, or some other automatic device moves in, it replaces Democrat and Republican alike. It recognizes no party lines.

I am glad to tell you that this bill, H.R. 8399, was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor by a vote of 24 to 3, indicating that the majority of committee members also felt this was a nonpartisan issue.

The able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] testified on behalf of this bill before the Rules Committee, as did our colleague from New York, the ranking minority member of our subcommittee [Mr. GOODELL].

Because our unemployment problem is nationwide we feel it is the duty of Congress to make every effort to find a solution.

This bill, we know, will not completely solve that problem, but we feel it is certainly a step in the right direct. A step we must take without further delay.

Our States or cities, alone, cannot provide the solution, nor can private corporations acting alone. However, with combined effort by States, counties, cities, private enterprise, and the assistance of the Federal Government, we can start on the road back to full employment and a healthy national economy.

I know that some people will say "we cannot afford this additional expense."

Let me point out to you, we cannot afford not to have this program.

All of us know that automation and technological advancements will continue at an even more rapid rate in the years ahead. With each advancement, more jobs in certain categories are eliminated. Without additional training, the future of these displaced workers point to only one place, our relief rolls.

We must remember one thing: Not only does the worker go on relief, but his family does also. His children do not receive, as a result of this situation, the necessary education or training to prepare them to work and live in our highly automated society of tomorrow, and, we may end up with them on our relief rolls permanently.

We must give these men and women who are raising families the opportunity to be retrained, reenter the work force, education and support their families, become self-sustaining and active contributors to our national economy.

This legislation is an investment in the future. The ultimate returns received by the Nation will be boundless.

Let us look just a little further. I understand that we are going to be asked to help industry further modernize plant and equipment through tax legislation.

It must be realized that with each modernization and each improvement we will see more and more displaced workers, not only in the unskilled groups but also in the semiskilled group.

I do not want to be termed an "alarmist," but I would like to call your attention to the fact that if we keep losing taxpayers from the employment rolls and forcing them to become tax recipients on the relief rolls, who will pay their share of the cost of government? I mean the cost of city, county, State and Federal governments.

We know there are jobs available. However, they all call for more education or for more special training in specific skills than those now held by our unemployed.

With the passage of this legislation and the machinery available for our long-term unemployed to secure training our hard-core unemployment rate will be materially reduced.

Not only will our economy continue to grow, but our total unemployment will shrink and our relief rolls will decrease.

I ask your serious consideration of this legislation and your vote in favor of it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I desire to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania upon the statement he has made. Secondly, I rise to pay personal testimony to the diligent effort the gentleman from Pennsylvania has put into this matter. Last August when this bill was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor the gentleman undertook to get it programed and advised that he would offer perfecting amendments when it reached the floor. He said he was going to continue his study and investigation of this matter. During all this time he was quick to give credit to other members of his subcommittee. For instance, he told me that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL) had important and what he thought were beneficial amendments.

Of the other members of the subcommittee some were interested in the farm provision, others in the youth training provision. The gentleman has pursued this matter vigorously, as has the subcommittee over which he presided; and I think it can well be said that this has been a bipartisan effort and that it has been a job well done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of manpower training legislation. As the ranking member of the subcommittee that wrote this bill I wish to state that I think this bill we brought out of the committee is a promising beginning. It is my understanding that there will be presented a substitute, with bipartisan support, which embodies completely my bill, H.R. 10363. I emphasize that it includes, word for word, every single provision in that bill. Under these circumstances I am particularly pleased, because I offered these amendments; there was a total of 28 or 29 that I offered in subcommittee. About half of them were approved in subcommittee and the other half were rejected. Now that other half is being accepted in the form of a substitute. Under those circumstances I feel we are writing effective legislation.

I offered those amendments primarily to narrow our efforts and focus them on the places of most critical need and to prevent waste in this program.

I would emphasize, in answer to some of the comments that have been made here earlier that I certainly do not think training legislation is the full answer to our unemployment problem. It is a beginning. We are not going to spend money on any people who do not accept training, who do not make a sincere effort to utilize their abilities and develop new skills. If 10 percent of the unemployed in an area accept training, those are the ones we are going to spend money on. If 90 percent reject the training, we shall spend no money on them. They will remain on the unemployment rolls and the welfare rolls. So the 10 percent is a bonus. It is money spent well to put those 10 percent back into the productive stream of our economy.

I do not endorse the view that automation is a major cause of unemployment. I do not believe the facts will indicate that we should panic about the effects of automation. Most of its results are beneficial to mankind. Automation increases productivity and in my opinion when you increase productivity you ultimately increase employment. Historically this has been true in our economy.

No substantial expert has come before our committee and argued against technological progress and automation. We are simply striving to adapt humanely to the needs of fast change in our economy.

The statement was made earlier that we would have no one to train under these programs. I have before me a small example of some of the skills for which training would be useful. And when we go back into the House I shall place this in the RECORD as part of my remarks. But broken down, to give you an example of the type of things

we can do, in an 8- to 20-weeks training period, we could train workers to be bookkeeping machine operators, key punch operators, clerk-typists, nurses' aids, welders, sewing machine operators, electronic assemblers, fabricators of plastics, and so forth.

In a 21- to 52-week training time we go all the way from medical record librarians and psychiatric social workers through X-ray technicians, surveyors, fertilizer technicians, and so forth. This is a long, long list and to anyone who is interested I should be glad to make it available for him to see at the desk.

My amendments were designed to prevent the types of things which were discussed here earlier as to abuses, putting people on training allowance to train them to be waitresses or dishwashers or chambermaids. One of my amendments would prevent any training allowance to a person who is trained for less than 6 days. This will eliminate in itself most of the very small minor skills for which some person might get a day or two of training. They can be trained, but will receive no training allowance. For anybody who is trained for less than 2 weeks under my amendment there must be an immediate job vacancy available. It is my opinion if you are training a person for less than 2 weeks' time you should know a job vacancy is there and will be there at the end of 2 weeks. Under my substitute bill there will be a training allowance paid only to unemployed—not to employed or underemployed or prospectively unemployed but only to unemployed, heads of families. In other words, the ones who are in most critical need and who have held jobs for at least 3 years will receive the help. This will prevent giving this aid to young people who have quit school in order perhaps to qualify for training allowances or for some kind of training.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LANDRUM. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman from New York I would ask how his amendments would permit payment to people selected under this act under the provision on page 8 of the substitute which I understand will be offered, which reads thusly:

"Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purposes of this Act."

Now how are you going to provide for the payment of training allowances to a worker from that farm family?

Mr. GOODELL. The training allowance would be paid to him when he accepted a program of training for a specific skill, provided he was a head of family. If his training was for less than 6 days he would get no training allowance.

Mr. LANDRUM. You have just stated that no training allowance would be paid to one who had not held a job for at least 3 years. Must this farm family show that they had not had income of more than $1,200 for a period of 3 years?

Mr. GOODELL. No. He must show, to qualify for this aid, that he has held a job for 3 years in his lifetime.

Mr. LANDRUM. That is, if he has been a farmer, 3 of the years of his life, whether they were consecutive or not—or interspersed with great periods of employment in something else, he would still qualify under this bill?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. My amendment is designed merely to prevent aid to any young people who are quitting school and then going into a training program to be paid for it. They not only must have worked for 3 years but they also must be heads of families and unemployed.

Mr. LANDRUM. In view of the last statement which the gentleman has made, referring to page 7 of what I understand will be the substitute to be offered by the gentleman we find that the Secretary of Labor whenever appropriate shall provide a special program for the testing and counseling of youth 11 years or older for selection of these youths for whom occupational training under this act is indicated. How are they going to qualify for on-the-job training when obviously they cannot have held a job for 3 years prior to that?

Mr. GOODELL. The young people who do not qualify as heads of families with 3 years of work and being unemployed will qualify for training but not for training allowances. We set up a special program for testing and counseling of these young people but they will get no training allowances from the Federal Government.

Mr. LANDRUM. Are you by this provision encouraging the 16-year-olds to abandon their high school training program?

Mr. GOODELL. I think this amendment prevents that. That is my intent in presenting the substitute.

Mr. LANDRUM. Are you encouraging the 16-year-old to abandon the opportunity to go to the area vocational schools that are being established in many of our States?

Mr. GOODELL. He may go to the vocational school exactly the way he is going now but he will not be paid a training allowance for doing so.

Mr. LANDRUM. That is the point I want to get at. In order to go to the vocational school he has to go there under the reqirements and prerequisites set up by the Secretary of Labor. Is that not correct? That is what you are saying.

Mr. GOODELL. You have raised another point which I will cover at this stage because it is a very excellent point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

To a considerable degree the original administration bill confused the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor. In subcommittee a number of my amendments were accepted which I believe clarified this point completely.

The original bill had a tendency to put our vocational schools under the Labor Secretary. We did not want that. We want them segregated completely, if I may use that word.

Mr. LANDRUM. That is a good word.

Mr. GOODELL. We will not get into that because I am afraid we have a little disagreement there. We want this separated, may I say, so that the vocational system would continue to be run by the local and State governments and HEW; and, therefore, we provided that 19 percent of the money would come from the Federal Government, 40 percent from the local government, and 35 percent from the State government. It is primarily a State and local program. We provide Federal aid to take up part of the burden. We specifically deny the Secretary of Labor the authority to move over into that program and start trying to take it over. I believe we do that effectively.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. I cannot agree with that statement just made by the gentleman in view of the provisions of section 202 headed "Selection of Trainees." This states specifically that the Secretary of Labor, not the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor shall provide a special program for testing and counseling of youth 16 years of age or older, and for the selection of those youths for whom occupational training under this act is to be given. You specifically give the authority to the Secretary of Labor to select those youths.

Mr. GOODELL. Absolutely.

Mr. LANDRUM. And refer them to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. GOODELL. Absolutely.

Mr. LANDRUM. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have the direction of the educational agency, the counseling and guidance of the public school program and State school program which presently do that. Why do you want to remove it from them and let the Secretary of Labor get his fingers into the pie?

Mr. GOODELL. I will tell you precisely why we want to do it; and let me make this point: Selection, counseling, and referral of these unemployed prospective trainees is done by your local employment offices, by State employment offices, and the U.S. Employment Service under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor is going to make this decision through those offices as to selecting, and testing, and referral. That is where the Secretary of Labor's authority ends. After the Secretary refers them, the local, State, and HEW vocational system provides the training, they control this training and the schooling. That is where we want to keep it.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. LANDRUM. So you confirm my previous suggestion that the only way you are going to get these youths into the vocational training program after the adoption of this bill is after the Secretary of Labor has tested them, counseled them, looked them over, sized them up for the qualities he wants, and then refers them himself.

Mr. GOODELL. He may enter vocational school without any reference to employment offices or the Secretary of Labor. But the only way he will qualify for a training allowance is if he goes through the orderly procedures of the employment offices. A good example of the need for such a procedure is that many of these vocational schools are teaching obsolescent trades where, had they consulted the employment offices, the employment offices could have told them the skills in which there were shortages and they could train people accordingly; under the substitute, there would be some coordinated effort.

Mr. LANDRUM. It seems to me that could be done under the Smith-Hughes Act, the National Defense Vocational Training Act, and others.

Mr. GOODELL. If I may say, the only agency that is capable of dealing with this unemployment problem properly and doing the testing and counseling is your local employment office which is under the jurisdiction of the States and the Department of Labor.

Mr. LANDRUM. Who is to determine the unemployment problem? Who is to determine the skill necessary? You are here giving the Secretary of Labor authority to select the trainee and to select him at a high school age level.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Somebody has to decide whether the youth or other unemployed person is going to be sent to an occupational school or on-the-job training. You have to have some concentration of responsibility in the matter of selection and referral but after the individual goes on the job or goes into that school, does not that institution and whoever in the Federal or State Governments, or whoever has jurisdiction, continue to have jurisdiction over the training?

Mr. GOODELL. That is true. We have a specific provision in here requiring HEW through the school to notify the local employment office if the student is not performing satisfactorily or attending satisfactorily. It is then entirely in the discretion of the HEW and the local vocational school system,

as to whether the trainee is training satisfactorily. If they notify the Secretary of Labor that he is not, then he is cut off from the training allowance.

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

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

Mr. LANDRUM. In view of what has just been said about the Secretary of Labor having no more authority after the selections are made, I read section 303 of the proposed substitute, and it is in the pending bill too:

The Secretary of Labor shall make appropriate provision for continuous supervision of the on-the-job training programs conducted under this title to insure the quality of the training provided and the adequacy of the various programs.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman in his very meticulous and intelligent way has skipped to another section dealing with on-the-job training, not vocational training. The Secretary of Labor now has jurisdiction and we are giving the Secretary of Labor continued jurisdiction over on-the-job training in the plants. That is no change over present law.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply want to call to the attention of the Members of the House, this is one of the key areas where there has been a collapse in this whole program in our society. There has been a fight on jurisdiction between the Department of Education and the Department of Labor. I want to commend the committee for grappling with this difficult problem, and also the gentleman from Georgia for bringing out the point that this is the area that the Congress must resolve. But we certainly do not want to continue this confused jurisdiction. The committee has done an excellent job of preserving jurisdiction in a very practical way and providing a responsibility for moving forward.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

May I point out further, in the substitute there will be a matching provision. The State governments shall match Federal funds in the payment of these training allowances as quickly as possible. My bill makes it 18 months. The unemployment compensation fund will be protected under my bill, which is the substitute, by providing reimbursement for training under the unemployment system. Today in approximately 17 States a man who is unemployed and collecting unemployment insurance may take training and continue to collect his unemployment compensation. This provision will permit us to reimburse those State unemployment trust funds, paid for entirely by the employers, for the period that a man is undergoing training. I think this is fair because you are taking a man out of the job market when he goes into a training school. He is temporarily not available for suitable jobs, and he should not be charged to the employed. I am happy that provision has been accepted.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Section 203(f), page 11: "A person who receives training under this act shall not for 1 year be entitled to any training allowance."

That takes all discretion away from the man. If he refuses to take the training, he is sitting on the sidelines until he can get back to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GOODELL. That is very important. The greatest challenge made of this training allowance by conservatives, such as myself and others here, is that we might end up letting people stay on the unemployment rolls until their full eligibility had elapsed, then they could jump over and take up a training allowance.

This provision would give the local employment office some authority to deal with such a situation. A man who was deemed qualified for training and asked by the employment counselors to take up training and refused to do so, because he wanted to stay on the unemployment rolls until his eligibility was gone, would not be eligible for training for a year thereafter. It may be a harsh provision, but he is just ineligible, that is all.

Mr. WAGGONNER. What would happen if a man had been on the unemployment rolls and he had just one week of eligibility left?

Mr. GOODELL. In that circumstance, he would be eligible. If the long-term unemployed, particularly, are eligible for training and qualified, we want them to get the training and get them back in and start paying taxes instead of being on the unemployment or welfare rolls.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But the assumption is that the Secretary of Labor knows more about this than the man himself.

Mr. GOODELL. The unemployed man can refuse training. But he just will not get a training allowance for a year thereafter if he refuses it, and wants to sit around collecting unemployment compensation. I do not think he should be able to do that with impunity.

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

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

Mr. KYL. The gentleman always speaks with such clarity. Suppose we have a rather small community and there are 25 people who want to be retrained in 25 different occupations, as you have listed them. Where are these people going to get their training?

Mr. GOODELL. We provide that they can be sent to the nearest place that provides this kind of facility. If they choose to go, they will go and we will help pay their transportation costs back and forth. One of my amendments would limit the total amount of this transportation allowance that may be granted to these people, but in small communities we anticipate they will have to go to the nearest facility, and if transportation is necessary, they will be paid that. If it is more economical for them to go and stay 5 days, in the nearest city for instance, to get this training, we will pay them subsistence while they are in the city.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What is this business going to cost, and where is the money coming from to pay it?

Mr. GOODELL. The money is going to come from the Federal Government, $262 million over a 2-year period. States will match Federal money after 18 months. I believe the history of training under the vocational rehabilitation program and under the vocational program generally has demonstrated that we will get back a major share of our expenditures in terms of increased productivity and taxes collected from the individuals involved. Instead of them standing around stagnating, they will be working and they will pay their share of taxes and pay part of the load, and we want to help them do that.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could share your optimism, but I do not.

Mr. GOODELL. I am sorry I cannot persuade my esteemed colleague from Iowa, but I do feel this very deeply. This has been, I may say to my colleagues on this side, a Republican approach. It is a solidly conservative approach, in my opinion, to the problem of unemployment, to help the people develop their own potential and get back into the working force. I do not want to try to solve this problem by wildly throwing a lot of Federal money into the economy, loading your employers with more cost so that they cannot expand their operations, create new jobs, and improve their productivity. Nor should we do it by generally hamstringing the economy. This substitute bill, H.R. 10363, offered by me last week will help the employers to develop the skills of their workers, and they will be able to find the people they need in short skills more quickly because they will know where their supply is coming from. I, as much as anyone who has spoken here do not believe that we ought to shield our people or our economy completely from the facts of life, nor avoid the necessary purging and shedding of inefficiencies in our economy. This substitute bill is a method of helping people help themselves by putting workers, who are laid off by reason of technological advancement, back to work productively, when they can carry their own load from there on. I want to express my commendation to the other side for accepting my substitute bill, H.R. 10363. My bill has 11 major differences from the committee bill. Those 11 changes were rejected in subcommittee when offered by me. I am glad the Democratic members of the committee are now accepting H.R. 10363, in toto. We will now have a bipartisan approach which I can accept wholeheartedly.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I support the bill, H.R. 8399, and particularly the inclusion of low-income farm people in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure for me to speak in favor of H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which bill is now before the House. I have always been a firm supporter of, and a great believer in, more vocational education; more training for our citizens so that they can better compete for jobs in this age of technology and, thus, earn a better living for themselves and their families; more training so that industry will be encouraged to locate where there is a good supply of skilled employees; and more training so that our great country can grow and increase its productivity and thus maintain its leadership in the free world. I am glad the Committee on Education and Labor placed the responsibility for formal training under this bill in the hands of our friends of vocational education, who have had 40 years of experience in educating and training people for the vocations.

In my State, vocational education has done fine things—it is conducted by fine teachers and fine administrators. The only trouble with vocational education in Alabama is that there is not nearly enough of it. We do not have enough money to get the equipment and to compete with industry for teachers to furnish sufficient up-to-date training to the many people who could use it, and who desperately want and need it.

There are some in this great body who might have doubts about the wisdom of a comprehensive nationwide program of vocational training. Let me assure them on this score. The backlog of training to be done is so great that they need have no fears if this program went three times the size now proposed by the administration. Let me assure them that between training our unemployed people of all ages and upgrading the skills of those who are now working, there will be no problem of spending the money both wisely and usefully.

The State of Alabama can well use the $5 million provided by this bill in the next 2 years. One-third of this sum will be available for equipment, teachers' salaries, and the other expenses of vocational education which as the Members of this body know has been

supported by the Federal Government ever since 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. The remainder of the funds will be available for providing allowances to tide over the unemployed person while he completes his training.

Mr. Chairman, I want to propose one amendment which I think will strengthen the bill. Alabama is an agricultural State. Many of its people are farmers who are not earning a good enough living. There are 79,724 rural farm families in my State whose total annual income is $1,200 or less. Of these families, 4,110 live in my Seventh Congressional District. This is not just an Alabama problem. There are 1,624,505 such farm families in the United States today. But where the national figure represents 12 percent of the country's farm community, the figure for my district represents 27 percent and the Alabama figure indicates that a total of 23 percent, nearly one-third, of our farm families earn less than $1,200.

These people are not unemployed the way a city dweller is when he has no job. But actually, this meager farm income is so small that the farmer's condition amounts to unemployment. Where the net family income is less than $1,200, it is my view that such a person should be considered unemployed. The change which I propose will permit farm workers to prepare themselves for jobs in their local communities and thus supplement their farm income. The Senate-passed bill contains language so providing and I am told that such an amendment to this bill is acceptable to the administration and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Mr. HOLLAND], who has worked so diligently and so worthily and so effectively on this bill.

I therefore propose the following amendment:

"At the end of section 202(a), on line 10, page 7 of the bill add the following: 'Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.'"

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the so-called Goodell bill, H.R. 10363, is primarily the original Holland bill, except that it does embody parts taken from the Senate bill, such as the priority provisions in that bill, which I personally feel will improve the Goodell proposal and the substitute to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. But, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] also goes to the Youth Opportunities Act to take another provision, and that is on-the-job training for the youth.

Mr. Chairman, there are three titles in the Youth Opportunities Act. Title I provides for on-the-job training. Then there is the public service employment title, and the Youth Conservation Corps. It was our hope, of course, when we were studying the Youth Opportunities Act last year, and we felt at the time that we would get the Youth Opportunities Act to the floor prior to the retraining bill. But since the retraining bill has been brought to the floor first, naturally it makes good commonsense to put all of the retraining programs together.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I may be able to help clear up some way, somehow, where this question of authority should be lodged, and why it should be lodged in the Secretary of Labor. We have got to have a concentration of authority. We have more than 1 million youths today between the ages of 16 and 22 years who are unemployed, who are dropouts from high school, and from the grade schools. Many of these dropouts, these teenagers, that this bill provides for have dropped out of vocational educational schools. Would it not be ridiculous to try to require these youngsters to go right back to a place from which they had already dropped out?

It is natural that we have other provisions to take care of such youngsters, such as on-the-job training. We feel that good work can be done under this particular provision. Many of us remember the NYA days where hundreds and hundreds of thousands of youths between the ages of 17 to 22 were trained on the job and took their places in defense plants, having been trained as stonemasons, welders, woodworking, and in many other trades.

Since the Department of Labor has the very definite responsibility, under this legislation, for determining manpower needs and the responsibility to screen, counsel, and select the people to be trained or retrained, they certainly should have the right to enter into contracts with HEW in connection with retraining. I may say that during World War II the Manpower Commission at that time determined the skills needed and they selected the people and referred them to various industrial establishments for training, as well as to the public vocational schools of America. This is not any precedent in any sense of the word.

So I think the committee has acted wisely in placing this authority in the hands of the Secretary of Labor because not only the youngsters, but the people trained or retrained always visit those State employment offices to ascertain information about employment. These unemployed expect the employment offices to have the answers.

Mr. Chairman, this is another point I would like to make: whether the people to be retained really want this bill. I for one, know that this is not a cure-all. In many areas in my section we need a public works program. In one of my counties we have some 12,000 unemployed. Some 3,100 of them today are drawing unemployment compensation. There are more than 3,000 exhaustions and some 6,000 to those, mostly miners, have not had employment for many years. But right across from Pike County, Ky., in Mingo County, W.Va., they have a training program under the Area Redevelopment Administration—a county about half the population of Pike County—and they can only train 200 people in the trade school there, but they have 964 men who have come in and applied for training. And this is right across the river from the county that I am talking about. This clearly demonstrates the great demand for training.

Not many years ago 25,000 men in the district that I represent earned a living from the mining of coal—today that figure is down to 10,000 even though the amount of coal being mined is about the same. The 15,000 who watched machinery take their jobs have been fighting adversity. They do not have the skills which employers require. Most of them want work, but they look for work under a terrible handicap. The bill we are debating today offers some of them hope. It offers training to those of them who can get benefit from such training. It offers it to them in the form of courses which are considered likely to provide jobs, and it offers them this training with enough weekly financial aid so as to permit completion of the courses.

The bill's passage will be a great day for vocational training. It provides some funds for on-the-job training to the extent that employers will find it feasible. But the greater part of the training money will go to vocational training—the kind of shop work, the kind of experience on modern machinery which is available at Mayo Technical Trade Schools in Ashland, Hazard, and elsewhere in the Nation. The bill will thus provide vocational training at an increased scale, $4½ million in Kentucky alone. As in other vocational training programs now supported by the Federal Government, this money will be expended for teachers' salaries, new equipment, the rental and renovation of buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity of speaking on behalf of a program which will mean so much to the people. I commend the administration for its leadership in bringing hope to our unemployed and in showing the way to a new era for vocational training.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House be inserted at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the letter referred to is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1962.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The amendments to H.R. 8399 in the proposed Holland substitute include certain language of which the purport is to transfer title I of H.R. 8354 to H.R. 8399. Title I of the administration's Youth Employment Opportunities Act (H.R. 8354) would authorize an annual program of training the first year for approximately 25,000 youth between the ages of 16 through 21.

The proposed amendment leaves to the discretion of the Secretary of Labor the proportion of training services available to such young people. In order to assure those who have devoted their interest and energies to the growing problem of 1 million out-of-school and unemployed youth, I want to make clear that it will be my intention to make available sufficient moneys authorized by H.R. 8399 as amended for training at least 25,000 young people the first year and 33,000 in subsequent years. The number of young people aided by the bill might exceed this number. I have assumed that appropriations will be made available at a level contemplated by the bill.

I will appreciate your making this letter a part of the legislature history of this bill.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend this subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] for the very fine work that they have been doing, and in particular coordinating the various areas that this bill touches on. I say that with real concern because this does touch on one of the jurisdictions of the Committee on Ways and Means which considers unemployment insurance.

I am most pleased to state that among the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will be found the provision in regard to the unemployment insurance systems in the States so that this program will not interfere with or in any way damage them. I am looking to see if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is in the Chamber. This matter has been cleared with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] together with myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman BYRNES and others on the Committee on Ways and Means who are concerned with it. I do want to say my interest in this legislation goes way beyond the aspects of the unemployment insurance program. This has been a matter of constant concern to the Joint Economic Committee. I am happy to state that this bill and the concept is the approach I take in regard to the real problem of unemployment which is that it is essentially a matter of frictional and structural

unemployment and not a matter of cyclical and what I term to be the concept of the Keynesian economists who say that the unemployment can be solved through massive Federal expenditure programs. Indeed, I think the work that this subcommittee has done points up very pointedly the area just where it needs to be pinpointed and it is a matter of rapid economic growth, automation we call it, where skills are made obsolete very quickly and where it is concentrated among the unskilled and semiskilled workers, and that this job of retraining I might say is not a simple one—it is not just a question of matching the unskilled and the semiskilled unemployed person with the new skills that technological advancement creates because you are not going to take the displaced cotton picker or the displaced ditch digger and train him for these higher skills.

What is happening is that a person with a job retrains or studies at night to learn a higher skill so he moves over into that higher skill leaving a job open for someone down the line to upgrade his skill. This is a very difficult and complicated matter that this bill is directing its attention to with reference to this basic problem of retraining. Essentially the point needs to be made that automation and rapid technological advancement actually creates more jobs than it displaces. But the human element involved is the thing that makes it difficult for us as legislators to meet because an unemployed person or a displaced skill is related to a human being and it involves all the human problems while the newly created job—which, incidentally, is going begging because we are not filling the jobs we need to fill—is not related yet to a human being and therefore we do not have it calling out in this fashion. Lest anyone think that these thousands of jobs that are going begging are not in existence, test yourself with your own newspaper and look at the want ads, particularly on Sunday where you will see the want ads showing skills that are going begging. Take the New York Sunday Times of this last Sunday or of any Sunday. You will find column after column and page after page of people advertising for the skills that are needed in our economy. Actually our unemployed are our greatest resources to fill these skills that our society needs.

One of the points brought out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] very ably and also by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] when he was pointing out this problem of the jurisdiction of vocational education which is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and on-the-job training and apprenticeship training which is in the Department of Labor, one of the tragedies has been over the period of years that our two Departments most concerned in this area have not been doing their job and vocational education has gotten to the point where much of it is training people in skills that are already obsolete.

The committee hearings bring this out to some degree; but the point of this lies here: Secretary Ribicoff in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee just 2 weeks ago in regard to revising our welfare program, pointed out the great need, he said, to have schools in the field of social work, not just the college graduates, I might add, to function in the field of social work. I asked the Secretary: "What are you doing in your vocational educational program toward attracting people to take jobs, to go out and become technicians in this field?" And Secretary Ribicoff made this remark, and I was pleased to hear it; he said: "After some of our previous discussions on this we are completely revising and studying in depth the entire field of Federal vocational education." This is a program, I might state, which dates back to 1917. This is nothing new. This is a program that has been in existence along with the other bill which became law in 1946. So a great deal of work has to be done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in this tremendous area of vocational education.

Likewise, the Department has not been doing an adequate job in developing its dictionary of skills. That was brought out during debate on the floor when the rule was under consideration. I believe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] demonstrated the inadequate list of skills that has been compiled to date by the Department of Labor, highly inadequate. The job is not being done.

But the point of this bill and the key to this bill, in my judgment, is the requirement that both of these Departments report back—this is found on page 20, section 504(a)—both the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of HEW shall report to the Congress prior to March 1, 1963, on what they have done in developing their programs, so that they know what they are doing and requiring, and the coordination of these two Departments on the scene.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I also would like to commend the gentleman for his leadership. In fact, many of my amendments were derived from the very solid statement he made after the study, and they have been incorporated in the substitute which will be presented tomorrow. I think the gentleman from Missouri can take considerable credit for this substitute.

The gentleman also referred to the requirement for reporting within a year. I would point out that the substitute which will be presented tomorrow specifically adds to the other report provisions that were in the previous bill, requiring that reports include the number of individuals trained and the number and types of training activities under this act, the number of unemployed or underemployed persons who have secured full-time employment as a result of such training, and the nature of such employment. That is spelled out in the bill specifically. They must report in detail and that report must also be made in 2 years, 1 year after enactment and 2 years after enactment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York for the great work he did. I am so pleased these amendments are being accepted.

If I may turn again to the other side of the aisle and to say to the chairman how much I appreciate the cooperation the chairman gave to those of us who were trying to work on this, and the fact he has been working in this field so many, many years with great results. It could only be achieved with your patience and understanding, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, chronic structural unemployment has been a problem which our country has faced almost continuously since the last war. In my home State of Minnesota there is a graphic example of this—the Iron Range of northern Minnesota. As I have watched the situation in that area I have become aware that steps must be taken to solve our problems—not just ease the pain caused by those problems nor postpone the day in which we must face up to the truth of those problems.

This is not a question of our States neglecting the problem of chronic unemployment. Many pepole at the State level of government are working hard to find a solution. Again, to use my home State as an example, Governor Andersen, of Minnesota, is providing admirable leadership to remove unemployment and to restore a more favorable competitive position for our American iron ore industry.

Within the realm of Federal responsibility, the present short range programs—such as providing adequate unemployment compensation—are desirable in alleviating the situation.

More important is that we develop long range programs aimed not only at lessening the results of our economic problems but also designed at removing the sources of these problems.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor I have supported and will continue to support Federal aid for the retraining and relocation of unemployed workers. I believe that the question we face today is how we will arrive at the best bill to provide this retraining and relocation of workers.

Workers who have lost jobs because of basic changes in the economy must be encouraged to learn other skills which are in demand. We must not abandon those workers with obsolete skills to carry the burden of technological change alone.

The majority of these workers had no control over the economic shifts which left them unemployed with unwanted skills. They also lack the necessary resources for retraining. Added to these factors is a third and most important reason for Federal aid. Our national economy is presently losing the productive services of these workers.

The home communities of the retrained cannot be expected to carry the full load when, after new skills are developed, employment may be found in other areas and perhaps in other States.

If a retraining bill is passed it must be carefully coordinated with private, State, and local efforts to solve the problem. In particular, the training allowance provision must be made to dovetail with the present unemployment compensation system.

This, the Goodell substitute bill, would insure by requiring the States to match Federal funds in paying the retraining allowances as quickly as possible and by providing reimbursement to State unemployment compensation funds which would permit training while a worker collects unemployment compensation.

The Goodell substitute also provides needed provisions to insure that those people most needy receive retraining funds and that the retraining funds are not misused.

It is my privilege to serve with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL) on the Education and Labor Committee. Mr. GOODELL'S keen grasp of this problem as it came before the committee and his hard work in drafting his retraining bill has greatly impressed me. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL) is to be commended for his efforts and contributions.

During the past few weeks there has been much discussion of expanded American foreign trade and of how the transition to freer trade can be made a smoother one. All of this talk has centered around the competitive position vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

Legislation providing for the retraining and relocation of workers would do much to enable us to compete more favorably with the rest of the world. Retraining of workers would not simply postpone the day when certain American products can openly compete with European goods as would be the effect of import quotas. Rather retraining would act to improve our competitive position today.

Retraining of workers is an example of positive and progressive Federal action at its finest. For this reason I heartily support the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important legislation which would help the workers of our Nation adjust to the problems which are created by automation and rapid technological advances; legislation which would provide for the effective development and use of our Nation's manpower resources to meet the skill requirements of our highly advanced and constantly changing industrial society.

There is no question in my mind that one of the most serious domestic challenges confronting us in the 1960's is to achieve full employment in the face of a rapidly expanding labor force and the continued displacement of workers by automation.

We can, of course, take satisfaction that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment in January of this year dropped below the 6-percent level for the first time since September of 1960. We must take cognizance of the fact, however, that the number of long-term unemployed—those who have been out of work for 15 weeks or longer—has not changed from last Januarys total of 1,250,000, and that 700,000 of these workers have been out of work for more than 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, this problem of long-term unemployment is especially severe among the nonwhite elements of our labor force, and this is a matter with which I am greatly concerned. As the Department of Labor's figures for the month of January 1962 indicate, 10.8 percent of our labor force is composed of other than Caucasians—28.7 percent of this group, however—a disproportionately high level—has been seeking work for 6 months or longer.

This problem must be dealt with for it is a cause of severe personal suffering as well as a serious loss to our total national effort.

There is agreement among those who have studied this matter, as the Committee on Education and Labor has stated in its excellent report accompanying this bill:

"That a substantial proportion of our unemployment exists because idle workers do not have the skills necessary to enable them to undertake existing jobs. Many hundreds of thousands of unemployed lack the skills which are needed in our present-day economy. Unless these people acquire new skills, their unemployment will persist even when recovery from the present recession is completed."

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt that the labor force of this country is our most valuable productive resource. I urge my colleagues therefore, to support this constructive and urgently needed manpower development and training legislation which would enable us to more effectively utilize this resource; legislation which would improve the skills and adaptability of our Nation's workers through a continuing assessment and review of our manpower needs, and through broadly based programs of training and retraining which would match workers' skills with needed jobs.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 28, 1972]

HOUSE

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8399, with Mr. MAHON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] had 25 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, during the course of yesterday's debate a number of questions arose with regard to the fashion in which this bill, if enacted into law, would operate. In particular, there were questions with regard to an alleged conflict of responsibility between the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with regard to the effect of enactment of this legislation upon existing vocational education and on-the-job training programs. I will direct myself to those questions.

In practical operation the manpower retraining program would work something like this: First, the Secretary of Labor would, through the facilities of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the U.S. Employment Service and other divisions of the Department of Labor determine occupational——

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

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

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman going to be able to support the amendment that will be offered?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I think the proposed amendment has a number of very good features and I support both the amendment and the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the first step involves the selection through testing, interviewing and counseling of persons who are able and qualified to take training and want such training for new jobs. The jobs for which they will be trained would depend upon determinations by the Department of Labor and by the various State employment agencies. They would determine what the job needs and the training needs of their areas were and they would select the occupations for which trainees would be trained.

Second, the States, under the provisions of their agreements with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would provide suitable training programs to equip selected trainees with the desired skills. They would use existing public and private vocational training schools and agencies and on-the-job training programs.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], raised a question with regard to the operation of other vocational training programs if this program were to be enacted into law. I think it should be made very clear at this point that, as far as trainees under this program go, they must be selected and referred to training by the State employment agencies; but this would in no way affect the operation of other vocational education programs and in particular it would not require a referral by the Secretary of Labor before taking part in existing programs such as the area vocational institute programs under the National Defense Education Act. They would continue as before.

The Federal Government would pay the cost of training under the act for unemployed trainees and up to 50 percent of the cost for trainees who have jobs of one sort or another and who are engaged in training for upgrading purposes.

During the course of the training program the Secretary would pay trainees a training allowance roughly equivalent to unemployment compensation benefits.

Persons being trained on on-the-job training programs would, of course, be receiving some payment from their employers and their training allowance would be reduced accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to this matter of training allowances, the committee believes that training allowances are essential if this program is to work. Under the employment compensation laws of about two-thirds of the States, an unemployed person eligible for unemployment compensation and drawing unemployment compensation will lose his rights to those benefits if he undertakes a training program. When he undertakes a training program, he is considered no longer available for work and he is cut off from unemployment compensation. This feature of State unemployment compensation systems has been an important factor in inhibiting the use of training programs by unemployed persons. A man with a wife and two or three or four children can ill afford to give up his unemployment benefits, which he needs to pay the rent and to buy the groceries, to take a program of training. The proposal for training alloawnces is designed to make it possible for unemployed persons to take this training program and equip themselves for new employment without suffering a complete loss of income. They will receive an amount roughly equivalent to their unemployment compensation benefits while they are training.

Approximately one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated will be allocated to teachers' salaries, equipment and rental of buildings which are aspects of vocational training traditionally supported by Federal funds. Approximately two-thirds of the total authorized to be appropriated would be expanded for the payment of training allowances.

Finally, the bill provides for counselling and placement services through the State employment agencies for trainees who have successfully completed their courses.

Additional matter in the Holland bill sets forth the formula for the apportionment of Federal funds among the States, and provides safeguards to insure that the training offered is adequate to the purposes for which it is given, and to prevent States and other governmental units from substituting Federal programs under the act for existing local programs.

I think this last, Mr. Chairman, is a very important point because it is not our intention to merely subsidize existing vocational training programs. Funds under this act would be available only for additional training programs, over and above those presently being conducted. No State or locality could receive Federal funds for a training program under this act, if it were using these funds to reduce its local effort. They must maintain their level of local effort.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that throughout this bill the utmost care has been taken to provide economical and efficient operation of the training program through maximum utilization of existing Federal and State agencies and avoiding duplication and overlapping of Federal and State efforts.

One of the ways we do this, Mr. Chairman, is through maintaining the traditional lines of authority of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Throughout the history of such programs, the Secretary of Labor has been responsible for determining manpower needs and the referral and placement of jobseekers. We keep that function in the Department of Labor. We do not attempt to set up a new bureau within the Depart-

ment of Health, Education, and Welfare to perform the same task.

We likewise keep on-the-job training under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor. That is where it has been and we do not want to make a change.

Similarly we bring in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who has responsibility for Federal vocational education programs. We retain his role of leadership of those programs. There is no change in the existing lines of Federal authority contrary to what some of the speakers yesterday might have indicated. But, nevertheless, this is the explanation for the fact that both the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are involved in the operation of this act.

Mr. Chairman, we do not pretend that the enactment of this bill is going to solve the Nation's unemployment problem. Indeed, under the 2-year operation of the act, only about 410,000 persons could receive training. The number of unemployed exceeds four million. But, we do believe we have a responsibility to make progress toward assisting those displaced from their jobs by technological change. That is what this bill does and I urge its enactment.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the manpower development and training bill in general and the Holland-Goodell amendments in particular.

Retraining is clearly a constructive conservative approach to the problem of unemployment. The objective of the bill is to assist individuals to develop their own potential and to return them in the productive streams of the American economy as rapidly as feasible. It focuses our effort on the hard core of residual unemployment, rather than indiscriminately raising Federal expenditures and Government deficits in order to stimulate the economy. In addition to concentrating on the most crucial needs, the retraining approach is an investment with real returns in both human and economic terms. It gives people on the unemployment rolls a new hope; a chance to regain the confidence, dignity, and self-esteem that derives from the full employment of their individual talents and potential. In economic terms it means increased productivity and tax returns from productive workers instead of stagnation and the endless drain of welfare payments.

In the past, I have applauded administration efforts to increase jobs in the depressed areas of my State. I have urged the Secretary of Labor not to overlook the pressing needs of western Maryland where the Cumberland labor market area has a current unemployment rate of 7.3 percent—December 1961—and Hagerstown 9.8 percent—December 1961. I welcome this bill as an important step in easing the substantial and persistent unemployment in these and similar areas.

While I welcome the administration's efforts, I have been disturbed, Mr. Chairman, by the impression that has been created, intentionally or not, that the Republican Party is dedicated to obstruction of this program.

This bill is a Republican contribution with bipartisan support. The Republican policy committee devoted considerable time in this general area last year. A special task force under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri, Representative Curtis, issued a report last summer entitled "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy." Retraining and manpower development were treated extensively in that report. The work of my colleague, the getleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], on the subcommittee reporting this bill is generally known and appreciated within this body.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should also like to endorse the specific amendments offered in the Holland substitute. These tighten up an already sound bill. They concentrate aid where it is most needed—to unemployed heads of families rather than high school dropouts. They extend the principle of matching Federal with State funds. They permit another dovetailing with existing unemployment assistance programs. They eliminate potential abuses in the granting of training allowances. They institute attendance and progress requirements in regard to these allowances. I wholeheartedly support my colleague in his efforts to produce a carefully and narrowly drawn 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 this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. HOLLAND: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962'."

Mr. POWELL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be considered as read, and be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire as to whether the substitute the gentleman from Pennsylvania now offers is the same as H.R. 10363, the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]? Is it identical in all respects?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is identical.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] be known as a cosponsor of the bill? We had one famous bill here known as the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is of bigger importance than the Landrum-Griffin bill.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, in making this proposal, I am encouraged by the wide support given this legislation and the many fine things said about it from all parts of the country and from both sides of the aisle.

In proposing this substitute, I am, in effect, reintroducing my own bill, H.R. 8399, as it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, 24 to 3, last July 27. With the cooperation and assistance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, we worked untiringly for the passage of this legislation, we have made certain modifications which will have a wide appeal to the Members of this body.

I would like to remind the House that it has been 7 months since the committee discharged its obligations on H.R. 8399.

Since then we have had two hearings before the Rules Committee—one last September and a second one several weeks ago.

I have also had the benefit of letters from many parts of the Nation as well as firsthand discussions with many of my own constituents, who are looking forward to the promise and hope which this bill will provide for them.

As the Senate passed a companion bill on August 23, I have carefully studied the debate which took place in that Chamber and, finally, I have consulted quite frequently with many of the Members from both sides of the aisle, since Congress convened.

From all these sources, some significant additions to H.R. 8399 have been incorporated into the substitute. I would like to summarize these changes for you.

First. The most important is to spell out the fact that payment of training allowances are for those adults who have had at least 3 years of gainful employment and who are heads of households. This has always been my view, but to define it clearly is quite agreeable to me and to my colleagues.

Second. This bill was developed for the unemployed—the factory worker, the miner, and the white-collar clerk. It has been brought out, however, that the small farmer and the farmhand are also experiencing hardship from technological change. To help those whose net income is less than $1,200 per year we have considered them unemployed, rather than underemployed, for the purposes of this bill. I appreciate the help of my Republican and Democratic colleagues from the rural areas of the Nation for this suggestion and recommendation.

Third. It was the intent of this bill to preserve the system of training allowances separate from unemployment insurance benefits. In order to make this intent perfectly clear, a provision has been added which states the reimbursement of moneys will be given to those States which pay insurance benefits for time spent in training. This will insure replacement of funds to those States now following this practice.

Fourth. A fourth change has to do with the training for youth. H.R. 8399, as reported, provided training for all ages. In order to clarify this intent for those for us who are interested in the many unemployed between the ages of 16 and 21, my substitute includes a provision to provide this training.

Fifth. One oversight has been brought to our attention. It is the theory of the bill that those getting training will get training allowances rather than unemployment insurance benefits. These allowances are pegged at the State average. We failed, however, to take account of the unemployed person receiving benefits above the State average; the substitute makes this change.

Sixth. The original bill provided for 10 supergrade positions and we find this is no longer appropriate. It has, therefore, been eliminated in this substitute.

Seventh. The training for minor skills, requiring less than 2 weeks' time, will be prohibited unless immediate job opportunity is available before the training is undertaken.

Eighth. No training allowance will be available for those requiring less than 6 days' training. For jobs such as dishwashers, waitresses, and the like which require only 2 days' training, training will be available but not allowances.

Ninth. Trainees are required to have satisfactory attendance and show progress to remain under the program. Failure to do so—without good cause—will automatically stop the payment of allowances, and trainee cannot again qualify for at least 1 year.

Tenth. Applicants for training under this program cannot qualify if they have, during the previous year, received allowances for training under any other Federal program.

Eleventh. In regard to the subsistence and transportation expenses of trainees under this program, actual and necessary expenses must be shown. In no event shall these exceed $35 per week or 10 cents per mile.

Twelfth. States will be required to match Federal funds covering the cost of training allowances as quickly as is feasible.

These changes were discussed and approved by all interested persons.

I appreciate the help given me by all the Members who assisted and I would again like to commend Congressman GOODELL for his suggestions and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting our unemployed back to work—active in the work force of the Nation—thereby allowing our people to regain their self-respect and permitting them to again support their families and educate their children.

This, Mr. Chairman, is first and foremost in my mind.

To accomplish this I will cooperate with all Members on both sides of the aisle.

I know many Congressmen—both Republican and Democratic—who represent districts that need this legislation and I know these Members want to vote for this bill.

I want them to be able to do so and I will bend over backward to let them.

What is most important is that we give our unemployed of the Nation the chance they so greatly need.

With assistance and advice of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] I believe we have the legislation properly prepared to meet the approval of all factions in this Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the amendment in the nature of a substitute bill which is now on your desk.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I want at the outset to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], for his work on this legislation, and I want to pay particular tribute to him for his willingness to accept this substitute, H.R. 10363, and offer it jointly on a bipartisan basis. And, I wish to emphasize the difference between this substitute on which we will vote and the bill that came from the committee.

This substitute will focus the bill on the unemployed workers who are heads of families and who have held jobs for at least 3 years. There will be no training allowance to a worker who does not fall in that category. It requires matching by the States of the administrative cost and of the training allowance cost after a period of 18 months. Experience has shown that where the States participate and put up some of this money, and they participate in this program through the employment offices locally and through the vocational offices locally as well as through the State legislatures appropriating money, that the program turns out to be much more efficient. The unemployment compensation fund will be protected by a new provision in my substitute bill. We had a running debate throughout the consideration of this bill as to how we could preserve the independence of this unemployment compensation system and the local control over it. We have worked out a system of reimbursing those unemployment trust funds which permit the payment of benefits to workers who are undergoing training. This, I believe, is important. It means that there will be an inducement for our State legislatures to extend the provision permitting unemployed workers to take their training while collecting unemployment benefits. Today, in most of our States, in all but 17, this is forbidden. A worker who is unemployed cannot be trained and still draw unemployment compensation. He has no choice. In other words, he must sit and just take the benefits. The substitute requires that there must be an immediate job opportunity if training is to be for less than 2 weeks. It is my view that if you are going to train a worker for less than 2 weeks' time, you should know that there is a job waiting for him at the end of that period.

The substitute forbids any training allowances for training of less than 6 days. This does not mean they cannot train workers for skills which take less than 6 days to acquire. But such trainees are not going to be paid a training allowance during that period. H.R. 10363 requires specifically satisfactory attendance and progress and requires the vocational school, or whatever other facility is involved, to notify the local employment office immediately if satisfactory performance is not forthcoming from the trainees.

Mr. Chairman, the bill forbids any payment of training allowances for 1 year after the training is completed, or after the training is turned down by a worker. This will foreclose the possibility of a worker collecting unemployment compensation after being advised by the office of employment locally that he should get some training and go back to work and he deciding that he wants to wait until his unemployment compensation runs out and then go over and get some training allowances. If he is offered the opportunity to train and turns it down under the substitute and under the bill he will thereafter be ineligible for a training allowance for 1 year. We will permit no training eligibility to be determined by the employment office on the basis of union membership or nonunion membership, and we restrict the types and amounts of transportation and subsistence allowances that can be paid.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10363, which is the substitute now pending before the House, I believe is an efficient and effective and progressive program that this Congress should support upon a bipartisan basis. The program will help these workers get off the welfare and unemployment rolls and back into the productive stream of our economy.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment now pending before the House. I am in full agreement with the previous speakers to the effect that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLLAND) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL) certainly deserve the gratitude and commendation of the entire Congress for working out an agreeable and acceptable formula that we can vote on today.

Mr. Chairman, I think the substitute provision in some instances strengthens the bill. I would like to particularly point out the tribute that belongs to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLLAND). Two years ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLLAND) had asked the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House permission to conduct hearings on the effect of automation on the American economy. He has done a magnificent job. He has assembled a tremendous record of information and knowledge on this subject. The mere fact that we are here today, able to vote on this bill, I think is a tribute to his diligence and his sincere interest in this subject. I think the fact that we are able to vote on this bill today also reflects the new look in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York (Mr. POWELL) who has indeed encouraged this investigation of the impact of automation on the American employment scene, and who has helped the committee in every aspect.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is adopted today, and I hope it will be, we indeed are writing an historic piece of legislation into the books of our country.

We are in this way giving full meaning to the fact that the Congress of the United States recognizes that problems in the employment field of America must follow the trend of automation; but we are also strengthening the whole concept of free enterprise as contrasted to the communistic totalitarian system's economy. We are saying here in effect that we recognize that American industry, working within the concept of free enterprise, has the right, has the responsibility, has the duty to move forward, to develop new technological means; but we are also recognizing that in this process there is a great dislocation of workers. And we here today are trying to provide legislation which will take care of these dislocated workers and put them back into the stream of gainful employment.

There are people in this country who have been unemployed for many, many years. These are people who want to go to work. These are people who want to preserve their personal dignity and earn their livelihood. But they have been dislocated from their regular jobs for various reasons—automation, movement of industry, foreign imports, various other reasons.

This legislation will help an estimated 450,000 people become better trained to take on new skills to replace old ones for which there no longer is a need because of technological improvements. The impact of these 450,000 people who would be helped by this legislation would be of great benefit to the economic growth of the country, to an extent that can hardly be estimated.

The question was raised, can older people be retrained? I have such profound confidence in the ingenuity and ability of the American worker that there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a man who has worked with machines all his life can, indeed, be retrained for another job regardless of his age. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this can be done with considerable success. In Chicago, we have seen hundreds of older workers lose their original jobs—jobs they held for many years—because some very large companies have moved to other parts of the country. There is no demand for these workers' particular skill in most instances. I believe the only way you can put these people back to work is to quickly train them for another job. There are jobs available. You need only look at the want ads of many newspapers to verify this statement. With just a little help in retraining, many of those now unemployed can be helped to qualify for these jobs.

The question was raised quite properly by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. ASHBROOK, whether or not this is going to intrude upon other vocational programs. I think the substitute bill certainly reduces that possibility. Notwithstanding that, however, it appears to me that any legislation can be successful only if the legislative branch of the Government continues periodically to review the activities of the executive agencies of Government. We have had several examples of this in our committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] when we called in administrators to see what they are doing with legislation that we pass in Congress; to see whether or not they are doing a good job. On a bipartisan basis we have suggested ways to improve administration of laws passed by Congress, in those cases where they have not been staying within the spirit of the act. I think if this act does not work, or is not administered properly by the agencies, Congress should react very swiftly. It is my judgment that Congress has a duty to ascertain whether the laws it enacts are being properly administered by the agencies.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], how many amendments are pending on his side?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we have no amendments. We have worked this bill out in compromise.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if there are any amendments pending on either side, may I ask whether they are perfecting amendments, or whether they are amendments that change the substance of the bill?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any amendments that are pending.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask what amendments are pending, if any?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which is at the desk.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] on the pending amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15 p.m.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished minority leader of my committee has moved that all debate close at 2:15. If he will amend his motion to reserve the last 5 minutes to this side, I would have no objection to that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman may not make a reservation on a motion.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Holland-Goodell substitute and to call attention to several items which, I think, deserve particular attention. This bill would set up a 2-year program as it will be amended by the Holland-Goodell substitute and would authorize expenditures in the neighborhood of $253 million. I do not believe it is realistic to expect that the Department of Labor can properly and wisely spend as much money as is authorized for the first year of this program. Looking back at the area development legislation, sometimes referred to as the depressed-area bill, we know it has taken a long time to get that program underway. Before the pending bill could be effective, there must be made an inventory of the skills in short supply and a number of other steps must be taken. I should like to call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the fact that more money is probably being authorized than will be needed or can wisely be used in the first year. The Committee on Appropriations should take a close and careful look, and require that the Department of Labor justify fully the appropriation of any funds authorized by this bill.

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

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would call the attention of my colleague to the fact that just the other day, in a discussion at the Department of Labor, I asked about the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

I was given to understand that as far as the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act are concerned, the funds appropriated have been almost completely committed for the current fiscal year. I do not know if the gentleman has other information, but that is the information which was given to me.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I join the gentleman in the desire to get this program underway as quickly as possible. It is not my purpose to retard it; however, I am suggesting that it is difficult to get a program of this kind rolling at once. It is going to take some time, and I question whether the full amount to be authorized by this bill is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to go to another point. The substitute contains an important provision in section 504 which provides that selection of trainees shall not be contingent upon membership or lack of membership in a labor organization. I would assume that if this provision had not been included we could expect that the Department of Labor, under no circumstances, would select trainees on the basis of whether or not they happened to belong to a union. In the selection of trainees, surely unemployed workers have the right to expect and demand that the Department of Labor will not discriminate on the basis of whether a person happens to be a union member or happens not to be a union member.

This can be very important because workers of the Negro race are excluded from membership in a number of unions and a large percentage of the unemployed are Negroes.

Now that section 504 has been included in the Holland-Goodell substitute, it should not be taken out in conference. If the conferees should now allow the provision to be taken out it might be inferred that Congress would condone discrimination by the Department of Labor, on the basis of union membership or the lack of thereof. Accordingly, it is very essential now that section 504 be retained by the conferees.

I assume that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLLAND) will be among the conferees. Will he comment in regard to section 504 of the substitute he has offered which provides that the selection of individuals shall not be contingent upon membership or nonmembership in a labor organization?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was the judgment of the committee. I will stand by the committee's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLLAND).

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. MAHON, 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. 8399) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 544, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on 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.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HIESTAND. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Mr. HIESTAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

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

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—354

Adair, Addabbo, Addonizio, Albert, Alexander, Alford, Andersen, Minn., Anderson, Ill., Andrews.

Anfuso, Arends, Ashley, Aspinall, Auchincloss.

Avery, Ayres, Bailey, Baker, Baldwin.

Baring, Barrett, Barry, Bass, N.H., Bass, Tenn., Bates, Battin, Becker, Beckworth, Belcher, Bell.

Bennett, Fla., Berry, Betts, Blatnik, Boggs, Boland, Bolling, Bolton, Bonner, Bow, Boykin, Brademas, Bray, Breeding, Brewster, Bromwell, Brooks, Tex.

Broomfield, Brown, Buckley, Burke, Ky., Burke, Mass., Byrne, Pa., Byrnes, Wis., Cahill, Cannon, Carey, Cederberg, Celler.

Chamberlain, Chelf, Chenoweth, Chiperfield, Church, Clancy, Clark, Coad, Cohelan, Collier, Conte, Cook.

Corbett, Corman, Cramer, Cunningham, Curtin, Curtis, Mass., Curtis, Mo., Daddario, Dague, Daniels, Dawson, Delaney.

Dent, Derounian, Derwinski, Devine, Diggs, Dingell, Dole, Dominick, Donohue, Dooley, Dowdy, Doyle.

Dulski, Durno, Dwyer, Edmondson, Elliott, Ellsworth, Everett, Evins, Farbstein, Fascell, Feighan, Fenton.

Finnegan, Fino, Flood, Flynt, Fogarty, Ford, Fountain, Frazier, Frelinghuysen, Friedel, Fulton, Gallagher.

Garland, Garmatz, Gavin, Giaimo, Gilbert, Glenn, Gonzalez, Goodell, Goodling, Granahan, Grant, Gray.

Green, Oreg., Green, Pa., Griffin, Griffiths, Gubser, Hagen, Calif., Halleck, Halpern, Hansen, Harding.

Harris, Harrison, Wyo., Harsha, Harvey, Ind., Harvey, Mich., Hays, Healey, Hechler, Hemphill, Henderson, Herlong, Hoeven.

Holifield, Holland, Horan, Hosmer, Huddleston, Hull, Ichord, Mo., Inouye, Jarman, Jennings, Joelson, Johnson, Calif., Johnson, Md., Johnson, Wis., Jonas, Jones, Ala., Jones, Mo., Judd, Karsten, Karth.

Kastenmeier, Kearns, Kee, Keith, Kelly, Keogh, Kilgore, King, Calif., King, N.Y., King, Utah, Kirwan, Kluczynski.

Knox, Kornegay, Kowalski, Kunkel, Kyl, Laird, Lane, Langen, Lankford, Latta. Lennon.

Lesinski Libonati, Lindsay, Loser, McCulloch, McDonough, McDowell, McFall, McIntire, McMillan, McVey, MacGregor, Mack.

Magnuson, Mailliard, Marshall, Martin, Mass., Mathias, Matthews, May, Merrow, Michel, Miller, Clem, Miller, George P.

Miller, N.Y., Milliken, Mills, Minshall, Moeller, Monagan, Montoya, Moore, Moorhead, Pa., Morgan, Morris.

Morrison, Morse, Mosher, Moss, Moulder, Multer, Murphy, Natcher, Nedzi, Nelsen, Nix, Norrell, Nygaard.

O'Brien, Ill., O'Brien, N.Y., O'Hara, Ill., O'Hara, Mich., O'Konski, Olsen, O'Neill, Osmers, Ostertag, Patman, Pelly, Perkins, Peterson.

Pfost, Philbin, Pike, Pirnie, Poff, Powell, Price, Pucinski, Purcell, Quie, Rains, Randall.

Reifel, Reuss, Rhodes, Ariz., Rhodes, Pa., Riehlman, Rivers, Alaska, Roberts, Ala., Roberts, Tex., Robison, Rodino, Rogers, Colo., Rogers, Fla., Rooney, Roosevelt, Rosenthal, Rostenkowski, Roudebush, Roush, Ryan, Mich., Ryan, N.Y.

St. George, St Germain, Santangelo, Saylor, Schadeburg, Schenk, Schneebell, Schweiker, Schwengel, Scott, Scranton, Seely-Brown.

Selden, Shelley, Shipley, Short, Shriver, Sibal, Sikes, Siler, Sisk, Slack, Smith, Iowa, Spence.

Springer, Stafford, Staggers, Stratton, Stubblefield, Sullivan, Taber, Taylor, Teague, Calif., Thomas, Thompson, N.J., Thompson, Tex.

Thomson, Wis., Thornberry, Toll, Tollefson, Trimble, Tupper, Udall, Morris K., Ullman, Vanik, Van Pelt, Van Zandt, Vinson.

Wallhauser, Walter, Watts, Weis, Whalley, Wharton, Whitener, Wickersham, Widnall, Wilson, Calif., Wilson, Ind., Wright, Yates, Younger, Zablocki, Zelenko.

NAYS—62

Abbitt, Abernethy, Alger, Ashbrook, Ashmore, Beermann, Blitch, Bruce, Burleson, Casey Colmer, Davis, James C. Davis, John W., Dorn, Downing, Findley, Fisher, Forrester, Gary, Gathings.

Gross, Haley, Hall, Hardy, Harrison, Va., Hébert, Hiestand, Hoffman, Ill., Jensen, Johansen, Kilburn, Landrum, Lipscomb, McSween, Mahon, Mason, Meader, Murray, Norblad, Passman, Pilcher.

Pillion, Poage, Ray, Reece, Rivers, S.C., Rogers, Tex., Rousselot, Rutherford, Smith, Calif., Smith, Va., Stephens, Teague, Tex., Thompson, La., Tuck, Utt, Waggonner, Whitten, Williams, Willis, Winstead, Young.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Martin, Nebr.

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett, Mich., Broyhill, Cooley, Davis, Tenn., Denton, Fallon, Hagan, Ga., Hoffman, Mich., Kitchin, Macdonald, Madden, Saund, Scherer, Sheppard, Smith, Miss., Steed, Weaver, Westland.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote: Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962".

TITLE I—OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING AND MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Statement of finding and purpose

SEC. 102. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the cost of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, and to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

Automation and occupational training

SEC. 103. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods of detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereon; and to such ends conduct or cause to be conducted within the Department of Labor and other agencies of Government a comprehensive and continuing program of research as may be necessary;

(2) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning automation, technological developments, and prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from such developments;

(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of, and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for, untrained and unexperienced youth;

(4) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

Improving labor mobility

SEC. 104. In order to encourage the mobility of labor, to determine existing impediments to such mobility, and to determine the feasibility and desirability of methods to improve the mobility of labor, the Secretary of Labor is directed to—

(1) establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to impede the mobility of workers or which facilitate mobility, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance pay plans; the operation of seniority systems; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes. A report on these studies shall be included as a part of the Secretary's report required under section 105.

(2) promote by discussions, publications, and other appropriate means, the development and adoption of equitable practices which improve the mobility of workers.

Manpower report

SEC. 105. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1963) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

Information and research

SEC. 106. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available, in such manner as he deems appropriate, information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State, area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

Appropriations for administration

SEC. 107. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $1,770,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $1,670,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to administer the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Responsibility for programs

SEC. 201. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, and develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training, designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are and will be required.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall carry out his responsibilities under this title through the maximum utilization of all possible resources for skill development available in industry, labor, public and private educational and training institutions, State, Federal, and local agencies, and other appropriate public and private organizations and facilities.

Selection of trainees

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training under titles III and IV those unemployed or underemployed individuals who cannot be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall also provide a special program for the testing and counseling of youths, sixteen years of age or older, and for the selection of those youths for whom occupational training under this Act is indicated.

(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed individuals, the Secretary of Labor shall, to the maximum extent possible, also refer other individuals qualified for training programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to individuals to be trained for skills needed within the area of their residence. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

(c) Before selecting an individual for training, the Secretary shall determine that there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the individual is to be trained. If such employment is not available in the area in which the individual resides, the Secretary shall obtain reasonable assurance of such individual's willingness to accept employment outside his area of residence.

(d) The Secretary shall not refer individuals for training in an occupation which requires less than two weeks training, unless there are immediate employment opportunities in such occupation.

(e) The duration of any training program to which an individual is referred shall be reasonable and consistent with the occupation for which the individual is being trained.

(f) Upon certification by the responsible training agency that an individual who has been referred for training does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training, absent good cause, the Secretary shall forthwith terminate his training and subsistence and transportation allowances, and withdraw his referral. Such individual shall not be eligible for such allowances for one year thereafter.

(g) The Secretary of Labor shall provide

placement services to individuals who have completed their training under this Act, as well as counseling services to such individuals for an appropriate period after they have been placed.

Training allowances

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States (which, for the purposes of this Act shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed individuals selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of this title and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Each such agreement shall provide that eighteen months after the enactment of this Act any payments made thereafter under this section must be matched by State funds in an amount equal to the Federal payment. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for individuals undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided however,* That in any week an individual who, but for this training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such an allowance shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.

With respect to any week for which an individual receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available, a supplemental training allowance may be paid. This supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

For individuals undergoing on-the-job training, the amount of any payment which would otherwise be made by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to that payment as the number of compensated hours per week bears to forty hours: *Provided,* That in no event shall the payment to such an individual, when added to the amount received from the employer, bring the total to more than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

(b) Training allowances may be supplemented by such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor to be necessary to defray actual and necessary transportation expenses of individuals engaged in training under this Act and, when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence, to defray actual and necessary transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of such individuals. The Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding the rate of $35 per week; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile.

(c) Training allowances shall be limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) No weekly training allowance shall be paid to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is eligible for unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

(e) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, so far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of individuals for weekly training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

(f) If unemployment compensation payments are paid to an individual taking training under this Act, or any other Federal Act, the State making such payments shall be reimbursed from funds herein appropriated. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the States and such amount shall then be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account.

(g) A person who, in connection with an occupational training program, has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under the provision of this Act or any other Federal Acts shall not be entitled to training allowances under this Act for one year after the completion or other termination of the training with respect to which such allowance or payment was made.

(h) No training allowance shall be paid to any person who is receiving training for an occupation which requires a training period of less than six days.

(i) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

Agreements with States

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with States, or with the appropriate State agency pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse the State or appropriate agency and its employees for services rendered for such purposes.

(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 205. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

Appropriations

SEC. 206. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $65,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $110,667,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE III—ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Development of on-the-job training courses

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall encourage, develop, and secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip individuals selected for training with the appropriate skills. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible, secure the adoption by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial, educational, and community groups which he determines are qualified to conduct effective training programs under this title of such programs as he approves, and for this purpose he is authorized to enter into appropriate agreements with them.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational educational program conducted pursuant to the provisions of title IV.

Training program standards

SEC. 302. In adopting or approving any training program under this title, and as a condition to the expenditure of funds for any such program, the Secretary shall make such arrangements as he deems necessary to insure adherence to appropriate training standards and policies, including assurances—

(1) that the training content of the program is adequate, involves reasonable progression, and will result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment;

(2) that the training period is reasonable and consistent with periods customarily required for comparable training;

(3) that adequate and safe facilities, personnel, and records of attendance and progress are provided; and

(4) that the trainees are compensated by the employer at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations hereinafter authorized, considering such factors as industry, geographical region, and trainee proficiency.

Supervision of on-the-job and related training programs

SEC. 303. The Secretary of Labor shall make appropriate provision for supervision of the on-the-job training programs conducted under this title to insure the quality of the training provided and the adequacy of the various programs.

State agreements

SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State, or with the appropriate agency of the State, pursuant to which the Secretary of Labor may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State or appropriate agency for services rendered for such purposes.

(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss, and insure that the func-

tions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 305. The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

Appropriations

SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor a sum, not to exceed $2,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $4,800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE IV—VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Provision of vocational training

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, pursuant to the provisions of title II of this Act, enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational education agencies will undertake to provide the vocational training needed to equip individuals, referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupation specified in the referrals. Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public education agencies or institutions or, if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose, through arrangements with private educational or training institutions. Any such agreement may provide for payment to such State agency of up to 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and up to 50 per centum of the cost with respect to other individuals, and shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provisions for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, with immediate notice to the Secretary of Labor in the event a trainee fails to attend or progress satisfactorily, and provision for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of the title: *Provided*, That, after eighteen months after the enactment of this Act, any amount paid to a State to carry out an agreement authorized by this part shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of such cost. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under such an agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the needed training by agreement or contract with public or private educational or training institutions.

Cooperation with Secretary of Labor

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall cooperate with the Secretary of Labor in coordinating vocational education programs with on-the-job training conducted pursuant to the provisions of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 403. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

Appropriations

SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a sum, not to exceed $28,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Apportionment of benefits

SEC. 501. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under titles II, III, and IV of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards, shall consider the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State.

Other agencies and departments

SEC. 502. (a) In the performance of his functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in subsection (d). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

(b) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

(c) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as they deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(d) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another. Such limitation shall not prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that such assistance will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

Maintenance of State effort

SEC. 503. No training program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under title III, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under title IV, satisfies himself that neither the State nor the locality in which the training is carried out has reduced or is reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

Selection and referral

SEC. 504. The selection of individuals for training under this Act and the placement of such individuals shall not be contingent upon such individual's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

Secretaries' reports

SEC. 505. (a) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under titles I, II, and III, including the number of individuals trained and the number and types of training activities under this Act, the number of unemployed or underemployed persons who have secured full-time employment as a result of such training, and the nature of such employment, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement.

(b) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall also make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under title IV, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement. The first such report shall also contain the results of the vocational training survey which is presently being conducted under the supervision of the Secretary.

Termination of authority

SEC. 506. (a) All authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1964.

(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of these titles shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to these titles prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under titles II, III, and IV of this Act after December 30, 1964.

Appropriations

SEC. 507. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this title, but not to exceed the sum of $1,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and not to exceed the sum of $2,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1962]

SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all the conferees of both parties, on both sides of the Capitol.

The differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill were not particularly significant but I shall briefly mention a few of the more important ones and the disposition of them made by the conferees.

First, the duration of the training program. The Senate version proposed a 4-year program; the House version, a 2-year program. The conferees compromised on a 3-year program, ending June 30, 1965. Both versions provided that the States shall assume 50 percent of the cost after a certain amount of time, which differed as between the two versions. The conferees agreed that the States will assume half of the cost after the second year; in other words, during the last year of the program.

Second, the amount of authorization. The conferees agreed on authorizations for appropriations as follows: For the current fiscal year, $5 million for the first full year, beginning July 1, $100 million; and for each succeeding year, $165 million—totaling $435 million for the 3 years. The original Senate bill had provided $655 million for 4 years; the House version, $262 million for 2 years.

Third, training allowances for youth. Both versions provided training allowances equivalent to a State's weekly unemployment compensation benefit. The House version limited these allowances to persons who have had at least 3 years of gainful employment and who are heads of families or heads of households. The Senate version included the same limitation, except that youths aged 16 through 21, even though unmarried and without work experience, could receive training allowances up to 5 percent of the total authorization. The Senate provision was an effort to do something in regard to the overwhelming problem of school dropouts, with which those of us who come from metropolitan areas are so familiar. The conferees compromised by accepting training allowances for youths, with the 5-percent limitation of the Senate version, but with the minimum age raised from 16 to 19, and a ceiling set at $20 a week.

Fourth, subsistence and transportation expenses. The versions of both Houses authorized payment of subsistence and transportation expenses for workers who take their training at locations beyond commuting distance from their homes, limited to $35 a week and 10 cents a mile. The Senate version contained a provision authorizing these limits to be exceeded in "unusual circumstances", but, regretfully from my point of view, the conferees eliminated this provision because of the House insistence.

Fifth, the National Advisory Committee. The conferees accepted a Senate provision calling for appointment of a National Advisory Committee representing labor, management, agriculture, education and training, and the general public. There was no similar provision in the House version; but the House receded, and accepted the Senate version.

Sixth, nondiscrimination because of union membership. A provision in the House version stated that the selection of workers for training and their subsequent placement in jobs should not be contingent upon membership or nonmembership in a labor organization. The Senate conferees accepted the House provision.

Both the House and the Senate versions contained provisions, not in dispute authorizing the Secretary of Labor to develop information on the Nation's needs for trained manpower, to distribute such information for use in planning training programs, and to conduct research on such matters as the effects of automation and the mobility of labor; and requiring an annual manpower report by the President. I am particularly pleased with provisions in these sections of the bill which authorize the Secretary of Labor to make extensive investigations into the future manpower needs of our country, ranging all the way from the top need for nuclear scientists to the need for persons to fill jobs at the bottom of the scale. I believe this action today to recognize manpower planning as an element of national policy is one to which we shall look back upon in the years to come with merited pride.

I believe this function of manpower planning, which appropriately belongs in the Department of Labor, will make an enormous contribution toward overcoming unemployment in the days ahead and will better enable us to staff freedom in the constant cold-war struggle with our Communist opponents.

This act will provide long overdue leadership at the national level in promoting and assisting the States as well as local groups, private and public, in the training and retraining of workers, unemployed, underemployed and otherwise, so that they can return to productive and useful occupations in our society and can contribute to the fullest extent to the national product. Our responsibility, as a nation, to our own people, and our position and responsibilities as the leader of the free world, require the fullest development and utilization of all our manpower resources.

The conference bill will provide new and imaginative methods for dealing with problems that have been allowed to exist too long. We cannot tolerate the economic waste involved in unused human resources. Nor should we as a nation tolerate the hardship, misery, and loss of dignity that are the consequences of prolonged unemployment. Enactment of this proposal—which was the first bill urged upon us by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message—will help us to move forward in developing a more efficient and better utilized labor force. It will pay large dividends by providing the unemployed with the opportunity to become productive citizens, once again bearing their part of the Nation's responsibilities, as well as participating more fully in the benefits of a prosperous economy.

Mr. President, this bill is our first real effort in this Congress to measure up to the challenge which the President of the United States laid before the country, both during the campaign and more recently from the White House at one of his press conferences—the challenge of finding 25,000 new jobs a week for the foreseeable future, in order to prevent massive unemployment and provide an opportunity for remunerative employment to everyone who wants to work. It is this great constructive effort that we support in this proposal.

I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator agree with the view I have seen published, that the bill will allow us to train or retrain as many as 1 million applicants?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I believe that is a conservative estimate, if we include both on-the-job and classroom training.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the country should be alerted to the fact that this is a very large-sized operation.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad the Senator has made that point.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the Senator in the hope that the Senate will adopt the conference report, in spite of all the inadequacies in the bill and I shall in a moment speak about them independently, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the able Senator for his assistance in bringing this bill to the Senate from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last year, and also acknowledge that he is the author of the section creating a national advisory council.

Mr. JAVITS. I am pleased to hear that statement from the Senator. I am pleased that the conferees have done about as well as could be done in any conference, notwithstanding the unhappiness of the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself about certain of these matters.

There is another thing that can be said in asking the Senate's approval of the conference report. There may be some argument about the figure of 25,000 new jobs a week. We have had that argument before the Joint Economic Committee. There are questions of substantial difference. Certainly, the answer is that the training afforded in the bill will provide needed training for persons who will be added to the work force.

Will the Senator not agree with me that at least another very major objective of the bill is how to alert American labor to the coming automation and the fact that we must produce more, and produce more efficiently? How are we going to do it unless we find techniques which will enable us to go forward in the direction of giving to the worker some concept of the needs and the help he will require in making the adjustments which we ask him, on economic and patriotic grounds, to make?

Mr. CLARK. I would agree completely with what the Senator from New York has said. I should like to point out, however, that this bill is not only to accommodate American labor to the employment opportunities of the future, but also to accommodate American education, because, under the bill, the Secretary of Labor is directed to make studies to determine where workers will be needed in all occupations. This will include physicists as well as workers in the domestic services or other fields where workers will not need higher levels of education.

My hope is that processes will be developed whereby, under freedom and without compulsion, the Nation's manpower will be divided and directed so that the brains and abilities in our society will be most fully utilized for the advancement of our country and of Western civilization.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator agree with me that, as we are facing a trade program which may require certain efforts of workers and business, just as we are facing an automation program, which is essential to the country, of the same character, just as we are facing a new tax law which will encourage reequipment of American industry, which is becoming obsolescent in terms of equipment, we cannot consider this bill as the final one on the subject, and that nothing the Senate conferees have done will foreclose us, as the situation develops, from perhaps taking other steps in the direction of training and retraining workers in the national interest?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. This is only the beginning. We still have on the calendar, and I hope we do something about it, the youth employment opportunities bill. I hope we can do something about the bill which will authorize employment on public works projects on a standby basis to be utilized if and when we have a new recession, and find unemployment increasing to a significant extent. This is only one step to help increase the growth rate of our economy. This is only a step in a long series of legislative efforts that will be necessary to provide full employment during the days ahead, in accordance with the important objectives of the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that I may address myself to the conference report independently, though briefly, and that my remarks may follow the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his request for a moment, I should like to say a word of praise for my fellow conferees on both sides in this Chamber. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] were most helpful in working out the difficulties which confronted us. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] were most helpful. Although the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was not able to be present, he gave me his proxy and his views before he left.

On the House side also, there was bipartisan effort to come out with a constructive bill. I should like to pay tribute to Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House conferees; Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, the sponsor of the House bill; Representative JAMES O'HARA, of Michigan, who took a significant part in the proceedings; and also Representative CHARLES GOODELL, of New York, who made significant contributions in shaping our bipartisan bill.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island with the understand-

ing that thereafter I shall accede to the request of the Senator from New York.

Mr. PELL. I earnestly desire to support the bill which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has so ably handled in the conference, and I commend the Senator for the way he defended the interests of the Senate and got all the essential ideas of the Senate-passed bill into the bill reported by the conference committee. It will be really a milestone, in its own way, in the history of the United States.

Our country, while technologically advanced, has lagged behind many of the other countries of the world in the sociological fields. This is a field in which we have, so far, lagged greatly. By passing the bill and making it law we shall at least catch up with most of the countries of the world which have already acted in this area.

Speaking from the viewpoint of my own specific area, the State of Rhode Island, the bill could be of great help in solving our own problems.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind comments.

I wish to add that the Senator from Rhode Island has worked most actively on the subcommittee during the past year, when we took extensive testimony before bringing the bill to the Senate. The Senator has been of great assistance in the entire progress of the proposed legislation.

I also wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the work of the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I wish to pay particular tribute to him. The Senator from Alabama permitted the members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, to be the Senate conferees. I think the Senate conferees have less seniority than the Senate members of any other conference committee in my knowledge. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his graciousness in handling the problem in that way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed independently, without asking questions, but that the Senator from Pennsylvania may nevertheless not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief, but there are a number of things which need to be specially noted. I think the prime one, to me, is how the proposed legislation developed in the other body.

Mr. President, I have been in the Congress now for 14 years. I have served in both bodies. I have been pursuing during every year of this time, a struggle in my own party to see that my party was responsible for affirmative proposals to the American people on the major issues of our times, proposals completely consistent with what I consider to be the twin pillars of my party—the private economic system, and equal opportunity without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

Mr. President, we have here a splendid example of how that policy pays enormous dividends both to the Nation and, I say with respect—I know my colleagues will understand this—in party terms as well, for by proposing the constructive and affirmative alternative in the other body, Representative CHARLES GOODELL of my own State has made it possible for the proposed legislation to be enacted, though it might otherwise be just bogged down as is the education bill and as are other bills in the other body.

We are now in the final stages of passage of the proposed legislation, with pride in its authorship, and with an ability for members of each party to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], as chairman of the Senate conferees, in return for his own graciousness in complimenting the conferees of both parties for a job well and constructively done.

Mr. President, to me this is a prime vindication for the fight which has been fought within my own party all these years. It is the constructive alternative which, in terms of the party's activities, represents one of the greatest services we can bring to the Nation. I am delighted that a Representative from the State of New York, Mr. GOODELL, took the opportunity to carry the ball and to demonstrate the validity of this thesis.

In a sense, it is even better that he did so than I, Mr. President, because I have stood for this principle so long it is very valuable to have it proved from a source not particularly identified, perhaps, with me, but by an upstate New York Republican Representative.

It is the constructive alternative authored by Representative GOODELL which has strongly influenced what we are acting on now—a version containing strict and realistic administrative provisions. Such provisions are the result of hard and long and detailed work. Within this framework I am glad to see that my distinguished colleague in the House steered through the conference a proposal based on the experience of the Honorable Martin P. Catherwood, industrial commissioner of New York, who found in his work with the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act that State facilities could be utilized more effectively if the Federal program worked directly through them. Thus, new language was substituted for section 304(a) of this bill to assure such utilization of appropriate State agencies by the Secretary of Labor.

Second, Mr. President, the creation of a National Advisory Committee, and the encouragement of local and industry-wide labor-management-public committees for which I am deeply indebted to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], without whose cooperation this could not have been done, can be turned to an enormous advantage for our country. This is a practice which we pursued in World War II. We had 5,000 such committees in World War II on the plant and local level. The estimate is that about one-third of those, or roughly 1,500 did a really vital and important job in dealing with problems of absenteeism; in easing the shift to automation and other efficiency-making projects, which materially improved our productivity; in easing management-la-labor relations relating to grievance procedures and other problems; and in solving the transportation problem which is a material one in many of these plants.

Mr. President, this is an opportunity on the local level which, to my mind, can be extremely important both in regard to productivity, which is so critical an element in whether we shall win or not win the cold war, and also in terms of the relationships between management and labor, which dominate not only productivity but also the climate of social justice in our own country.

I hope very much that the administration gaze will be attracted to this opportunity, and that so will the ideas and the leadership of labor and management, which is equally as important, and that all will seize the opportunity presented by this proposed legislation and really use it.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that this proposal can answer a tremendous number of problems. On the one hand, the trade unions fear bills like those to apply the antitrust laws to trade unions; and, on the other hand, management fears totalitarian ideas and attitudes on the part of certain elements of labor leadership. This is an opportunity, in the typically American way, by working together on the local level, to avoid many of those excesses and to wrestle with and to solve problems in a very effective way, as we demonstrated during the war we could do.

Finally, Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that the compensation to youth who will study under the terms of the proposal, who will be learning or training under the terms of the bill, has been reduced, and that the age limit has been raised. I have talked in very recent days with most distinguished leaders in our community, with people like Helen Hall Harris, one of our great settlement workers in New York, and one of the greatest in the world. These people feel very strongly that we should encourage those who are from 16 to 19 years of age to study under the terms of the bill, and that there is a tremendous area in which we could help to deal with problems of juvenile delinquency, of youth crime, and of school dropouts.

I hope very much that our committee—and I say this to the chairman of our subcommittee—will require from the Labor Department a rather close report on how the proposal works out. We are now making the first step, as the Senator has so properly said. I am hopeful that we shall be able to demonstrate, on the basis of facts, that to raise the age limit and to cut the figure for maintenance for those who study was improvident. Having oriented the thinking in the minds of our own colleagues, I hope we may be able to take other steps which will really make this work as it should.

Mr. CLARK. I share the view of my friend from New York, and I recall to him the brilliant study of this subject made by the former president of Harvard University, Dr. James B. Conant, which impressed us all wtih the problem of school dropouts in the great metropolitan areas of our country, a critical problem about which we must do something.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the conference report to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1416)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1991) relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.'

"TITLE I—MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION

"Statement of Findings and Purpose

"SEC. 101. The Congress finds that there is critical need for more and better trained personnel in many vital occupational categories, including professional, scientific, technical, and apprenticeable categories; that even in periods of high unemployment, many employment opportunities remain unfilled because of the shortages of qualified personnel; and that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained, in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom. The Congress further finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological developments, foreign competition, relo-

cation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that Government leadership is necessary to insure that the benefits of automation do not become burdens of widespread unemployment; that the problem of assuring sufficient employment opportunities will be compounded by the extraordinarily rapid growth of the labor force in the next decade, particularly by the entrance of young people into the labor force, that improved planning and expanded efforts will be required to assure that men, women, and young people will be trained and available to meet shifting employment needs; that many persons now unemployed or underemployed, in order to become qualified for reemployment or full employment must be assisted in providing themselves with skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that the skills of many persons now employed are inadequate to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economy; and that it is in the national interest that the opportunity to acquire new skills be afforded to these people in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity and its capacity to meet the requirements of the space age. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to require the Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation, and to develop and apply the information and methods needed to deal with the problems of unemployment resulting from automation and technological changes and other types of persistent unemployment.

"Evaluation, Information, and Research

"SEC. 102. To assist the Nation in accomplishing the objectives of technological progress while avoiding or minimizing individual hardship and widespread unemployment, the Secretary of Labor shall—

"(1) evaluate the impact of, and benefits and problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production and demand on the use of the Nation's human resources; establish techniques and methods for detecting in advance the potential impact of such developments; develop solutions to these problems, and publish findings pertaining thereto;

"(2) establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which tend to impede the mobility of workers or which facilitate mobility, including but not limited to early retirement and vesting provisions and practices under private compensation plans; the extension of health, welfare, and insurance benefits to laid-off workers; the operation of severance pay plans; and the use of extended leave plans for education and training purposes. A report on these studies shall be included as a part of the Secretary's report required under section 104.

"(3) appraise the adequacy of the Nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommend needed adjustments, including methods for promoting the most effective occupational utilization of and providing useful work experience and training opportunities for untrained and inexperienced youth;

"(4) promote, encourage, or directly engage in programs of information and communication concerning manpower requirements, development, and utilization, including prevention and amelioration of undesirable manpower effects from automation and other technological developments and improvement of the mobility of workers; and

"(5) arrange for the conduct of such research and investigations as give promise of furthering the objectives of this Act.

"Skill and Training Requirements

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall develop, compile, and make available, in such manner as he deems appropriate, information regarding skill requirements, occupational outlook, job opportunities, labor supply in various skills, and employment trends on a National, State area or other appropriate basis which shall be used in the educational, training, counseling, and placement activities performed under this Act.

"Manpower Report

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as he deems appropriate pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, use, and training; and the President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1963) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training.

"TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"Part A—Duties of the Secretary of Labor

"General responsibility

"SEC. 201. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall determine the skill requirements of the economy, develop policies for the adequate occupational development and maximum utilization of the skills of the Nation's workers, promote and encourage the development of broad and diversified training programs, including on-the-job training, designed to qualify for employment the many persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without such training, and to equip the Nation's workers with the new and improved skills that are or will be required.

"Selection of Trainees

"SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall provide a program for testing, counseling, and selecting for occupational training under this Act those unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure appropriate full-time employment without training. Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling, and selection of youths, sixteen years of age or older, for occupational training and further schooling. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 annual net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purpose of this Act.

"(b) Although priority in referral for training shall be extended to unemployed persons, the Secretary of Labor shall, to the maximum extent possible, also refer other persons qualified for training programs which will enable them to acquire needed skills. Priority in referral for training shall also be extended to persons to be trained for skills needed within, first, the labor market area in which they reside and, second, within the State of their residence.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the occupational training needs of referred persons, provide for their orderly selection and referral for training under this Act, and provide counseling and placement services to persons who have completed their training, as well as follow-up studies to determine whether the programs provided meet the occupational training needs of the persons referred.

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

"(e) The Secretary shall not refer persons for training in an occupation which requires less than two weeks training, unless there are immediate employment opportunities in such occupation.

"(f) The duration of any training program to which a person is referred shall be reasonable and consistent with the occupation for which the person is being trained.

"(g) Upon certification by the responsible training agency that a person who has been referred for training does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training absent good cause, the Secretary shall forthwith terminate his training and subsistence allowances, and his transportation allowances except such as may be necessary to enable him to return to his regular place of residence after termination of training, and withdraw his referral. Such person shall not be eligible for such allowances for one year thereafter.

"Training Allowances

"SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed persons selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of this Act. Such payment shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks, and the amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent quarter for which such data are available: *Provided, however,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of such allowance, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess. With respect to Guam and the Virgin Islands the Secretary shall by regulation determine the amount of the training allowance to be paid any eligible person taking training under this Act.

"With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payment during the most recent quarter for which such data are available, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. This supplement training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above.

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

"(b) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to pay to any person engaged in training under this title, including compensated full-time on-the-job training, such sums as he may determine to be necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of such persons when

such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence: *Provided*, That the Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding $35 per week, at the rate of $5 per day; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall pay training allowances only to unemployed persons who have had not less than three years of experience in gainful employment and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this part.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Apportionment of Benefits

"SEC. 301. For the purpose of effecting an equitable apportionment of Federal expenditures among the States in carrying out the programs authorized under title II of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make such apportionment in accordance with uniform standards and in arriving at such standards shall consider only the following factors: (1) the proportion which the labor force of a State bears to the total labor force of the United States, (2) the proportion which the unemployed in a State during the preceding calendar year bears to the total number of unemployed in the United States in the preceding calendar year, (3) the lack of appropriate full-time employment in the State, (4) the proportion which the insured unemployed within a State bears to the total number of insured employed within such State, and (5) the average weekly unemployment compensation benefits paid by the State. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized to make reapportionments from time to time where the total amounts apportioned under this section have not been fully obligated in a particular State, or where the State or appropriate agencies in the State have not entered into the necessary agreements, and the Secretaries find that any other State is in need of additional funds to carry out the programs authorized by this Act.

"Maintenance of State Effort

"SEC. 302. No training program which is financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under this Act shall be approved unless the Secretary of Labor, if the program is authorized under part A of title II, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if the program is authorized under part B of title II, satisfies himself that neither the State nor the locality in which the training is carried out has reduced or is reducing its own level of expenditures for vocational education and training, including program operation under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Educational Act of 1946, except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

"Other Agencies and Departments

"SEC. 303. (a) In the performance of their functions under this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, shall use the available services or facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, under conditions specified in section 306(a). Each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such services and facilities and either may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall carry out their responsibilities under this Act through the maximum utilization of all possible resources for skill development available in industry, labor, public and private educational and training institutions, State, Federal, and local agencies, and other appropriate public and private organizations and facilities.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 304. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title I.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $97,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title III.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for planning and starting programs under this Act.

"Limitations on Use of Appropriated Funds

"SEC. 305. (a) Funds appropriated under the authorization of this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

"(b) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased by a State or local vocational education agency with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of part B shall become the property of the State.

"(c) No portion of the funds to be used under part B of this Act shall be appropriated directly or indirectly to the purchase, erection, or repair of any building except for minor remodeling of a public building necessary to make it suitable for use in training under part B.

"(d) Funds appropriated under this Act shall remain available for one fiscal year beyond that in which appropriated.

"Authority To Contract

"SEC. 306. (a) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts or agreements, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as they deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not use any authority conferred by this Act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another. Such limitation shall not prohibit assistance to a business entity in the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary of Labor finds that assistance will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless he has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

"Selection and Referral

"SEC. 307. The selection of persons for training under this Act and for placement of such persons shall not be contingent upon such person's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

"Definition

"SEC. 308. For the purposes of this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"Secretaries' Reports

"SEC. 309. (a) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under title I and part A of title II, including the number of persons trained and the number and types of training activities under this Act, the number of unemployed or underemployed persons who have secured full-time employment as a result of such training, and the nature of such employment, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement.

"(b) Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to March 1, 1964, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall also make a report to Congress. Such report shall contain an evaluation of the programs under part B of title II, the need for continuing such programs, and recommendations for improvement. The first such report shall also contain the results of the vocational training survey which is presently being conducted under the supervision of the Secretary.

"Termination of Authority

"SEC. 310. (a) All authority conferred under title II of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

"(b) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the termination of title II shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment or other obligation entered into prior to the date of such termination: *Provided*, That no disbursement of funds shall be made pursuant to the authority conferred under title II of this Act after December 30, 1965.

"And the House agree to the same."

ADAM C. POWELL,
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
NEAL SMITH,
CHARLES S. JOELSON,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
PETER A. GARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
PAT MCNAMARA,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
MAURICE J. MURPHY, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1991) relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of

the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed upon in conference are described in this statement, except for incidental, minor, and clarifying changes. These differences are taken up in the order in which they appear in the House amendment.

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION

Section 103(1) of the House amendment provided for research through the Secretary of Labor on matters involving manpower requirements, developments, and utilization. This provision was dropped from the conference substitute in view of the provisions for research provided in section 102(5) of such substitute.

Section 104 of the House amendment provides that in order to encourage the mobility of labor, to determine the impediments to such mobility, and to evaluate methods of improving the mobility of labor, the Secretary of Labor must make certain studies and must promote the development and adoption of equitable practices which improve the mobility of workers. The section also provided that the Secretary must establish a program of factual studies of practices of employers and unions which impede or facilitate mobility of labor, including among other subjects the operation of seniority systems. The Secretary was directed to include a report on these studies in the manpower report provided for in section 105 of the House amendment (sec. 104 of the conference substitute). The Senate bill did not include anything requiring the Secretary of Labor to promote the mobility of labor; it did, however, contain a provision (in sec. 103(2)) for factual studies which was like the House provision on studies, except that it did not require a study of the operation of seniority systems or require the inclusion of material in a report as was required by the House provision. The conference substitute in this respect is the same as the House amendment except that "affect" is substituted for "impede" and "facilitate", and the reference to seniority systems is omitted. In including the requirement that the Secretary make a report on these studies, it is the intention of the conferees that the report should not include recommendations which might affect free collective bargaining.

Section 107 of the House amendment authorized the appropriation of $1,770,000 for the first fiscal year of the program and $1,670,000 for the second year, for carrying out title I. The Senate bill did not segregate the authorizations for this title out of the general authorization provided in section 304(a). The conference substitute, in section 304(a), authorizes the appropriation of $2,000,000 to carry out this title during fiscal 1963 and $3,000,000 for each of the next 2 fiscal years. These additional sums reflect adjustments made in the authorizations originally provided in title V of the House amendment.

TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Section 201(b) of the House amendment directed the Secretary of Labor to carry out his responsibilities under title II of the House amendment through maximum utilization of all resources for skill development available in all training institutions, in Federal, State, and local public agencies and institutions, and in private organizations and facilities. The Senate bill did not contain this provision. The conference substitute included this provision as section 303(b) with an amendment making it also applicable to the responsibilities of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This provision is in the nature of a general instruction to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in no way affects the specific instructions regarding agreements with States which are set forth in section 231 of the conference substitute.

Section 202(a) of the House amendment provided that in connection with the programs for the testing, counseling, and selection of persons for training under the act, he should provide for a special program for the testing and counseling of youths 16 years of age or older, and for the selection of those for whom occupational training is indicated. The Senate bill provided for the counseling and selection of such youths for occupational training and further schooling. The conference substitute is like the Senate amendment. The inclusion of the words "further schooling" does not indicate that the Secretary of Labor is to handle matters affecting classroom instruction; those words merely recognize the growing emphasis on work-study programs.

Subsection (b) of section 202 of the House amendment directed the Secretary of Labor to extend priority in referral for training to persons be trained for skills needed in the area of their residence. The comparable Senate bill provision extended such a priority to persons to be trained for skills needed in the State of their residence. The conference substitute provides that such priority shall be extended to persons to be trained for skills needed within, first, the labor market area in which they reside, and, second, the State of their residence.

The Senate bill, in section 202(c), directed the Secretary of Labor to determine the occupational training needs for referred persons, to provide for their selection and referral for training, and provide them with placement services after their training is completed. The House amendment contained no provision which was entirely comparable, but it did provide in section 202(g) that the Secretary of Labor should provide placement services for individuals who have completed training as well as counseling services to such individuals for an appropriate period after they have been placed. The conference substitute adopts the provision of the Senate bill but with the addition of the words "and counseling" after "placement," so that the subsection as thus amended will be as broad as section 202(g) of the House amendment.

Subsection (f) of section 202 of the House amendment relates to termination of allowances when the trainee does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress, absent good cause. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. Section 202(g) conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except for the deletion of the comma before "absent" in order to make it clear that the determination of the absence or presence of "good cause" is to be the responsibility of the training agency and not of the Secretary of Labor.

The first paragraph of section 203(a) of the House amendment (relating to weekly training allowances) specifically included the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands within the meaning of the word "State" for the purposes of the act. The Senate amendment contained a definition of "State" for the purposes of section 301, which added Guam to the above list. The conference substitute adopts the procedure of defining the term "State" for purposes of the entire act in section 308. This definition includes not only the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, but also Guam. At the end of this paragraph the substitute inserts a new provision giving the Secretary of Labor power, by regulation, to determine the amount of training allowance to be paid eligible persons taking training in Guam and the Virgin Islands. This provision is inserted because unemployment compensation payments are not made in Guam and the Virgin Islands.

The second paragraph of the House amendment provided that where an individual receives unemployment compensation which is less than the average weekly unemployment compensation for a week of total unemployment in the State making the payment, a supplemental training allowance may be paid. The supplemental training allowance would be the difference between his unemployment compensation and the average weekly compensation payment referred to above. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the House amendment with a technical amendment making it clear that supplemental training allowances may be paid only to persons who would be eligible for a training allowance.

The House amendment provided, in the third paragraph of section 203(a), for a limitation on the training allowance of persons undergoing on-the-job training so that the training allowance when added to the amounts received from the employer, would not exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation payment referred to above. This provision has been deleted from the conference substitute so that the limitations on training allowances will be the same for persons undergoing on-the-job training as they are for persons undergoing vocational training.

Section 203(b) of the House amendment permitted the Secretary of Labor to supplement training allowances to the extent necessary to defray the actual and necessary transportation expenses of trainees, and when the training was provided in facilities which were not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence, to defray actual and necessary transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance for such individuals. It limited the subsistence expenses to the rate of $35 a week and the transportation expenditures to the rate of 10 cents a mile. The Senate bill permitted the Secretary to supplement weekly training allowances by amounts necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses of trainees when training was provided and facilities which were not within commuting distances of their regular place of residence. It limited subsistence and travel expense allowance in the same manner as did the House, but it contained an exception under which the Secretary could prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for expenses could be authorized on an actual expense basis. The conference substitute, in section 203(b), permits the Secretary of Labor to pay trainees such sums as may be determined to be necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses for such trainees when such training is provided at facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence. The Secretary is prohibited from affording any individual an allowance exceeding $35 a week (at the rate of $5 per day) and from authorizing any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents a mile.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment limited training allowances to unemployed persons having more than 3 years of experience in gainful employment who are heads of families or heads of households. The Senate bill contained an exception which would permit the Secretary of Labor, if he finds that such training allowances are necessary to provide occupational training to youths over 16 but under 20 years, to pay such training allowances, but only to the extent of 5 percent of the total allowances paid under the act. The House amendment contained no such exception. The substitute agreed upon in conference contains, in section 203(c), an exception that permits

the Secretary to pay training allowances at a rate not to exceed $20 a week to youths in their 19th, 20th, and 21st years where such allowances are necessary to provide them occupational training, but not more than 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under the section could be paid to such youths.

The Senate bill, in section 203(d), provided for dollar-for-dollar State matching of training allowances after the first 2 fiscal years of the program. The comparable provision of the House amendment required such matching after the first 18 months of the program. The substitute agreed upon in conference is the same as the Senate bill.

Section 203(d) of the House amendment denied training allowances to persons who have received or are eligible for unemployment compensation with respect to the week for which the payment would be made. The Senate bill contained a provision which was comparable, except that it denied such training allowances to persons who are seeking unemployment compensation with respect to such a week, instead of to those who are eligible for it. The conference substitute adopts (in sec. 203(e)) the provision of the Senate bill.

The House amendment provided in section 203(f) that if unemployment compensation payments are paid to an individual taking training under the act, or under any other Federal act, the State making the payments would be reimbursed. The amount of the reimbursement would be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished him by the States and the amount so reimbursed would then be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the House amendment with technical amendments which limit its application to persons who are otherwise eligible for a training allowance under this act. The reference to other Federal acts is dropped. It is the intent of this subsection that, if a State is reimbursed for paying unemployment compensation to trainees, that employers should not be charged with such unemployment compensation payments under the experience rating provisions of their laws, and that the trainees should not have their eligibility for unemployment compensation reduced on account of the payments they received during training.

Section 203(g) of the House amendment provided that a person who has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under this act or any other Federal act could not receive a training allowance under this act for 1 year after the completion or other termination of the training with respect to which the allowance or payment was made. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the House amendment with a technical amendment to limit its application to persons whose termination of training was not for good cause.

Section 203(h) of the House amendment prohibited training allowances for persons receiving training for an occupation which requires a training period of less than 6 days. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the House amendment.

Section 204 of the House amendment authorized the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with States and State agencies for the purpose of carrying out his functions under title II. This section has been consolidated with section 304 and appears as section 206 of the conference substitute.

Section 205 of the House amendment authorized the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of title II. This section has been consolidated with section 305 and appears as section 207 of the conference substitute.

Section 206 of the House amendment authorized the appropriation of $65,800,000 for the first fiscal year of the program, and $110,667,000 for the second fiscal year, for carrying out title II of the House amendment. As explained before, the Senate bill did not segregate authorizations by titles. The conference substitute aggregates in one authorization the amounts for this title, the on-the-job training provisions, and the vocational education provisions.

Section 301 of the House amendment was the basic provision directing the Secretary of Labor to provide on-the-job training. It directed him to make maximum use of, among others, educational groups. The comparable Senate provision required the Secretary to provide whenever appropriate special programs for youths 16 years of age and over.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill insofar as they relate to special programs for youths. It also directs the Secretary, to the maximum extent possible, to secure the adoption by States of training programs under this title. The reference to educational groups is stricken in conformity with the pattern of the bill which divorces the Secretary of Labor from any connection with traditional educational functions. The inclusion of language mentioning State programs stresses the desirability of the Secretary of Labor first seeking State agreements wherever States have existing programs for the purpose of achieving maximum coordination of efforts.

The provisions of subsection (b) of section 301 of the House amendment directed the Secretary of Labor to cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate on-the-job training programs with vocational educational programs conducted under the act. This provision has been dropped as a separate provision from the conference substitute in recognition of the provisions on cooperation contained in section 303. However, it should be understood that by this merger of provisions there was no intention to change the requirement that the Secretary of Labor shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in coordinating on-the-job training programs with vocational educational programs. The Senate bill contained a provision in section 204(d) to the effect that where on-the-job training programs require supplementary classroom instruction, appropriate arrangements for such instruction shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor. This provision, which has no counterpart in the House amendment, is retained in the conference substitute as section 204(c).

Section 205 of the Senate bill provided for the appointment of a 10-member National Advisory Committee containing representatives of labor, management, agriculture, education and training, and the public. The Advisory Committee was directed to encourage and assist in the organization on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis, of labor-management-public committees and similar groups to further the purposes of the act and was permitted to assist such groups in effectuating the purposes of the act. It was specifically authorized to accept gifts and bequests. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute contains the provisions of the Senate bill in section 205 but also provides for the payment of per diem and travel expenses to members of the Committee. It also has a standard exemption from the conflict-of-interest laws for members of the Committee.

Section 303 of the House amendment directed the Secretary of Labor to make provision for supervision of on-the-job training programs conducted under the act to insure the quality of training, and provide for the adequacy of the various programs. The Senate bill contained no provision which was comparable in language to this section of the House amendment. The conference substitute drops this provision as being duplicative of the provisions contained in section 204(b).

Section 304 of the House amendment related to State agreements and, as explained above, has been merged with section 204 and appears as section 206 in the conference substitute.

Section 305 of the House amendment gives the Secretary of Labor authority to prescribe regulations to carry out title III. This provision has been consolidated with the like provision in title II and appears in the conference substitute as section 207.

Section 306 of the House amendment authorized the appropriation of $2,800,000 for the first fiscal year of the program and $4,800,000 for the second fiscal year, for carrying out title III of the House amendment. As explained before, the Senate amendment did not segregate authorizations by titles. The conference substitute aggregates in one provision the authorization for the provisions of the substitute which are comparable to the provisions included in titles II, III, and IV of the House amendment.

The Senate bill, in section 231, and the House amendment, in section 401, both direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with States under which the appropriate State vocational educational agency will provide training needed to equip individuals referred to it for the occupation specified in the referrals. The State agencies would provide the training through public educational agencies or institutions or where they are inadequate, through private education or training institutions. In the case of any State which does not enter into an agreement under this section and in the case of any training which the State agency does not provide under the agreement, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide the needed training through public or private educational institutions. It is expected that wherever possible the many excellent private institutions will be utilized in the vocational educational programs provided by State agencies, or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in cases in which a State has failed to enter into an agreement or in the case of any training program not provided under such agreement.

The Senate bill provided 50–50 State matching in the case of vocational education provided pursuant to State agreements except that for 2 years after the program got underway the Federal Government would pay 100 percent of the cost of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals. The House amendment was the same except that the 100-percent payment with respect to unemployment individuals would continue for 18 months after the enactment of the act. In section 231 the conference substitute, in substance, adopts the provision of the Senate bill.

Section 402 of the House amendment related to cooperation between the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor. This provision has been merged with other comparable provisions and appears in the conference substitute in section 303.

MISCELLANEOUS

Section 501 of the House amendment listed four factors which the Secretary of Labor must consider in allotting Federal expenditures among the States. The Senate bill listed substantially the same factors, but provided that he could consider only these factors. The conference substitute (in sec.

301) permits him to consider only the listed factors, but adds one additional. The additional factor is the average weekly unemployment compensation benefits paid by the States. The conference substitute also makes it clear that unused apportionments may be reapportioned.

Section 502(a) of the House amendment directed the Secretary of Labor, in the performance of his duties under the act, to use the available services or facilities of other Federal agencies. Each Federal agency is directed to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor to the extent permitted by law and to furnish him the services and facilities he needs to perform his functions under this act. The Senate bill in section 303 contained a provision which was substantially the same. The conference substitute, in section 303(a), contains a provision similar to that in the House amendment except that the requirements of the provision are extended to include the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Senate bill contained a single authorization of an appropriation in section 304(a). It provided that the total amount of funds appropriated to carry out the act could not exceed $90,000,000 for the first fiscal year, $165,000,000 for the second fiscal year, and $2,000,000 for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years. The House amendment, as has been indicated, contained a separate authorization for each of the titles of the bill. The conference substitute contains a separate authorization for title I of the substitute, which corresponds to title I of the House bill. It also contains a separate authorization for title II of the substitute, which, in effect, lumps the appropriations for titles II, III, and IV of the House amendment into one appropriation. The conference substitute provides a separate authorization for title V. It should be noted that in each instance the Senate bill authorized appropriations for 4 years while the House amendment authorized appropriations for but 2 years. The conference substitute in each instance authorizes appropriations for 3 years.

The following is a summary of the appropriations authorized by the House amendment and those authorized by the conference substitute. For title I the House amendment authorized $1,700,000 for fiscal 1963 and $1,670,000 for fiscal 1964. For this title the conference substitute authorizes $2,000,000 for fiscal 1963 and $3,000,000 for fiscal 1964, and a like sum for fiscal 1965. The aggregate appropriations authorized by the House amendment for titles II, III, and IV were $97,100,000 for fiscal 1963 and $157,467 for fiscal 1964. The comparable appropriations authorized under the conference substitute, that is, for title II thereof, is $100,000,000 for fiscal 1963, $165,000,000 for fiscal 1964, and a like amount for fiscal 1965. The House amendment authorized $1,600,000 for carrying out title V for fiscal 1963 and $2,750,000 for fiscal 1964. The comparable authorization in the conference substitute, authorizes $1,000,000 for fiscal 1963, 1964, and 1965.

In addition, the conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $5,000,000 for the purpose of planning and starting programs under this act between the date of its enactment and June 30, 1962. No referrals for training will be made under the act prior to the beginning of fiscal 1963.

The Senate bill provided in section 304(b) that equipment and teaching aids purchased with funds appropriated to carry out the vocational education provisions of the act will become property of the State. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate bill as section 305(b).

Subsection (d) of section 304 of the Senate bill prohibited the use of funds appropriated to carry out the vocational education provisions of the act for purchase, erection, or repair of any building except for minor remodeling of a public building necessary to make it suitable for use in vocational education. Again, the House amendment contained no comparable provision and the conference substitute drops this provision of the Senate bill.

Subsection (e) of this section of the Senate bill provided that funds appropriated under the act will remain available for 1 fiscal year beyond that for which appropriated. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill.

Section 506 of the House amendment provided that programs under the act would be carried on for 2 fiscal years. The Senate bill provided that the programs should be carried on for 4 fiscal years. Section 310 of the conference substitute provides that such programs should be carried on for 3 fiscal years.

ADAM C. POWELL,
ELMER J. HOLLAND,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
NEAL SMITH,
CHARLES S. JOELSON,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
PETER A. GARLAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 13, 1962]

HOUSE

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Republican substitute for the Manpower Development and Training Act which was overwhelmingly adopted by this House contained a number of very important standards and safeguards. I am very happy to report that in our conference with our Senate colleagues we were able to retain all of these important measures. Thus, the bill which we present today is a good bill. If it is properly administered, it can provide much of the training which is so desperately needed by so many of our unemployed. It will also provide the means whereby the significant data on employment trends and future skill needs can be compiled and then disseminated to employees, employers, and unions.

Now, to be specific, what compromises were made in our conference? Also, what important features of the House bill were retained?

First, the bill now provides for a 3-year program. As you will recall, the House bill provided for a 2-year program while the Senate bill called for a 4-year program. The compromise which was agreed to, established a 3-year program. However, State matching is required after the first 2 years and both the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of HEW must submit detailed reports to Congress at the end of the first and second years.

Second, the conference bill adopts the Senate form and sets forth the provisions of the bill under three titles rather than five. This is only a technical change which was made so that redundancy could be avoided. The important thing to note is that the duties of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of HEW are still carefully spelled out. And, even more important, all of the provisions were retained which establish that the Secretary of HEW shall have full responsibility for all educational aspects of this bill. This includes the furnishing of supplementary classroom work when such work is required by an on-the-job training program.

Third, although the appropriations have been codified under one section—304(a)—the overall cost of the program remains approximately the same. The first full year will cost $100 million and the second and third years will cost $165 million each. In addition, $5 million has been provided for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for planning and starting programs. Thus, for the full 3-year-and-3-month period this training program will cost $435 million.

This is a lot of money. However, the benefits which can be realized from this program are also enormous. I, for one, when reviewing the results of this program after the first and second years, will do my best to make sure that this money is being wisely spent and that the maximum benefits are being realized. If this is not the case, I shall then bend every effort to effect immediate remedial changes so that the program can operate efficiently. In the event the necessary changes cannot be made I shall then return to the floor of this House and urge the immediate cancellation of the program. I want to make it perfectly clear that this bill does not establish a bureaucratic, experimental toy. This bill has been enacted because the needs of our country demand that a positive, hard-hitting training program be undertaken. This can and must be done. If unfortunately, this bill is unsuccessful, then this legislation must be terminated forthwith and some other means devised.

Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that the conference bill retained all of the House safeguards with respect to the selection of the trainees and the circumstances under which they can be paid a training allowance. In addition, it has been made clear that the Secretary of Labor must work through existing State agencies when setting up on-the-job training programs. In this respect it will be much similar to the manner in which the vocational education programs are administered.

The Secretary of HEW and the State vocational training agencies have been instructed to utilize the services of the many excellent private institutions whenever this is possible.

Finally, specific instructions are given in the manager's statement that when unemployment compensation is paid to a trainee and reimbursement is made to the State funds, the particular employer and employees account that has been charged is to be credited. This particular instruction carries out the will of the House in this matter. It must be underscored at this point, for the Department of Labor has indicated that it would interpret this reimbursement provision in a manner which would prohibit the crediting of the particular employer-employee account.

In conclusion then, this is a good bill. It has many vital safeguards and standards. If it is properly administered, it can do the job. I am confident that by carefully reviewing the bill's administration at the end of the first and second year we can do a great deal to keep it efficiently administered and going in the right direction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, Mr. Powell, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Mr. Joelson, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Kearns, Mr. Goodell, Mr. Garland, Mr. Bruce, and I, as conferees designated by the Speaker on S. 1991, met with six Members of the other body who were similarly designated.

Before us was the task of reconciling the differences which appeared in the measures adopted by the House and Senate.

I am happy to point out there were very few differences.

With the exception of the structure of the bill, very few additions were necessary and these will be outlined by my colleague, Congressman O'HARA of Michigan.

In order to secure complete agreement among the attending conferees, only two meetings were required. On March 7, the 15 members of the conference committee, with only 1 abstention, endorsed the provisions of the legislation now before us.

I believe there are very few occasions when such general accord has been shown by the Members of Congress.

The desperate need of the unemployed workers, the underemployed farmers, and our inadequately trained youth throughout the Nation has been recognized as the No. 1 problem on our homefront.

The Senate, displaying its awareness of the seriousness of the present unemployment problem, passed—by a voice vote—this report now before us the day after our conference committee reported it out.

I would like—at this time—to say that it was a pleasant experience to serve on this conference as the spirit of cooperation and the desire to provide adequate training programs for our unemployed prevailed throughout the meetings we held.

All of the attending conferees, from both the House and the Senate, recognized the urgent need of this legislation and worked diligently toward satisfactory agreement of minor differences.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, I would like to especially express my appreciation to the members of the House committee who served as conferees. We have gone through quite a bit together—from our original open hearings to this presentation of the final legislation—and I believe I can truthfully say that our convictions for the need of it have grown with each passing day.

With the overwhelming support of this legislation, already a matter of record by the vote of the House Members on February 28, I ask that you again endorse this program by supporting the conference report we have presented.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly with respect to the conference report on the Manpower Training and Development Act. In my brief comments I will try to underscore some of what I feel are the more important provisions of this bill as it has been modified by the conference.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION

The Senate bill contained a provision to the effect that where on-the-job training programs require supplementary classroom instruction, the appropriate arrangements for such instuction shall be agreed to between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor. This provision was retained in the conference substitute. Thus, when classroom work is required by an on-the-job training program, it is the intent of Congress that such classroom work will be provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in conjunction with the various State vocational education groups.

In addition, although the Senate provision stating that the Secretary of Labor shall test, counsel, and select youths for occupational training and further schooling was adopted, the conference report underscores the fact that the inclusion of the words "further schooling" does not indicate that the Secretary of Labor is to handle matters of classroom instruction. Those words merely recognize the growing emphasis on work-study programs. Finally, although the conference substitute includes the Senate provision which directs the Secretary of Labor to secure the adoption of training programs by various groups which appeared in the Senate version is stricken. This again conforms to the general pattern of the conference bill which divorces the Secretary of Labor from any connection with educational functions.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

The conference substitute contains language which specifically mentions State on-the-job training programs. This inclusion is intended to stress the desirability of the Secretary of Labor first seeking the State agreements whenever States have on-the-job training programs. In this connection, it should be noted that prior to the Senate adopting the conference report, my colleague from New York, Senator Javits, noted that New York State has a very effective on-the-job training program. He advised that it was his understanding that the Secretary of Labor would work through this State on-the-job training program when he places in effect the provisions of this act. Senator Clark, who was the chairman of the conference, agreed with Senator Javits' interpretation of this provision. I would also like to state that it is certainly my understanding that there was general agreement among the conferees regarding the manner in which the Secretary of Labor should administer the on-the-job training programs. Thus, it was agreed that in those States where there is an effective on-the-job training program, or such a program is adopted, the Secretary of Labor should work through the State agency which administers such a program.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

The conference report underscores the fact that whenever possible the many excellent private instiutions will be utilized in the vocational education programs. As we are all aware, there are many excellent private institutions which perform invaluable service in many of our States. It is anticipated that the services of these private institutions will be used whenever it is possible to do so. In many instances it will be only through the adequate utilization of these institutions that the training called for under this act can be carried forward.

REIMBURSEMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

The House provision which provides for reimbursement whenever unemployment compensation payments have been paid to a trainee has been included in the conference bill. During the House debate on this bill, it was specifically noted that where such reimbursement has been made, the employer's account which has been charged as a result of the payment of unemployment compensation should be credited. Unfortunately, the Labor Department, I understand, tentatively chose last week to interpret this provision as meaning that although there is reimbursement to a State fund, the particular employer's account which has been charged should not be credited. This interpretation directly contradicts the congressional intent. Members of our committee and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee are agreed on this point. In order to clarify this point once and for all, the manager's statement provides:

"It is the intent of this subsection that if a State is reimbursed for paying unemployment compensation to trainees, that employers should not be charged with such unemployment compensation payments under the experience rating provisions of their laws, and that the trainees should not have their eligibility for unemployment compensation reduced on account of the payments they receive during training."

In view of this statement, there now is absolutely no basis for the Labor Department to misinterpret the intent of Congress. I am confident that they will not do so.

PAYMENT OF TRAINING ALLOWANCES TO YOUTHS

Although the House bill did not contain a provision which would permit the payment of training allowances to youths, the conferees agreed to include such a provision. However, this provision is precisely stated and is very carefully limited in its application. Thus, the conference substitute permits the Secretary to pay training allowances at a rate not to exceed $20 a week to youths in their 19th, 20th, and 21st years where such allowances are necessary to provide for occupational training, but not more than 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances paid annually to the Secretary can be paid to such youths. By this provision it is intended that training allowances may be paid to those youths who have either completed their high school education or are too old or completely unsuited for further schooling of this type. In most cases, the youths receiving training allowances will be married and often times the head of a family. In no way is this provision intended to encourage youths to drop out of school when they should be continuing such schooling.

FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, section 203(c) contains three conditions to the payment of training allowances under this bill. First, that the recipient must eb unemployed; second, that he must have had not less than a 3-year attachment to the labor market; and third, that he be the head of a family or a household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Any persons, irrespective of age, who meet all three of these criteria and who are selected for training will be entitled to training allowances. Unemployed youths between the ages of 19 and 22 who have not had at least 3 years of experience in gainful employment and who are not heads of families may, if they are receiving training, be paid a training allowance at a rate not to exceed $20 a week.

Unemployed youths less than 19 years of age who do not meet the other two criteria specified in this section and who are selected for training can receive no training allowance in this bill.

Section 202(a) includes provision for a special program for the testing, counseling and selection of youths 16 years or older for occupational training and further schooling. The age limitation intended in this provision is 16 through 21.

Section 203(b) is intended to permit the payment of subsistence expenses and transportation costs not to exceed the rate of 10 cents per mile to any persons who are receiving training, whether or not they are eligible for, or are receiving, training allowances subject to the conditions contained in this section.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(NOTE.—The conference report, in the text shown above, was signed by President Kennedy on March 15, 1962, as Public Law 87–415.)

[87th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Report No. 1853]

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962 TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACCOUNT

August 7, 1962.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following report—to accompany S. 3529.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3529) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 with regard to reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to direct that the Railroad Retirement Board shall be reimbursed for all unemployment compensation payments made by it to persons taking training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415; 76 Stat. 23) and eligible for training allowances thereunder. The act provides for reimbursement in compensation cases to any State making such payments, and it is the object of this bill to make identical provision for reimbursement in the case of railroad unemployment benefits paid out of the railroad unemployment insurance account. Reimbursement would be authorized for all pay-

ments made prior to July 1, 1964, and for 50 percent of payments paid on or after that date.

BACKGROUND

Section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 provided for the payment of weekly training allowances to persons taking training thereunder. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with States to enable them to pay these allowances as agents for the United States. The allowances may be paid for a period not exceeding 52 weeks, and the weekly amount may not ordinarily exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) in the State paying the allowance.

However, training allowances, where paid, are in lieu of unemployment compensation. If the trainee for any particular week has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under the Social Security Act or under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, he is not eligible to receive a training allowance. In appropriate cases he may receive either the allowance or the unemployment compensation, but not both.

In most States, the unemployed worker becomes ineligible to receive unemployment compensation during any period when he undertakes vocational training or any other form of education. It is generally said, in such cases, that the unemployed worker has withdrawn himself from the labor market and for that reason cannot qualify for unemployment compensation.

However, a number of States follow the policy of paying unemployment compensation to insured unemployed workers whether or not they are taking training. An unemployed worker undergoing training under the Manpower Development and Training Act in any of these States, does not, of course, qualify for a training allowance for the reason that he continues to receive unemployment compensation.

In order to provide equal treatment for States in this group, section 203(h) provides that the States making such payments to a trainee under the Manpower Development and Training Act who is otherwise eligible for a training allowance shall be reimbursed from funds appropriated for the administration of the act.

However, the Railroad Retirement Board was inadvertently excluded from this provision. It now appears that unemployed railroad workers remain eligible for unemployment compensation under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act even though they are taking training under the Manpower Act. This means that the unemployed railroad worker in this position may not receive a training allowance. However, under the present system, the Railroad Retirement Board, unlike the various States in this identical situation, is not reimbursed for these payments.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (52 Stat. 1094, as amended) establishes a system of unemployment insurance for railroad workers completely outside the State unemployment compensation systems. The act is administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, and benefits are paid from the railroad unemployment insurance account in the unemployment trust fund. Railroad employment is excluded from coverage under the unemployment compensation laws of the States. However, the Manpower Development and Training Act does not exclude railroad workers from its provisions. Railroaders may qualify for training allowances under the same conditions as persons in other industries.

The Manpower Act did not intend to, and does not, make any distinction between railroad workers and those in other industries; there should be no discrimination against the railroad unemployment insurance account in the matter of reimbursement for unemployment benefits paid to trainees eligible for training allowances. The bill therefore provides for reimbursement of that account in the same manner as the States' accounts in the unemployment trust fund are reimbursed.

All of the interested parties are in favor of this amendment and urge enactment of the bill. The Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives' Association have joined in urging Congress to correct this technical oversight in the drafting of the Manpower Act.

The Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Railroad Retirement Board also recommend passage of the bill as a measure needed to correct this technical problem.

The bill will not require any additional appropriation. Reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account will be made out of the funds recently appropriated for the administration of the act.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 by adding a new paragraph to subsection (h) of section 203. That subsection now provides that a State which pays unemployment compensation to a trainee eligible for a training allowance shall be reimbursed from funds appropriated under the act. The amount of such reimbursement, determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished by the States, is to be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account. Subsection (d) of section 203 provides that after June 30, 1964, any amount paid to a State to enable it to pay training allowances, or to reimburse it for unemployment compensation paid by it to trainees eligible for training allowances, shall be paid on condition that the State bear 50 percent of the amount of such payments.

The first sentence of the new paragraph which the bill would add to subsection (h) of section 203 provides for reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account in the unemployment trust fund for unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act paid to a person who is taking training, and is eligible for a training allowance, under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The account would be reimbursed for all such benefits paid before July 1, 1964, and for 50 percent of the amount of such benefits paid on or after that date. This limitation on reimbursement for benefits paid on or after July 1, 1964, corresponds to the condition imposed on State reimbursement by subsection (d) of section 203.

Under the second sentence of the new paragraph, above referred to, the amount by which the railroad unemployment insurance account is to be reimbursed would be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the Railroad Retirement Board. The amount so determined would then be placed in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

[87th Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 2369]

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962 TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACCOUNT

September 14, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Powell, from the Committee on Education and Labor submitted the following report to accompany S. 3529.

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3529) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 with regard to reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate Aug. 9, 1962]

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACCOUNT

The bill (S. 3529) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 with regard to reimbursement of the railroad unemployment insurance account was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (h) of section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended, effective March 15, 1962, by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation, and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(2) If unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are paid to a person taking training under this Act and eligible for a training allowance, the railroad unemployment insurance account in the unemployment trust fund shall be reimbursed, from funds herein appropriated, for all of such benefits paid prior to July 1, 1964, and for 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid on or after that date. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the Railroad Retirement Board and such amount shall then be placed in the railroad unemployment insurance account."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1853), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

"PURPOSE OF THE BILL

"The purpose of the bill is to direct that the Railroad Retirement Board shall be reimbursed for all unemployment compensation payments made by it to persons taking training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415; 76 Stat. 23) and eligible for training allowances thereunder. The act provides for reimbursement in compensation cases to any State making such payments, and it is the object of this bill to make identical provision for reimbursement in the case of railroad unemployment benefits paid out of the railroad unemployment insurance account. Reimbursement would be authorized for all payments made prior to July 1, 1964, and for 50 percent of payments paid on or after that date."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, Sept. 19, 1962]

REIMBURSEMENT OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill S. 3529, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3529)?

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE GLASS HOUSE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a rather remarkable—indeed, a unique—television film has come to my attention and I should like to bring it to the further attention of this body and through it to the people of the United States.

The film is called "The Glass House." Perhaps some of my colleagues were fortunate enough to have seen it when it was first telecast by the CBS television network on Friday, February 4. I am happy to say it will now be aired a second time, on Friday, April 7, and I urge each of you to make every effort to see it.

This is not an entertainment film, aside from the fact that its professional entertainment credits—writing, acting, direction, and production—are of the highest caliber. It is a relentless, devastating, and above all compelling authentic portrayal of what goes on, as a matter of routine, day after day, in our prisons, whether they be county jails or Federal penitentiaries. Television is often accused of providing us with a steady, unrelieved diet of pap and pablum, of escape from reality, of flimsy, frothy entertainment on a virtual 24-hour basis. "The Glass House," of a certainty, is none of these.

"The Glass House" is proof positive that television can be of enormous and vital service to society, even within the framework of the much maligned entertainment show. For "The Glass House" was not designed as a documentary to be aired on a Sunday afternoon for an audience of a minute handful of people and a bid for applause from the FCC. It was designed as an entertainment motion picture, to be telecast in the very choice 9 to 10:30 p.m., Friday nighttime period.

I have been aware for a long time—I think all of us have—of the crying need for prison reform in this country. But never have I known this need to be brought home to me so dramatically, so compellingly, so shockingly as by "The Glass House." For this is not a pleasant film. It has no moments of comic relief or even a fleeting respite from the constant, exhausting pressure it applies to the viewer from the first moment of its opening scene. And in order to make doubly sure that its flavor and background were absolutely authentic, its producers shot the film entirely within the confines of the Utah State Prison.

This could not have been done without the full and understanding cooperation of Gov. Calvin L. Rampton of Utah and Warden John Turner. I salute them for their vision and their courage. It took a large measure of both to allow their prison facilities to be used for the making of this remarkable motion picture.

"The Glass House" was produced by Tomorrow Entertainment, Inc., a forward-looking subsidiary of the General Electric Co. Its stars are Vic Morrow, Clu Gulager, Billy Dee Williams, Kristoffer Tabori, Dean Jagger, and Alan Alda. It is based on an original story by Truman Capote and Wyatt Cooper, with the screenplay done by Tracy Keenan Wynn. It was directed by Tom Gries. The coproducers are Robert Christiansen and Rick Rosenberg and the executive producer, Roger Gimbel.

I purposely salute these talented gentlemen by name in these regards for I believe they have made a unique and singularly valuable contribution in their presentation of "The Glass House." I urge, once again, the membership of this body to see this film, if they have not already, on Friday night, April 7.

"The Glass House" makes one further point which I believe is pertinent: That writers of talent and conviction can, indeed, write what they wish to write for television; that producers of integrity can, indeed, recognize and embrace such convictions; and that a network can, indeed, put on the air a controversial film for the greater benefit of society as a whole.

EASTERN MASSACHUSETTS HOCKEY TOURNAMENT CHAMPIONS

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the town of Norwood, which is part of my Ninth Congressional District in Massachusetts, is celebrating not only its Centenary Year, but, will also celebrate the year in which the Norwood High School hockey team brought home the laurel wreath as Eastern Massachusetts Hockey Tournament Champions.

This victory has been long in coming, but well-deserved. After many years of being second best to Arlington High School hockey team, the Norwood Club won the championship in a thrilling exciting game with less than 3 minutes remaining in regulation play.

I would like my colleagues in the House to join with me in congratulating Coach Don Wheeler and the members of the Norwood High School hockey team and in order that my colleagues may enjoy the playoff performance, I am inserting an article from the Boston Herald-Traveler in the RECORD:

NORWOOD ICE CHAMP, SPILLS ARLINGTON, 3–2

(By Bill Abramson)

It began to look like a rerun of last year's EMass Hockey Tournament final, but someone changed the ending. This time Norwood came back to win its first title, 3–2, over defending state champ, Arlington, last night before 12,420 at Boston Garden.

A year ago Norwood dominated the first period of play, but came out of it scoreless before losing 3–0. This year the Mustangs outshot Arlington 21–2 in the first 12 minutes, but with five minutes to play it was Arlington, 2–1.

Then, with 4:21 to play, Norwood's second line of Bill Denehy, Greg Walker and Dan Bayer again, as they had done all night, pulled Norwood even. Denehy popped in the equalizer off Walker's shot that was deflected wide by the Arlington defense.

And Ed King, Bay State League MVP, was in the right place to score the winner with 2:41 to play. Mike Martin took control at the Norwood blue line, skated up the center and faked a slap shot before feeding Bill Clifford busting down the right side. Clifford fired for the far corner and King tipped the drive in as pandemonium broke loose.

"Clifford set up the play," King said in the exuberant Norwood dressing room. "I just tipped it in. We've worked on that all year long and this is the first time it worked."

Norwood outshot Arlington 44–10 as it reversed the three straight losses in tourney finals administered by the Suburban League's perennial tourney team.

"We outplayed them all the way," Norwood coach Don Wheeler explained. "This was our game all the way. I knew there was no way we could lose it. There are certain things that you just know and even when we were down 2–1 I knew we would win.

"Our second line was just fabulous and I think they turned it around. They just went out there and tore hell out of them."

The second wave, which has scored in every tourney game, put Norwood on the board after just 35 seconds of play when Bayer shot from the right point and the puck eluded goalie Chuck Cremmens and went behind the net. Denehy picked it up and tried to stuff it inside the left post, but Cremmens saved. The rebound came out to Walker and he lifted his shot just under the crossbar.

Arlington came back to tie it at 1-1 on Alan Quinlan's score at 1:06 of the middle period. Maury Corkery got control of the puck along the left boards and fanned on his shot. But he was able to get it over to Quinlan who had time to fake goalie Bill Pieri down and fire over him.

The Spy Ponders took the lead as Peter Noonan carried down the left side, shot and picked up his own rebound as a Norwood defenseman blocked his first attempt. Noonan fired the second try over Pieri's shoulder at 2:24 of the final frame.

But maybe Wheeler had read the script because he said he knew Norwood would win.

"Norwood played inspired hockey," Arlington coach Ed Burns said. "I thought we could steal it when we went ahead 2-1. But Norwood kept hustling. They could have had four or five more if it weren't for Cremmens who was fantastic. I'm proud of my kids because they played great hockey all the way."

Arlington attack was blunted by eight penalties, including a major and misconduct.

But King probably said what everyone from Norwood felt. "It wouldn't have been as nice unless it was Arlington!"

Division 1

Norwood	1	0	2—3
Arlington	0	1	1—2

N—Walker (Denehy, Bayer); A—Quinlan (Corkery); A—Noonan (Quinlan); N—Denehy (Walker, Hurley); N—King (Martin, Clifford).

ALL-TOURNEY TEAMS

(Selected by tournament committee)

Division 1

Forwards—Maury Corkery, Arlington; Bill Clifford, Norwood; Ed King, Norwood; Mike Flanagan, Arlington.

Defense—Brian Walsh, Matignon; Peter Brown, Norwood.

Goal—Jeff Goodchild, Beverly.

Tourney MVP—Walsh.

Division 2

Forwards—Dan Yeadon, Burlington; Mark Shepard, Wayland; Bill Moore, Barnstable.

Defense—Ralph Hollenborg, Billerica; John Hurley, Barnstable.

Goal—Jeff Sollows, Barnstable.

To Coach Don Wheeler my congratulation for a job well done and to each player—thank you for true sportsmanship.

PEACE FOR THE 1970'S: SOVIET STYLE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Dr. James D. Atkinson appeared in the February 11, 1972 edition of the Washington Report.

Dr. Atkinson briefly reviews Soviet expansionist efforts in the subcontinent of India, their espionage apparatus in Great Britain which came to light with the defection of the chief of the Soviet sabotage and assassination section for the British Isles, and the Communist shipment of armaments to fuel the conflict in Ireland. He notes that the scope and boldness of Soviet political warfare efforts has increased as their strategic military power has grown, and that unless the United States makes some effort to rebuild its own strategic forces we can expect more of the same throughout the 1970's.

As Soviet strategic military strength in relation to that of the United States continues to grow, so does the area in which they have freedom of action. They no longer are particularly worried about out strategic power when targeting areas outside of the continental United States. It is apparent that our capability to extend our strategic umbrella of protection to distant parts of the world is steadily lessening.

The present administration has no plans even to regain strategic parity with the Soviet Union, much less bring us back to a position of clear superiority. The "sufficiency" criterion which currently governs our strategic force posture is not based on "simply adding up the relative size or capabilities of Soviet and American strategic forces" but on "broader underlying questions," according to the last State of the World Message. Perhaps this is because it is becoming so embarassing to add them up.

Whatever the case may be, Soviet efforts to increase their existing strategic superiority indicate that they are not as yet basing their strategic force posture on the "broader underlying questions." The heightening scope and intensity of their efforts to bring additional areas of the world into the world into the Communist camp might even lead us to believe that they are assessing the strategic balance, or rather imbalance, in the old-fashioned way. It obviously has not yet dawned on them that, "paradoxically," strategic superiority no longer confers a decided advantage. They have not reached the level of sophistication necessary to confuse paradoxes with some essential insight into the nature of things.

Until they do we are in trouble, as the following article by Dr. Atkinson makes clear.

PEACE FOR THE 1970'S: SOVIET STYLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. James D. Atkinson is Professor of Government at Georgetown University, Member of The International Institute For Strategic Studies, Special Consultant to the President of The Institute for American Strategy, and a recognized authority in the defense studies field.)

In 1967, and again in 1968, The American Security Council prepared studies on the Changing Military and Naval Balances, U.S. v. USSR, at the request of the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. These studies, followed by later analyses and special papers, accurately warned about the vast Soviet thrust to secure military-technological superiority over the United States. Now, in the early 1970s, the hard evidence indicates how the USSR is making use of its enhanced military-technological power to change the geo-political map of the world.

The succinct statement of the chief of Japan's delegation to the United Nations, Kiichi Aichi, is perhaps as clear as anything concerning the decline of the United States and the rise of the Red Star of Russia in the world. Speaking at the end of the UN General Assembly meeting of last October 25—and following the seating of the Chinese Communists—he said: *"What has happened makes one feel that the U.S. strength in world politics has declined."*

PAKISTAN DISMEMBERED

The victory of India over Pakistan last December was a clear indication of the rise of Soviet influence on the Indian subcontinent and in the Indian Ocean. The USSR, quite aware of its greatly increased power in the strategic balance, assisted India with both advice and military hardware.

Indeed, it may well be that the Soviets not only encouraged India to attack both East and West Pakistan, but actually triggered the undeclared war. For, only a few days following Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolai Firyubin's long consultations with Indian officials, the commander-in-chief of the Soviet Air Force, Marshal and Deputy Minister of Defense Pavel S. Kouthakov, arrived in New Delhi on October 30.

The Soviet air chief spent about a week in India and, following his departure, the USSR organized a large airlift of military equipment for India by way of Egypt. Giant *Antonov 12* cargo aircraft were used in early November to transport Soviet military equipment to India, and one can hardly be surprised at the actions which followed: The invasion of East Pakistan by the Indian Army and Air Force and air attacks on selected targets in West Pakistan in December.

BANGLADESH EMERGES

The Pakistan forces in East Pakistan were defeated in this undeclared war, and what was formerly East Pakistan was proclaimed the sovereign state of the People's Republic of Bangladesh last month. Not surprisingly, among the first of the countries to grant recognition to Bangladesh were the four Soviet satellite states of East Germany, Bulgaria, Poland, and Mongolia. The close collaboration of this new "state" with the USSR was further indicated by the appearance of a Bangladesh contingent at the fifth conference of a Soviet-supported front organization. This occurred during the second week of January in Cairo, with Egypt, whose government has been collaborating more and more closely with the Soviets, hosting the conference. This front group, the Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization (AAPSO), has served for some time as a Soviet vehicle for agitation, propaganda, and political warfare directed against the West, but especially against the United States.

AAPSO is an excellent example of Soviet-style *"peace"* for the 1970s since it is actively engaged in the promotion of conflict at almost every level.

WHEN "PEACE" IS WAR

It is not without interest that the chief of the Bangladesh delegation, Mulla Jaladin Ahmed, told the AAPSO conference that he wanted to *"stress the resolve of the people of Bangladesh to struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, shoulder-to-shoulder with the progressive Afro-Asian states."* The *"struggle"* against *"imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism"* has long been a Marxist-Leninist euphemism for waging war under the guise of peace on all nations which do not accept the Soviet view of what the world should be, and especially for those nations which in any way bar the USSR's advance towards the goal of THE dominant world power.

Ahmed underscored the importance of Soviet assistance in defeating Pakistan. Said he: *"Our people highly evaluate the Soviet support in the struggle for liberation . . . [and] in the name of our people, government and our delegation, I thank the Soviet Union . . .* [Emphasis supplied.]

The dismemberment of Pakistan—a member of both the SEATO and CENTO defensive treaty organizations sponsored by the West—and the creation of the new state of Bangladesh is, above all, a victory for the USSR. India will more and more be drawn into the Soviet orbit and Bangladesh will soon, no doubt, be admitted to the United Nations, thus giving the USSR one more vote and, if the words of Mulla Jaladin Ahmed are any guide, one more political warfare mouthpiece on the East River.

INDIAN OCEAN: RED WATERS

The Soviet fleet in the Indian Ocean was increased in numbers during the undeclared India-Pakistan war and shows no signs of departure, unlike the United States Navy task force which was briefly in the Indian Ocean, but was later withdrawn. India, while not wanting the ships of the United States or of some other naval powers in the Indian Ocean, has viewed the Soviet naval buildup there without concern and, indeed, has upgraded the port facilities in Visakapatnam by, apparently, providing facilities for Soviet submarines.

While India has kept Western nations away from the strategic Andaman and Nickobar islands, she has permitted the USSR to use these Indian Ocean islands for fueling Soviet ships and for other purposes. This is especially ironic in view of the $7.2 billion in United States taxpayers' money which has been granted to India over the years, until President Nixon cut off funds during the India-Pakistan war.

If any further evidence were needed as to the very close Soviet-Indian relations, it was supplied by the statement from New Delhi last Jan. 12 that an Indian defense mission would leave for the USSR the following day to make the final arrangements for an *"improved version"* of the Soviet Mig–21 to be deployed by the Indian Air Force. Production of this new type Mig (it may be the Mach-3 speed and 80,000-feet-plus ceiling Mig-23) is apparently planned for production in 1973–1974 in India with Soviet technological assistance.

Bangladesh, Indian-Soviet collaboration, Soviet naval expansion in the Indian Ocean, a weakened Pakistan on the brink of internal chaos—all of these add up to a pattern of Soviet-style *"peace"* for the 1970s, or, to put it rather more bluntly, Soviet willingness to embark on a strong forward strategy in world politics, emboldened by the steady rise of Soviet strategic striking power.

LYALIN DEFECTS, TALKS

Soviet willingness to take somewhat greater risks in the 1970s than in the past in exploiting conflict far from the Soviet borders and on grounds not favorable to the Soviets, was revealed by the defection of Oleg Lyalin at the end of last September. Lyalin, the chief of the Soviet secret police's sabotage and assassination section for the British Isles and, possibly, for a part of Europe, defected in London. Lyalin is thought to be related (possibly a *close* relative) to Lt. Gen. Serafim N. Lyalin, presently chief of one of the main directorates of the Soviet secret police and formerly chief of the infamous "SMERSH" murder squads of World War II and after.

Lyalin officially was employed by RAZNO,

the Soviet import-export organization which is a part of the Soviet trade mission in London. This was, of course, only a cover for Lyalin's real work: Planning for sabotage and apparently any groundwork for the assassination of persons the USSR secret police wanted liquidated.

TARGETS OF SABOTAGE

Some of the targets on the sabotage list appear to have been: (1) The early warning radar network, in which the United States is heavily interested and the key point of which is at Fylingdale in Yorkshire; (2) the U.S. submarine base at Holy Loch, Scotland, one of the highly critical bases from which a key part of our deterrent forces operates; (3) the British submarine base at Faslane, Scotland, from which missile-firing submarines of the Royal Navy operate; and (4) the anti-submarine warfare base at Portland, England, which is one of the world's leading research points for the detection of submarines and, obviously, a key site for the research and development of detection aids to counter the growing Soviet submarine threat.

Information given to the British counter-intelligence service by Lyalin led to action by the British foreign Office in declaring 105 Soviet agents *persona non grata* for using diplomatic cover in Great Britain to engage in espionage and related activities. Lyalin seems also to have given the British the information which led to the seizure of a very large shipment of arms and munitions designed to further exacerbate the conflict in Northern Ireland.

RED ARMS TO IRELAND

On last Oct. 16, the Dutch police, acting on information from British intelligence, seized an airliner in Amsterdam. This aircraft, a DC-6, had been flown in from Prague, Czechoslovakia, and was chartered by a Belgian company. It was flown by a Belgian pilot who, according to press accounts, was accompanied by a man named Ernest Koening, an American salesman living in Luxembourg.

The aircraft had cargo which a manifest showed was bound from Prague to London, but at Amsterdam the actual plan was to refuel and fly to some place in Ireland. This appeared to be Southern Ireland, from which the Irish Republican Army, which is outlawed by Eire, would transport the cargo across the border into Northern Ireland.

After a search of the aircraft, the cargo was found to consist of 116 wooden boxes. These contained ammunition, machine guns, automatic rifles, mortars, anti-tank rocket launchers, and hand grenades. The markings on the weapons and on the ammunition indicated that they had been made in the USSR and in Czechoslovakia. The rocket launchers alone would have contributed to a dangerous escalation of the conflict in Northern Ireland since the IRA could have used them against the armored cars which the British army has been using in an effort to preserve order in that province.

IRISH COMMUNISTS MEET

Perhaps it was only a coincidence that on the following day, October 17—the day on which the arms and munitions would have arrived in Ireland had the cargo aircraft not been seized in Holland—the Second Congress of the Irish Communists Party met. The Congress called for the overthrow of both the Government of Eire, headed by Prime Minister Lynch, and the Government of Northern Ireland (Ulster), or Stormont, as the government with its capital in Belfast is often called. Ninety delegates of the Irish Communist Party were present from both the South and the North of Ireland.

Present also were the following persons whose purpose was obviously to use the Irish Communists for the benefit of the Soviet Union: Prof. Nikolai Matkevsky, a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and of the Supreme Soviet; Dzhavid Sharif, a senior Soviet trade official, Jerzi Kwiatek, head of the Polish Communist Party's cultural" department; Wlodzimierz Komarskifi a representative of the Polish Student Union; Alexander Lilov, chief of the Bulgarian Communist Party's "cultural" department; un-named representatives of the official Soviet news agency TASS (which has long had a reputation for taking more interest in espionage and similar operations than in news gathering), and of the East German official news agency which is closely associated with Tass.

Most interesting is the fact that Prof. Matkevsky, representing the Supreme Soviet, has been very active in the past in Soviet-sponsored front organizations.

Soviet front groups, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Organization of Journalists, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Union of Students, and the like, have long been used by the USSR as vehicles for political warfare and for the exploitation of conflict situations. Additionally, it is known that the International Union of Students operates a training school in Prague for sabotage, subversion, and guerrilla warfare.

Prof. Matkovsky's presence at the Second Congress of the Irish Communist Party was reported by the London *Daily Telegraph* as *"significant"* and as closely related to Soviet efforts to exploit the conflict in Northern Ireland.

THE SOVIET FIRE BRIGADE

The purpose of the Soviet fronts, of Soviet secret police agents, and of their local Communist Party camp followers is just the opposite of the work of a good fire department. Trained firemen arrive on the scene of a fire and smother it with water, chemicals, *et cetera*. The Soviet fire brigade arrives on the scene of a conflict and then throws gasoline—in the form of agents, agitators, arms, and munitions—on the fire. This was openly admitted by a Cuban delegate to the Eighth World Youth Festival in Helsinki, Finland, when he said: *"We are here to teach the Africans and Asians how to conduct revolutions."*

The Communist Cuban was speaking, however, in 1962.

What is sharply different a decade later—in 1972—is that the USSR now possesses such powerful strategic striking power that Soviet arms and assistance can be given on a huge scale ranging world-wide from the support of the Indian invasion of East Pakistan to the exploitation of the conflict in Northern Ireland.

Unless the United States takes steps to rebuild its own strategic striking power, the pattern of *"peace"*, Soviet style, for the 1970s may well continue as it has unrolled during 1971 and early 1972, excepting only that the scale and boldness of the Soviet effort will increase.

DR. JAMES D. ATKINSON,
International Politics Editor.

AMERICAN HELLENIC EDUCATION PROGRESSIVE ASSOCIATION CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, AHEPA—the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association—celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding with its 20th biennial dinner here in the Nation's Capital. It is with profound respect and admiration that I offer my congratulations to AHEPA on this most exciting of occasions. It was with great honor and pride that I participated in their banquet last night, both as a member of the order and as a U.S. Congressman.

AHEPA, in hosting this banquet for the Congress, carries on a tradition that reaches back to ancient Greece, where the world's cherished principles of democracy and representative government first flourished. America's culture as well is greatly indebted to the genius of these great people. Greek civilization produced some of the world's greatest architects, playwrights, philosophers, artists, and historians. What student can be said to be truly educated without having studied major Greek figures in these areas? America has recognized her cultural debt to Greece and, I am proud to say, our two peoples have maintained a strong and enduring friendship because of it.

AHEPA has served an important function in strengthening these ties and in furthering the goals of democracy by encouraging its 46,000 members to participate in the governmental process; by instilling in them a respect for the privileges of citizenship and a loyalty to the United States; by developing a strong commitment to morality and an aversion to political corruption and all forms of political and social tyranny; and by promoting the goals and aspirations of Hellenic culture and Hellenism.

AHEPA expects its members not to be passive objects in society, but to be active and socially responsible citizens. These goals, of course, are consistent with AHEPA's Greek heritage as well as its American heritage.

AHEPA is active in the fields of education, charity, and civic improvement. The contributions of Greek Americans to the culture and strength of this great country are indeed significant and their impact immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate the order of AHEPA. I am proud to be a member of this organization which stands as a beacon, a model for all civic-minded groups. It has a proud tradition, an impressive history, and a bright future. I hope the years ahead bring success and fulfillment to all members of AHEPA.

ARVILLE SCHALEBEN RETIRES FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Associate Editor Arville Schaleben, a mainstay of the Milwaukee Journal's operation, retired last month after 43 years with the newspaper.

I extend my best wishes to Mr. Schaleben as he continues his service to journalism through other channels, and insert at this point an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 29:

HAPPY RETIREMENT, ARV

Another of Wisconsin's ablest journalists, nationally known for many years, has been

lost to the active profession by retirement from The Milwaukee Journal. Happily in the case of Arville Schaleben, he will continue to serve the cause of journalism as educator, mentor and authority on its principles and ideals.

Schaleben made a name as a probing and perceptive reporter in the first six of his 43 years with The Journal, and never lost the instinct or the zest all the rest of the time in news executive positions, where he rose to be associate editor. He long continued to be a world traveler and keen observer for Journal readers, literally from pole to pole, doing his own photography into the bargain.

Schaleben's special interests and productive labors in his news executive role have been highly useful in two fields: advancement of journalism as a career, and watchdogging the legal status of the press as a public service institution constitutionally protected. In the former he has worked to instill in journalism students a sense of the importance and values of newspaper work. In the latter, teamed with editors across the state and nation, he has helped lead the good fight, both for press freedom when menaced from outside and for press integrity and responsibility when endangered from within.

Young people getting their feet wet in The Journal newsroom will miss Schaleben's frequent tours of the room for friendly, understanding talks wtih them, encouraging them in their work, sympathizing with their problems. But he is in demand as a lecturer on college campuses and will be launching a new career as teacher and author, still striving to uplift even higher a profession that he is proud of—one that also is proud of him.

TOWARD SIMPLIFYING FEDERAL TAXES

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing matters to Mr. and Mrs. Average American these days is the enormously complex nature of our Federal tax structure. Like the weather, everyone seems to be talking about real tax reform, yet nothing ever really gets done about it that is meaningful to the average citizen.

Mr. Bart Fulton, a constituent of mine from Tuscaloosa County, Ala., has given a great deal of probing thought and attention to this subject. I would offer a portion of a recent letter from Mr. Fulton for inclusion in the RECORD. I think his remarks provide some good food for thought for all of us.

We want a simplified plan—a totally new tax measure—that a layman can understand. Moreover, Mr. Man In The Street wants taxes collected on the earnings of Foundations, Churches, Institutions—a figure said to total some fifty *billions* of dollars, untaxed as of now. In brief, Walter, we need a tax structure totally fair to all and slanted in favor to none!

Every dollar earned, after expenses attendant to the earning, should be taxed.

The scale I suggested may be wanting, in that it might not produce sufficient income on which to run the nation. But the PATTERN is right! It is entirely possible, using a computer, to determine the exact amount of taxes that should be paid on various incomes—assuming all exemptions have been eliminated. If Joe Bloke earns X dollars, after costs, he will pay X tax thereon. And, with such a simplified plan, we could save the government the x millions of dollars now going to an army of IRS parasites.

The most asinine fiasco on the face of God's green earth is our present federal income tax structure—a burden that's eating the very heart out. It stands to be the death of us all. The power to tax is the power to rule, to destroy in the end.

BUSINESS LEADERSHIP AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American business leadership has often been charged with failing to fulfill pressing social needs; indeed, some say that business has not only neglected, but has even aggravated our social problems. An outgrowth of this popular sentiment has been shareholder activities such as campaign GM round I and II, where the stockholders are presenting major challenges to the management personnel of the largest corporations in America. I think we sometimes need to be reminded that a number of America's leading corporations have been deeply involved in trying to solve America's vast social dilemmas.

The following is part of the Chase Manhattan Bank's annual report for 1971. I think it is an excellent example of the kind of initiative American corporations are capable of producing once they do become so involved:

A QUIET KIND OF REVOLUTION

(By E. J. Kahn, Jr.)

In the last few years, more and more American businesses have found themselves, wittingly or unwittingly, involved in matters that used to be considered none of their business. High among their new priorities is the often frustrating but increasingly pressing search for ways to improve an intangible for which there is no fixed line on a profit-and-loss statement—the quality of life. To have to think in terms of social responsibility as well as stockholder responsibility has made some businessmen uneasy; but these days the company that doesn't react at least sympathetically—let alone innovatively—to the aspirations of society at large is likely to end up, whatever its material accomplishments, as a social outcast. "What all this boils down to," one Chase officer said not long ago, "is that a corporation must adapt to the world it functions in."

Inasmuch as banks, rightly or wrongly, are often thought to be the most conservative of businesses (and bankers the flintiest of businessmen), it comes as something of a shock to one whose connection with banks has rarely extended beyond a teller's cage to learn the extent of one bank's self-immersion in the whirlpool problems of our times. The idea of examining the social performance of corporations is not new; a few months back, for instance, *Business & Society* evaluated twenty-five large companies and—happily for this brief account of one bank's tentative steps into strange new territory—rated the Chase first. What has been going on at the Chase these last few feverish years is regarded by some of the bank's in-house evaluators as merely a part of a gradual, evolutionary process. But to the outside observer, the activity has aspects and implications that seem little short of—although the word is rarely uttered at One Chase Manhattan Plaza except in reference to others—revolutionary. Still, as one Chase executive who dares to use the word said not long ago, "It's been a quiet kind of revolution, and one that's all the more extraordinary in that, unlike your usual nonbusiness revolution, it pretty much started at the top."

Banks are limited in what they can do by law, by tradition, and by their primary purpose, which is of course to lend and manage money for a profit. And like any other institutions, they must reflect their times as much as try to shape them. The Chase, for instance, has a great many minority-group employees—at last count, 6,278—but this 32% representation derives as much from compulsion as compassion: any New York-based organization that wants to man its desks and phones and computers must rely on the available labor pool, and in New York, as in most urban centers, the nature of that pool has drastically changed. Long gone is the day when personnel managers could expect to fill clerical vacancies with demurely dressed blonde high school graduates; Afros and suede jerkins are the style. There is no shortage of available candidates cast in the old-fashioned mold, however, to flesh out boards of directors. Thus, it was not mere inevitability that made the Chase the first big American bank to invite a black to join its board. Now, the bank has two black directors, one of them a woman. Anybody who might have tried to borrow money from a Chase lending officer a few years ago, in order to bet it on the likelihood of the bank's soon having a black woman director, would have been turned down as, if not plain dotty, a very poor risk.

As recently as 1963, fewer than 8% of the Chase's employees were black or Spanish-speaking; and the bank's directors, not to mention all its other visible operatives, routinely wore white shirts to work. But as shirts began to change, so did the fabric of the entire city, and Chase soon embarked on a concentrated effort to recruit minority employees. It was a campaign much in the bank's self-interest. A bank is inextricably enmeshed in the community in which it functions; it cannot pull up stakes and leave if things look bleak. When New York is a fun city the Chase grins; and when a rock is thrown through any New York window, the Chase winces. Accordingly, nine years ago, the bank started searching for new, minority-oriented programs. Two of the first steps in this direction were small, acronymic ventures—BET and JOB: a Business Experience Training program and a Job Opportunities in Business program. The participants in BET were high school students, many of them black, who were given employment at the bank every afternoon provided they agreed to attend school every morning. So far, there have been 277 BET students, 195 of whom finished high school. Of these, 51 went on to college, and 101, who evidently got more turned on by their afternoon than by their morning studies, stayed at the Chase. JOB was for dropouts; the bank could thus train them all day long. Of the 465 individuals who have gone through this course—most of them, too, nonwhite—127 are currently working for the bank.

In 1967, at about the time that JOB was getting underway, a number of people at the Chase began to think hard about the kind of social and economic environment in which the bank could expect to operate in the foreseeable future. David Rockefeller was then president of the bank, and he had been instrumental in the formation early that year of the National Urban Coalition, which was addressing itself to a sobering multiplicity of country-wide problems. But aside

from its low-key aid to disadvantaged students, the Chase hadn't addressed *itself*, on an institutional scale, to many local problems. "There had been crises in the cities, and youthful unrest everywhere," Rockefeller says today. "There was deep concern in many sectors of society about the role of institutions. It was time for us at the bank to look at ourselves and see what we were doing and what perhaps we ought to do."

Others at the bank were harboring similar thoughts. One of those was Thomas W. McMahon, Jr., a Chase executive vice president and, as chairman of the Urban Affairs Committee of the American Bankers Association, a prime mover in, among other ventures, a billion-dollar A.B.A. loan program to help minorities in fifty cities, and the MINBANC Capital Corporation to supply needed capital to the nation's minority-owned banks. In May, 1967, he corralled a half-dozen Chase senior vice presidents under his wing and shepherded them on a first-hand encounter with dope peddlers, pimps and other members of the citizenry with whom they had had little routine contact. "I thought it was very educational for them," McMahon said afterward. "You can't design social programs in a board room or, when it comes to that, in the White House. You have to get to know people."

In June, 1968, Rockefeller called a meeting of the heads of various Chase departments. The outcome was the creation of a high-level Urban Affairs Advisory Committee and of the first full-time urban affairs functionaries in the bank's history. Later, as programs expanded, the 17th floor (where the highest-ranking Chase men roost) responded further by setting up an urban task force to review programs and look ahead.

"Everybody always seems to think that because you're the Chase Bank, you can change the world," says one of the members, John B. Davies, Jr. "Well, you can't. But that doesn't mean you shouldn't try. And when you succeed, in however small a way, you have the satisfaction of knowing that you're part of a major institution that has not only made a commitment but is engaged in many programs that are bringing about social and economic change."

Programs in education, for instance: It was all well and good, the Chase had realized back in 1967, to lend a hand to high school dropouts; but these young people, no matter how conscientious, were unlikely to develop into bank officers, and the Chase was as aware as any other organization that in the long run one hasn't struck much of a blow for equality if almost all one's minority-group employees are segregated in low-level categories. So Chase had begun recruiting, for one thing, on black college campuses in the South, and had had fair, if something less than spectacular, success. In any event, the source of most of the bank's new hometown employees, whatever their race or color, was likely to continue to be New York. Remedial education, which was basically what BET and JOB represented, was good enough after its fashion, but it wasn't enough. Accordingly, the bank is now helping to devise a plan whereby the Chase, in collaboration with the New York City Board of Education and the Bank Street College of Education, would undertake the upgrading of training for primary and junior high school principals. The abler the principals, presumably, the abler their graduates. "Perhaps this particular enterprise won't alter the course of New York," Rockefeller told an acquaintance, "but it's a tangible way of participating actively in one of the city's most acute problems."

In an urban-affair policy statement issued by the Chase early in 1970, the bank announced its determination to help the poor of New York (the rich, bankers know, can usually help themselves) "both by creating opportunities for ownership and management of business in disadvantaged areas and by seeking new ways to meet the urgent problems of inadequate housing."

The officer in charge of the minority-housing phase of the new program, Joseph H. Quinn, does not lend money quixotically, but at the same time, he has made several loans—to, among others, the proprietors of store-front churches—for which there was no discernible collateral.

"We just have to put our faith in individuals," Quinn says. He hasn't merely been giving out mortgages; he has also invited community leaders to the bank and given them practical courses in mortgage-process—yarmulked Hasidim and dashikied brothers all listening intently together as he expounds on mortgage points and brokerage fees. Quinn started off with $100 million to allocate as suitable opportunities arose. That sounds like a lot of money, and it is a lot, but it is still somewhat less than 1% of all the bank's outstanding loans. Two of the three areas on which the Chase has been concentrating are in Brooklyn, which makes sense, since 34% of the bank's clerical staff lives there. Even within a single borough, Quinn and his associates have been confining themselves to small geographical areas, trying to make a perceptible dent in them with loans that vary as circumstances dictate—some money for, say, refinancing of existing homes, some for new-home purchases, some for the rehabilitation of rundown structures. It is the bank's conviction that a single change—a change in *any* direction—can markedly affect a locality; as Quinn once said, "We believe that improvement can be more contagious than deterioration." At the behest of a black Baptist minister in Brooklyn, the Chase authorized a loan of $325,000 for the conversion of a gutted warehouse into a day-care center and the establishment, a block away, of a school to train IBM key-punch operators, many of them the mothers of the day-care center's children. It is this kind of integrated effort that the bank hopes can revitalize listless neighborhoods.

The loans to minority businesses have been largely processed in the Chase's 170 branches and coordinated by a department presided over by a vice president, Lawrence J. Toal. He and his associates have not tossed the rules of banking to the winds; they still turn down, though not without regret, six of every seven petitioners who come their way. But the loans they do grant are high-risk loans—that is, to men and women who have little experience, less capital and nothing really going for them except ideas and enthusiasm. By the end of 1971, the Chase had approved loans of around $14 million to 236 minority-owned businesses, a portion of this in the form of investments in these enterprises by the Chase Manhattan Capital Corporation. The largest single investment was $1.6 million in a California company that makes glove-box compartments for Chevrolets; the smallest loan was $750 to a new meat-processing firm as a security payment for rent on its proposed premises.

To date, the minority-business loans have had a loss rate of 4.7% of their total dollar volume. This compares unfavorably with the loss rate on the bank's ordinary, low-risk loans. But some of the borrowers not only have not failed but have rather spectacularly prospered. Notable among these is the Wallace & Wallace Fuel Oil Company, in the borough of Queens. It could scarcely have begun under less favorable auguries. The business record of its founder, Charles Wallace, a proud, tough, now 39-year-old black man from Florida with only a high school education, was unimpressive; his credit rating was nil; and by the most generous estimate his assets totaled $30,000. Most finance companies won't consider lending a man more than four times the sum of his assets. The Chase loaned Wallace $250,000, more than half of this against accounts receivable of uncertain magnitude. Wallace, who once described the bank as "an oasis on the horizon" of his "desert of despair," sold 100,000 gallons of fuel oil in 1969, pretty much as a one-man operation. By 1971 he had a dozen full-time employees and sales of 35,000,000 gallons; by 1975 he expects to have 100 employees and to hit 250,000,000 gallons, which would represent some 2% of all the fuel oil consumed in New York City. "No black businessman can really make it nowadays without going to the white establishment," Wallace says, "but most whites just give us a lot of lip service. The Chase gives me service."

While it is a source of pride to the Chase that almost one-third of its personnel are from minority groups, and that they now constitute 15% of its supervisors (the banking equivalent of foremen), the bank is not especially happy that of its 1,717 officers only 34—or 2%—come from those groups. Those minority-group employees who feel they are not moving upward fast enough can derive some small hope and comfort from the experience of another group—the women at the bank. Though for some time more than 50% of all the bank's employees have been female, in 1967 there were only 15 women officers. In 1971, there were 64. In absolute terms, the women still have a long way to go; in relative terms, they are making headway. As far as black officers are concerned, one of the bank's chief concerns is not only to find and train potential candidates but, having created them, to figure out a way of holding onto them; nowadays, any black with a solid financial background can just about write his own job ticket. Currently there are 17 blacks among 183 men and women in the Chase's credit-training program, its principal source of officers. A current black trainee in that course, Clifton Best, a native of Memphis, had worked for a bank in the South before he came to New York, but he considered himself a showpiece black man there. He thinks he will probably stay on at the Chase because, in part, of the absence of tokenism. "I don't know of any showpiece people around here," he says. "All anybody demands is that you know what you're doing."

One black officer who arrived at that rank by a different route is Sherman Brown, a social worker who was the assistant director of a Harlem settlement house when the Chase asked him to join its urban affairs staff. He spends most of his time outside the bank.

"Regardless of whatever pronouncements come out of the 17th floor, to get anywhere in a community you have to expose yourself to it," he says. "It's not often easy. If I go to a black group in Queens to talk about our home-loan operations, as often as not somebody will start off by saying that any black working for the establishment is automatically co-opted, and why in the world would anyone be working for a bank? I let them cuss me out for half an hour or so, and when the shouting session is over, I try to tell them I have something to offer them. There's usually someone in the crowd who'll eventually say, 'Hey, let the man speak. We want to hear about your mortgage pool.' Sometimes I stay at these meetings till midnight before I can make myself heard, but it's worth the wait."

Within the last couple of years, the Chase has become increasingly cognizant of the interdependence of the nation's economy and its ecology. In 1970, setting a precedent for banks everywhere, the Chase established a new staff position called Coordinator of Environmental Systems, and filled it with a chemical engineer, Robert H. Aldrich. He believes that banks can play crucial roles—mainly through their impact on legislation, technology, and finance—in upgrading the country's ecological system. Since he joined the Chase, it has been his pleasure to recommend the rejection of a loan application from a paper mill that couldn't conceivably

operate at a profit (no one at Chase ever loses sight of profitability) without shirking its environmental responsibilities; and to help bring about the approval of a loan to an egg company by assisting in the development of a technique for making its chicken droppings less of a public nuisance. Aldrich is probably one of the few officers of any bank who can be found on street corners sniffing automobile exhausts. He has been conducting curbside emission tests, in the hope of securing loans for manufacturers of devices to curtail that particular source of pollution. Recently, Aldrich's labors dovetailed neatly with those of Lawrence Toal, the minority-business-loans man: with Aldrich's ringing concurrence. Total authorized a Chase loan to a black entrepreneur who had figured out a way to eliminate noxious particles of dirt that accumulate in industrial incinerators.

Within the bank itself, Aldrich has become a vigilant ecological watchdog. He has been trying to devise a method of getting its waste paper—ten tons of it daily—recycled. Meanwhile, the bank's chief purchasing officer, James J. O'Donnell, who buys twenty-five million sheets of paper annually merely for the Chase's own printshop, has been looking into a new kind of recyclable paper made from sugar cane. "If we buy it and it isn't satisfactory, I guess I can always eat it," O'Donnell says. His department purchases fifteen million dollars' worth of supplies a year, and for 1971 he was enjoined by his superiors to obtain at least one percent of that from minority suppliers, and to reach two percent in 1972. It hasn't been easy to find qualified minority suppliers to buy things from, but so far O'Donnell has done business with fourteen of them (principally in printing, office supplies, data-processing services, and furniture repairs), and has come close to meeting his goal—in part, to be sure by accepting bids from inexperienced businessmen that run slightly higher than their competitors'.

What does it all add up to? No one can measure precisely how many new checking accounts or deposits have stemmed from the Chase's social concern, or how many robberies may have been averted, or windows left intact. "Sometimes you have to be satisfied with hearing somebody say that all banks are bad but that the Chase is least bad," one urban affairs staff man says. "Still, it's nice to be able to go to a party and not have people jump all over you the way they do if you're with some companies. Now I can say I'm with the Chase and keep my head up, and if one of my friends asks, 'How can you possibly work for a bank?,' I can reply quite honestly that I find it fascinating; that what keeps me there is the incredible potential we have to influence change."

The bank's management is itself trying to determine if there are any useful criteria for measuring the health of the whole economy. Should a polluting company's volume of business, for instance, be a total plus in the Gross National Product, or should there be a minus somewhere along the line for its pollution? Should "Gross National Product," when it comes to that, be supplanted by some such more meaningful phrase as "Gross National Well-being?" Should the time-honored principles of accounting be radically altered, to include intangibles like social good? Toward the end of 1971, the Chinese commissioned a study of the still largely unexplored area of social audits. "We're trying to discover whether we can quantify something that's never been quantified before," one officer says. "We're trying to find some new kind of arithmetic that makes sense today. Maybe we'll have to redefine our notions of acceptable loss ratios, for one thing, and take the position that when it comes to minority housing and minority consumer credit, a somewhat higher ratio should be perfectly acceptable. But most of all, we have to try to figure out how far we should go in all these directions we've been moving. Some of our hesitant people ask, 'Aren't we doing too much?,' and the 17th floor counters with, 'Aren't we doing too little?,' and what all of us have to ascertain sooner or later is, 'How much is enough?' "

From time to time, David Rockefeller tries to answer such questions himself. "However, far we go," he said recently, "I don't think we can ever give up our principal activity of lending money to our principal customers, but I certainly don't think we have exhausted the possibilities of what we can do. It seems clear to me that the entire structure of our socity is being challenged. And unless banks and other businesses take greater interest in what happens to society, there's a real possibility that our system will be radically changed or abandoned, and I can't see that that would be constructive."

INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS ACT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Individual Retirement Benefits Act. This legislation was requested by the President in a December 14, 1971, message to Congress. Having now had an opportunity to review the proposal in detail, I am convinced that the provisions of this legislation would do a great deal toward permitting the Nation's future senior citizens to provide for their own retirements in comfort and dignity.

The plight of the Nation's senior citizens has been a matter of concern to me and most Members of this body for some time. Indeed, during the time I have spent representing the Second District of Colorado in Congress, a number of significant pieces of legislation to assist senior citizens have been passed. Invariably, however, the legislation has established or expanded a government program which is aimed at providing some specific benefit to senior citizens.

Most senior citizens with whom I have met, through periodic senior citizen forums I hold and through meetings in my office, stress that they are not interested in receiving welfare benefits. Rather, they would prefer enjoying a measure of the fruits of their labor produced during their working years. Moreover, I have been impressed with the number of persons who are presently in the work force and who would like to provide for their retirement years through their own devices.

All too often they are unable to do so. While their salaries enable them to live in relative comfort, they simply lack the resources necessary to save for the future. More often than not their inability to save can be traced to the fact that their taxes—including income taxes, sales taxes, and property taxes—represent the single largest claim on their pay checks.

The Individual Retirement Benefits Act would make it possible for those Americans who choose to provide for their retirement to do so. It would reward self-reliance. It would assure the future for those who are covered by private pension plans and it would allow those not covered to take the steps necessary to have a degree of financial independence during retirement.

There are three principle features of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. First, an income tax deduction would be provided for those who wish to save independently for their retirement. Second, the tax deduction for self-employed persons who provide for their own and their employees' retirement is liberalized to better conform to current financial realities. Third, the bill establishes a minimum standard for the vesting of pensions in those who take part in a private plan for a number of years, but who lose their jobs or change their jobs prior to actual retirement.

Only 30 million employees are covered by private retirement plans. The others, unless they are of substantial means, will have to rely on social security or some other public retirement plan for the main source of their income following retirement. For these people, my bill would permit a deduction of up to 20 percent of an individual's salary, with a limit of $1,500 annually, for contributions made to a segregated retirement fund. A wide variety of investment possibilities would be allowed the taxpayer who chooses to establish such a fund for himself. Standards for the distribution of the accumulated assets of the fund are established to assure that the fund will not be utilized before retirement and to further assure that the fund would be liquidated during the life expectancy of the participant. Also, the deduction is reduced for those whose employers contribute to a fund and for those not now subject to either the social security or railroad retirement taxes. This would place all taxpayers on an equal footing with respect to total impact on income and tax liability.

Presently, those who are self-employed or who do business other than as a corporation are severely limited in the amount the business can deduct from its taxable income for contributions to retirement funds. No such limit exists for corporations, and the result has been a proliferation of concerns doing business as corporations chiefly for this tax purpose. Even professionals are being allowed to incorporate in many States so as to take advantage of the tax laws concerning employer contributions to retirement funds. Whatever the merits of incorporation, this is not a decision which ought to be made on the basis of the deductibility of employer contributions to retirement funds. Therefore, my bill would increase the deductible contribution limit for noncorporate firms from $2,500 to $7,500 per employee, and it would increase the percentage of eligible earned income from 10 percent to 15 percent.

For those 30 million Americans who are now covered by private pension plans through their employment, the bill would preserve interests accrued through the years. A basic problem in the present private pension system is the situation of the worker who loses his pension when he is discharged, laid off, resigns, or

moves to another job. For these persons, the typical private pension plan pays no benefits when retirement age is reached, despite the fact that both the employer and employee treat contributions to the fund as deferred compensation. The bill provides that employees would receive a vested right in their pension funds equal to 50 percent of accrued benefits when their age plus their years of service equal 50. Additional vesting of 10 percent would accrue for each additional year worked. Provisions to prevent employee abuse of the vesting requirements are included.

Mr. Speaker, the Individual Retirement Benefits Act does not establish an all pervasive scheme of Federal regulation. Some have suggested such approaches, but I believe the need is for Federal legislation which would protect employee interests in their pension funds and encourage private thrift without depriving individuals and funds of the flexibility they now enjoy. This is the approach taken by the bill, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention for their support.

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I I am inserting in the RECORD the March 13 edition of the bicentennial bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC Communications Committee. The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN

ARBC Chairman David Mahoney will appear as a guest on Sherrye Henry's "Woman" Show in New York on Tuesday, March 14 at 9:30 a.m. on WCBS. The Chairman will discuss the Bicentennial Parks and show the Park's model in one segment of Miss Henry's informative show for women featuring prominent guests from every field.

Five "city improvement type" projects, most already on the drawing boards, were informally adopted for support recently by the San Antonio (Texas) Bicentennial Committee. Four of the projects include planned downtown developments, as the Del Alamo project, extension of San Antonio River beautification, the Mexican Market project, and a San Antonio "new town." A fifth project, termed an urgent need for a 1976 celebration, was brought up with discussion of a municipal stadium for major sports events. Mrs. Gene Riddle, Associate Executive Director of the Texas ARBC addressed the committee during their meeting.

Thomas J. Guilfoil, a St. Louis (Mo.) lawyer, has been named president of the St. Louis Bicentennial World Congress, Inc., a non-profit group that is raising funds for a World Congress on legal and social justice to be held in St. Louis in August, 1975, as part of the American Bicentennial celebration.

The Americana Unit of the American Topical Association has announced plans to record and publish complete information on all issues relating to the Bicentennial that is expected from many foreign countries from now until 1976. The information will be published and recorded in Americana Philatelic News, the bulletin of the Americana Unit. For further information on the Americana Unit in conjunction with 200th anniversary issue contact American Unit C 9, Lauren R. Januz, 1370 Longwood Road, Lake Forest, Illinois, 60045.

A network of bicycle trails extending from the Newport News City Park to Jamestown and the proposed York River State Park has been suggested as a new Bicentennial program for Virginia. The plan has been proposed by Stanley Abbott of Williamsburg, former parkway superintendent, to link municipal park with a bike-hike trail paralleling Colonial Parkway. Abbott said recently that he believes the National Park Service is taking a look at building the bike trail beside the 26-mile historical park roadway.

Congratulations to Richard F. Pourade, editor emeritus of The San Diego Union, who has received a special "Ring of Truth" award, the first of a series of annual awards to be made by the Copley Newspapers over the next five years to recognize a special contribution to the Bicentennial by a Copley newspaper or employee. Mr. Pourade was recognized for his distinguished contributions to the preparations for the celebration of the American Bicentennial. Mr. Robert Letts Jones, president of the corporation, has urged his publishers and executives to stimulate programs in their communities which will fulfill the recommendation of the ARBC that the Bicentennial celebration be nationwide in scope, highlighting progress and the future.

Rhode Island Lieutenant Governor J. Joseph Garrahy recently urged members of the Sons of the American Revolution in Rhode Island to promote the state's Bicentennial celebration "so we can make giant strides in fulfilling our tourism potential." Lt. Governor Garrahy urged the SAR to expend itself in behalf of the Bicentennial celebration in 1976.

On March 14, the U.S. Senate has scheduled hearings on the ARBC's 1973 budget and the House will hold its hearings on the new budget on March 16.

Following are some newspaper comments on the ARBC's Bicentennial Parks:

Harriet Van Horne, a columnist for the New York Post (2/26) writes: "Obviously, this Bicentennial Commission is endowed with more wisdom than one usually finds in such groups. Out of their deliberations has emerged a master plan for beautifying America, restoring old landmarks, razing slums, and establishing 'Bicentennial Parks' in each of the 50 states."

From The Salt Lake Tribune (3/2), Salt Lake City, Utah, in an editorial titled "Gifts to the People"—"The idea of parks in each state built on land donated by the federal government, ranging from 100 to 500 acres, would leave a permanent residual, benefitting many people instead of long forgotten Trylons and Perispheres or Treasure Islands that few remember. More important, in a time when the urban crush is becoming more throbbing, a proposal to construct sizeable recreational parks, as a gift from the nation to the people, is a birthday present that is most appropriate."

The Christian Science Monitor (2/24) reports, "The American Bicentennial Commission has come up with a winning—not to mention needed—alternative to the delays and debate in Philadelphia. The various sites will be chosen for their natural setting and proximity to lakes or harbors—and will provide a much needed safety valve in the form of open space for harried city dwellers. Park structures will be designed in such a way to grace, not disgrace, the terrain. Architectural breakthroughs are likely, for innovation (along with maturity) will be encouraged."

The Bicentennial Parks would be a creditable permanent reminder of the national pride that Americans should feel in 1976 suggests the *Journal* in Wilmington, Delaware (2/28).

The Journal recommends Cape Henlopen as an obvious location for Delaware's Bicentennial Park, giving the state a "meaningful permanent bicentennial project." "If the federal commission continues to push for its 50-park proposal, Delaware's congressional delegation should get behind the Cape Henlopen location." (2/28).

PRAISE FOR GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the finest organizations for young women in our country, the Girl Scouts of America.

This week the Girl Scouts are celebrating their 60th anniversary and we should stop and think about the accomplishments of this remarkable organization.

Most of us only think about the Girl Scouts during their annual cookie sale and we never stop to wonder about their other activities.

The Girl Scouts provide young women with invaluable training in citizenship and they have an excellent program in environmental activities.

The statement "Girl Scouting Builds Character" may be a cliche, but it is very true.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an editorial from a newspaper in my district, the Northeast Times, which honors the Girl Scouts of America.

The editorial follows:

TIMES EDITORIAL VIEWS—U.S.A. GIRL SCOUTS MARK 60TH YEAR

About 30,000 girls in the Philadelphia area will mark the 60th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. in activities during Girl Scout Week, March 12–18.

Festivities start with Girl Scout Sunday when girls all over Philadelphia are holding Scout Sunday services. Some troops have taken on the responsibility of running their entire Sunday service while others are planning celebration breakfasts. Throughout the week banquets, window displays, special ingatherings and troop birthday parties will keep the girls busy.

Two new programs are being inaugurated during Girl Scout Week this year. Philadelphia Council is the first in the country to begin the "Emmanuel Badge." This interfaith badge is designed to help Scouts learn about the basic beliefs of the three major religious faiths of America. Scout troops working on the badge must fulfill requirements during the year, starting Girl Scout Sunday. By doing projects, researching and taking part in religious ceremonies other than their own, each Scout will relate what she has learned to every phase of Girl Scouting and her life.

The second addition, The Trefoil Society, is comprised of former members of the Girl Scout Board of Directors. This group will act in an advisory capacity so that Girl Scouting can continue to benefit from their vast experience and expertise. Trefoil Society Chairman Caspar Wister and Board Chairman Charles E. Strickler will host the group

at an inaugural luncheon on Wednesday of Girl Scout Week.

Girl Scouts have been going strong since the year Juliette Low started the first troop in 1912. Philadelphia troops began the next year and have a number of milestones to brag about.

In 1918 they sold the most bonds in the Fourth Liberty Loan Drive and got a medal for it. In 1923, they were the first to institute a Brownie program. The annual Cookie Sale started in Philadelphia in 1933 when the girls baked cookies in the windows of the Philadelphia Gas Works to raise money for more camping programs. The first day camp operated in Philadelphia in 1935 and earlier that decade the first troop for handicapped girls was started at the Philadelphia Home for Incurables. The first conference for high school age girls was held on Juniper Street and included a program that discussed girl-parent relationships.

The 40's found them fighting against juvenile delinquency and for better racial relations. In 1941, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. pledged their service for national defense at a ceremony in Washington D.C. and followed up by collecting paper and metal, working in hospitals, preparing dressings for the Red Cross and planted Victory Gardens.

The last 60 years have been filled with service to the country and for the community. Among their many activities in the 60's, they helped rehabilitate patients at the Philadelphia State Hospital. The men in Viet Nam received support from Scouts in the form of letters, toiletries and paper back books.

Contemporary problems of the 70's demand plenty of Girl Scout attention. Many are involved in drug hotlines and drug education workshops. To learn about themselves and find what's in store for them as women, they participate in Women's Consciousness Raising sessions. Ecology is a deep concern for Girl Scouts as they run glass re-cycling centers and clean-up projects. Scouts are even involved in helping the flood victims in West Virginia by collecting supplies and shipping them to the flood areas. As a matter of fact, wherever there's a community concern, you'll find a concerned Scout.

CALIFORNIA YOUTH LEGISLATORS STAND OUT

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, if the attitude and the spirit of the young people in my district is representative of young people across the Nation, then America indeed stands on a solid foundation and faces a bright future.

On February 18, some 150 high school students from throughout my congressional district gathered in mock legislative session at the University of California in Riverside to tackle two of the most pressing problems we have faced in this Congress—pollution and political campaign spending. With guidance from the Riverside Jaycees, the students themselves organized this legislative session, selecting the format, setting up the committee structure, and determining the topics for consideration. Further, they conducted the hearing procedures, questioned witnesses, and drafted constructive legislative proposals during the day-long session.

Their conscientious dedication and responsible manner were inspiring to all of us involved in their program as I am sure it would have been to each of my colleagues.

As a result of their work, and utilizing their committee reports, I plan to develop additional legislative proposals on pollution and campaign spending in the near future.

The students came with three basic intents; to listen and learn, to spell out their own concerns, and to develop well-founded legislative proposals. The Congress could well take that simple formula to heart. Often, we seem too concerned with our own pet projects and too busy talking about them to see all sides of a question.

In recognition of the leadership and the contributions of each of the following youth conference participants, I offer this congressional tribute. If time allowed, I could enter here a personal note about the individual contributions of each participant. Suffice it to say that the 1st Annual 38th Congressional District Youth Conference was the product of at least 150 individual efforts. Further it is a testimonial to the high caliber of our young people today. With youth leaders such as these I have only enthusiasm for the future of America.

Kevin Kane and Bob King, both from Riverside performed stellar roles as co-chairman, as did the official legislative secretaries, Dee McGowan and Kim Stelzner, also of Riverside.

The organizing committees lined up like this: Program—Bonnie Fauth, Kevin Kane, Terri Buus, Karen Bishop, Doug Frost, and Jay Jacobson, all of Riverside, and Mike Stroda of Sunnymead.

Facilities—Doug Svensson, Kim Lambert, and Melvin Vigil of Riverside, and Kathy Nagurski, and Gary Sheets of Rubidoux.

Registration—Albert Leland, Steve Marlatt, and Craig Celse, all of Riverside.

Printing—Vicki Manns and Kim Stelzner of Riverside, and Jay Ast of San Jacinto.

Public Relations—Bob King, Barry Brennan, Dee McGowan, Cathy Dumas, and Ron Redmond, all of Riverside.

Outstanding Jaycee leadership came from Jim Grant, Gene Agnes, Phil Cruz, Pete Miller, Rich Garcia, Gene Grant, Joe Arnold, and Jim Lovestrom.

Special accolades must go also to my loyal Riverside staff and volunteers including Cathy Swajian, Mary Riley, Sue Miller, Carol Hedrick, Beth Riley, and Dan Hollingsworth.

And the ones who really made the conference such an unparalleled success were the delegates themselves. I submit to you the delegates and their respective high schools: Ramona High School—Cathy Nelson, Bill Peterson, Dana Barthoff, Chris Smith, and Eric Manning. Corona High School—Diane Turner, Judy Usler, Ava Dunlavy, Don Williamson, and Laurie Sherman. Brawley Union High School—Howard Kellogg, Brad Luckey, Mark Shahan, Don Whitted, and Kathy Smith.

Rubidoux High School—Mike Strobach, Diana Vance, Sandy Myers, Mark Davis, and Cynthia Yingst. Norco High School—Joe Cloutier, Mary Doerr, Judy Hockenberry, Don Love, and Robin Willeford. Eagle Mountain High School—Peggy Harris, Mary Lou Robles, Judy Bilyer, Cathy Stanton, and Jodi Oatman. Perris High School—Kei Okubo, Robert Gutierrez, Virniecia Green, Karen Bagley, and William Menchelli.

Calipatria High School—Tom Barrington, Bhagwant Stwal, Robert Barras, Linda McConnell and Robert Sigmond. Moreno Valley High School—Jay Jacobson, Mike Strode, Laura Daniel, Leonard Therrien, Linda Hand, Tanya Brickham, and Jules Benne. San Pasquel High School—Iris Leamons, Becky Ramirez, Laura DeGrand and Diane Leamons. Polytechnic High School—Marilyn Brick, Mike Perez, Barbara Udell, Paul Wellenkamp and Melanie Morin. Calexico High School—Ophelia Gomez, Eliza Martinez, Celeste Cantu, Louis Valenzuela and Richard Carilla. North High School—Lorraine Rodriguez, Sara Schlanger, Steven McCutchan, David Dewitt and Laine Herman.

Norte Vista High School—Ken John, Carolyn Poppell, Jane Skinner, Fred Western and Frank Teurloy. Beaumont High School—Jon Wallace, Cathy Zilz, Gert Schaffhauser, Legan Chatigny and Cindy Blain. Indio High School—Sam Fernandez, Marvin Dennis, Carol Jesse, Robert Rawnsley, and Sabos Rosas. Notre Dame High School—Robert Wlock, Robert Lyons, Mark Kwasney, Paul Kreter and Duane Dennis. Elsinore Union High School—Robert Isaacs, Ken Gossalin, Dreama Walker, Caroline Childers and Norma Crandell. San Jacinto High School—Robert Brezine, Dean Mathes, Jerry Peebles, Brett Long, Bruce Kraveik and Bill Alexander.

Sherman Indian High School—Jack Coats, Emma Chico, Anita Tatro, Jackie Salgado and Colleen Stacey. Coachella Valley High School—Mark Davis, Sandra Avila, Mario Torres, Debbie Colmb and Arlene Alvarer. Palo Verde High School—Kris Kontilis, Karen Loder, Jennie Griffin and Juana Iroz. Banning High School—Nancy Black, James Wimberly, Mickie Montgomery, Richard Niemi and Larry Netschke. Palm Springs High School—Robert Severino, James Colbert, Rosa Villarreal, Gale Hurd and Stephen D. Petach. Hemet High School—Peter Hollmann.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

AGRICULTURAL YEARBOOK CITES WARREN COUNTY, TENN., AS EXAMPLE OF RURAL GROWTH AND PROGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Yearbook of Agriculture for 1971 includes an excellent account of the outstanding program of industrial development in Warren County, Tenn.

The article is entitled "How a Town Can Attract Industry", and the authors are Mr. G. W. F. Cavender, assistant administrator for special projects of the Farmers Administration, and Mr. Richard G. Schmitt, Jr., also of FHA.

The article points to the industrial growth and progress of Warren County, which FHA helped to make possible through grants and loans for water facilities and services.

Certainly I want to commend the local leadership in Warren County, as well as the Farmers Home Administration, for their cooperation in achieving rapid industrial growth.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place excerpts from the article in the RECORD herewith.

The excerpts follow:

WARREN COUNTY, TENN.—EXAMPLE OF RURAL GROWTH

Warren County, Tenn., had made some progress in industrialization by 1960, but many of its people were still leaving in search of jobs. Porter Henegar, then Executive Secretary of the Warren County Chamber of Commerce, said recently: "We realized a new approach was needed, so we started using a rifle instead of a shotgun. We began inventorying our resources and needs and established goals."

In 1960, the county seat of McMinnville undertook development of a water supply that could serve the entire county for domestic and industrial purposes. Now 68 percent of all Warren County citizens use the system, and there is ample capacity for expansion. The Farmers Home Administration provided financial assistance for five of the six rural water districts.

The area's first industrial park was acquired in 1965. There are now 400 acres fully accessible to utilities, plus a mile of rail frontage.

McMinnville and Warren County have furnished facilities and services for business and industry. They have also provided economic, social, and cultural opportunities for their citizens. They did this by taking advantage of available programs of both the private and public sector and making full use of local assets.

This has resulted in successful industrialization. There are 10 plants that employ from 250 to 1,050 persons, several others with 50 to 250 employees, and some that employ fewer than 50. Many of the plants have been established since 1960. The county has not neglected its long-established industries or its agriculture and nursery stock enterprise.

There are now 7,500 industrial jobs in the county. Clarence Redmon, of the Caney Fork Electric Cooperative (REA), said: "Warren County's industry has also provided an economic boost to adjoining counties where the lumber and coal business had declined."

Why did the Carrier Corporation come to Warren County? Personnel Manager Clyde Briggs replied: "One reason was the climate; another was the availability of low cost electricity and third was central location for the distribution of our product." He added that several places within a radius of 100 miles would have been acceptable, but Warren County was chosen because of progressive attitudes of the people, and community services and programs available for employees.

What have been the results? With outmigration stemmed, population in the county increased from 23,102 in 1960 to 26,972 in 1970. The tax base rose from $7.3 million to $42 million, retail sales shot up 94 percent, and assets of financial institutions went from $22 million to more than $62 million in the same period. Broadscale results included hundreds more gainfully employed, new housing, and a general upgrading of living conditions.

A recent USDA survey revealed that half the industrial jobs created in the last decade were in the countryside. But the change in composition of our total population, which shows a continual decline of people living in rural areas, reminds us that past efforts have not been adequate to hold and attract people in rural areas. More can and should be done.

THOMAS GURICK NEW JERSEY VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER: MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the pleasure of announcing that one of my high school constituents, Thomas J. Gurick, won first place in the New Jersey State competition of the VFW's 25th annual Voice of Democracy contest.

I have now obtained a transcript of Tom's winning speech and I think it would be well worth the effort of every Member to spend a few moments in studying it.

The speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Thomas Gurick)

There is great pain in giving birth to a child. There is also great suffering in raising a child. But you endure, you suffer, you persevere, because in the back of your mind you hope and pray, that after you have given every ounce of strength in trying to make this child a mature, strong human being he will become just that. You trust that he will have the responsibility to honor and respect you for the good fortune and great happiness you have granted him throughout the struggle of his younger life.

And by the same token, I believe, this is the manner in which our country was developed and still stands. It was given birth by the early colonization from Europe by people who had a hunger for freedom. It was a young country with many problems and misfortunes. But her people didn't give up. They struggled through the tyranny of Britain, through the havoc of the Revolutionary War, and through the growing pains which followed as a result of a nation with a lack of a strong representative government. Why did these people persevere? Why did they stand up and endure? They suffered, died, and withstood this agony because all these men had a responsibility to freedom, a responsibility to a nation which would render them certain rights and privileges never before bestowed upon citizens of one country. I also have this responsibility. I am an offspring, a citizen of this country which is now fully grown and fully matured. My responsibility to the freedom of this country is to respect and honor it for the good fortune and happiness which it has given to me. It is my responsibility to endure hardship, to persevere with pain, to fight and even die for my country, if necessary, just as my forefathers did. But most of all, I feel I should be mature enough to be able to accept, respect, and to be capable of handling mentally and physically the rights and privileges which are mine as a citizen of the United States. I think John F. Kennedy phrased it very well when he said: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

HON. GEORGE BUSH ON FOREIGN POLICY

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, our former colleague and present U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the Honorable George Bush, gave the people of the Fifth District of Ohio as clear and as concise a statement on our foreign policy as I have been privileged to hear. I not only want to share the Ambassador's speech with you, I want to take this opportunity to say that our former colleague is, in my humble opinion, doing an outstanding job in this difficult and terribly important assignment. I know that all of you join me in wishing him continued success.

His statement follows:

AMBASSADOR BUSH

The world is changing very fast, and so is American foreign policy. We are not just responding to external events. We are also creating new opportunities. And, over the past year, a pattern has begun to emerge. As the President told Congress in his third annual foreign policy report, 1971 was a "watershed year."

We are not only getting rid of some of the burdens that were a dissatisfaction in the past. We are also widening our options and improving our expectations. Let me tick off some of the President's initiatives that have helped give a new shape and meaning to world politics.

First, Vietnam. I am sure some of you disagree with the new policy. Some of you feel the American withdrawal is not proceeding fast enough. There can be no argument, however, whether this is a new policy with tremendous implications for the future.

Domestically, an oppressive burden on America is being eased. Internationally, our disengagement is widening our options for dealing with both allies and adversaries. We are no longer locked in. We have choices.

And, as I personally see it, we have bought some time so the war-weary people of South

Vietnam also have a chance to determine their own political future, free of coercion.

Second, the Nixon doctrine, which is in a sense an extension of our Vietnam policy to the wider problem of mutual security. Most of our allies and friends are now in a far better position to provide for their own security, at conventional military levels, than they were five or ten years ago. Western Europe and Japan in particular can afford to carry a larger share of the common defense burden. But a number of smaller nations, too, are now stronger economically. Thanks in part to our past assistance, and are socially and politically more stable.

They are beginning to look out for their own security, with no more than material assistance from us. This not only reduces our burdens, it also removes us from the uneasy role of protector and policeman. It is also good for the self-respect of those peoples who can stand on their own feet.

Yet, for the foreseeable future, only the United States can provide our friends and allies with the ultimate guarantee of a credible nuclear deterrent.

Third, the new era of negotiations with both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

We have long had an on-again, off-again dialogue with the Soviet Union, and even reached some important earlier agreements, such as the nuclear test-ban and nonproliferation treaties. Only in the last few years, however, has this dialogue made much progress on such fundamental issues of peace and security as access to Berlin and the limitation of strategic armaments.

The United States cannot take all the credit for this new Soviet flexibility. The important thing is that we have begun to make slow though painful progress out of the cold war stalemate, and possibly out of the terribly costly and dangerous arms race as well. We are even talking about joint space exploration, and that would have been unthinkable half a dozen years ago.

Similarly, the dialogue with Peking would never have begun if the President had not initiated, the moment he entered office, the most delicate signals which led to last week's summit in Peking. Now a process has begun that could have a profoundly constructive effect on world stability and peace. I am not suggesting that either China or the United States has abandoned its principles or its state interests. But a vacuum of hostile silence has been bridged. We are talking.

We are less likely to misjudge each other. We have recognized a common interest in improving the chances for peace.

Some cynics say there were no concessions, the visit was a publicity play—ridiculous! The very fact that an American President went to Peking and was welcome is a startling breakthrough. Six months ago saw American ping-pong players there and the world went crazy.

Now our President has gone there and laid the groundwork for future talks. The news of the China visit is the future, not the past. Plenty of difficulties lie ahead but so does plenty of promise—that might lead to a world at peace.

Fourth, the revolutionary reforms now underway in the free-world monetary and trading systems, and the equally important adjustments that are now being made in our political relations with our principal allies in Western Europe and Japan.

As the other great economic-power centers have matured across the Atlantic and the Pacific, the responsibilities for international finance have had to be distributed more widely. Similarly, the time has passed when our great trading partners were entitled to special protection of their own markets. The recent economic difficulties the United States has been undergoing, including our first international trade deficit in this century, and a mounting international payments deficit, hastened the need for reform.

Decisive action was called for, and the President took it last August. The broad-scale currency realignments agreed to last December, and the various trade concessions that have since been negotiated, restore the United States to a much more competitive position in the world economy. The next step, which has now been agreed to, will be a new round of trade-liberalization negotiations, beginning next year. The outlook is good.

Something else is happening that should please those of you who have worried about America's "overpresence" in the world. Partly as a result of all these other initiatives, the free-world alliance is growing up into a more mature partnership of equals, where burdens are better shared, and where the autonomy of each ally is respected.

It is a different world. And the United States is behaving differently in the world.

But never let us confuse cosmetics with fundamentals. As we behave differently, let us be sure that this is never mistaken for a lack of conviction or a lack of will to battle for our own principles. The open society is better than the closed. The free press is better than the controlled. Free elections are better than selecting leaders through totalitarian processes.

We must be clear as we communicate with others that we believe deeply in what America stands for. We must not let our nation's basic future be eroded away.

COMMUNITY SERVICE JOBS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which will provide older and middle-aged persons with increased employment opportunities: The Senior Citizen Job Corps Act of 1972, providing 50,000 part-time community service jobs for the elderly; and the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Act, providing unemployed or underemployed workers 45 years and over with the training, counseling, and placement services needed for advancement or transfer to more productive work.

THE SENIOR CITIZEN JOB CORPS ACT OF 1972

Most of us must know from family experience how elderly citizens are often frustrated in their desire to continue to work. They want to work not only to supplement their meager social security benefits, but also to continue to be active and productive citizens. Unfortunately, too often a senior citizen is shunted aside and finds it difficult to get a job, particularly in periods of high unemployment. Their employment problems are compounded by our social security laws which, unfairly in my judgment, reduce social security benefits when a recipient's income exceeds $1,680 a year—or $2,000 as proposed in H.R. 1.

There is great need for the special services which can be provided by the elderly. Not very long ago I visited the Foundling Hospital in Manhattan which has many young children in needs of the warmth and affection that could be given by elderly citizens if they were employed during the day to teach them, to play with them, to love them.

Not long ago I described to our colleagues the terrible conditions which exist in our institutions for the mentally and physically disabled. One such institution in New York City, Willowbrook, has more than 5,000 children. Because of the lack of staff, these children are not adequately cared for. Indeed, the most disabled who need special care in feeding are sometimes subject to the threat of death, because of inadequate help. Normally an attendant stays with a severely retarded child for 20 minutes during a feeding; because of the shortage of personnel, no more than 4 minutes of such attention can be provided at Willowbrook. It has been reported that children have died of chemical pneumonia, because rushed, forced feeding has sent food into their lungs. Then there are the many children who could learn to use their limbs if given therapy; again, this attention and patience is too often not available. These are but two illustrations of what could be done by the elderly to help the children as well as to benefit themselves.

The legislation which I am introducing will provide 50,000 jobs for persons of low income who are 62 years and older. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies to hire on a part-time basis elderly citizens to be paid at no less than the Federal minimum wage. Members of this Senior Citizen Job Corps could work as many hours as they want, as long as the total annual amount they earn does not exceed the level at which social security benefits start being reduced.

THE MIDDLE-AGED AND OLDER WORKERS ACT

Technological displacement has become a major problem in our industrialized economy, and the tendency of employers to look to the young when hiring new workers compounds the difficulties displaced workers face in finding new jobs. For so long in this country we have welcomed technological advance. But now, because of the hardships it imposes on our workers, we are beginning to fear it. I believe the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Act is a very important bill, for it offers these workers much greater job mobility and advancement opportunities.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE AGING

It has been almost 3 months now since the White House Conference on the Aging made its legislative recommendations, and I have seen very little evidence these last few months that any administration initiatives have been made to see that such recommendations are developed and enacted into law.

How the problems described by the conference can continue to be ignored is really beyond my understanding. The 1970 statistics show that almost 10 percent of our Nation's population is over 65, and almost one-fourth—4.7 million—of these persons live in households below the official, rock-bottom poverty line of $1,852 for a single person and $2,328 for a couple. For elderly minority groups, this percentage is much higher, with 48 per-

cent of them living in poverty compared to 23 percent for elderly whites. And for widows, the number living in poverty is over one-half.

Everyone in this country is complaining about inflation and the continuing rise in the cost of living. But it is our older citizens, living on fixed incomes, that suffer most from our Nation's economic ills. Housing, food, transportation, and medical expenses are the areas where inflation is hitting hardest, and these are the expenses that are already devouring the incomes of the elderly. In the past year alone medical costs increased by 10 percent, hospital charges by 65 percent, doctors' fees by 12 percent, and drug charges by 5 percent. Property taxes have increased by approximately 35 percent in the past 3 years, and in 1970 the Consumer Price Index rose by 5.9 percent. These are increases in basic, day-to-day expenses, yet many of the elderly cannot really even begin to pay them and are forced to live in substandard housing with poor diets, and inadequate health care.

The two bills I am introducing today adds to a series of bills I have introduced in this Congress that respond to the needs of the elderly in the areas of national health insurance, housing, free or reduced-rate transportation, nutrition services, social security increases, and tax benefits.

THE LAST THING U.S. MEDICINE NEEDS IS RADICAL REFORM

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you an article from the February 14 issue of Medical Economics.

The article follows:

THE LAST THING U.S. MEDICINE NEEDS IS RADICAL REFORM

(By Harry Schwartz)

The conventional practice of medicine and the physicians engaged in it are under attack in the United States as never before. Ranged behind a banner reading HEALTH-CARE CRISIS, a large and vociferous group of critics claims that the nation's medical system is woefully deficient in so many major respects that it must be radically reorganized—and quickly. On this essential diagnosis and prescription, the Nixon Administration stands shoulder to shoulder with Senators Edward Kennedy and Edmund Muskie, among others, as well as with many union leaders.

Many patients are vocally dissatisfied with the high cost of medical care and, increasingly, with the outcome—this latter fact attested to by an epidemic of malpractice suits. The past few years have seen barrages of articles, books, television programs, and other investigations of the weaknesses and inadequacies of the medical system. "Don't get sick in America," the nation has been told, as though there were some place where it was good to have cancer or multiple sclerosis or schizophrenia. Alarmed by this atmosphere, the American Medical Association has begun to run scared, offering programs for improved financing and delivery of health care, and seeking to upgrade its public image by sponsoring advertisements to show that doctors do care about the health of their patients, the quality of the environment, and the like.

In their righteous wrath, many of today's critics seem to feel that limits of truth, balance, or plain good sense just don't apply to their holy cause. Thus, one national magazine recently blazoned its front cover with WHY YOU CAN'T GET A DOCTOR, though the editors surely know that every week millions of Americans see and are treated by physicians. And in another national magazine, a television critic who signs himself "Cyclops" assured his readers that Medicare had enriched the doctors in much the same fashion that the oil depletion allowance had served the oil industry. One wonders if in an earlier era Cyclops denounced "faceless and nameless accusers" who presented no evidence but simply accused broad categories of people. More generally, the critics have often focused on the worst areas in this field and trumpeted their findings as though they were typical. With that technique, of course, every aspect of American life can be indicted, since all—the same as medicine—have weaknesses and deficiences.

Even unfair criticism can be useful in keeping an individual, an institution, or a section of society on its toes and helping prevent complacency. Vice President Agnew's attack on the media can be defended from this point of view. But in the case of medical care, many of the critics have "solutions" they want to offer. Having told us what incompetent, greedy monsters dominate the medical profession, the critics assure us that if we will only adopt their pet nostrum, all will be well in the best of all medical worlds.

The fact that for many years to come most of the physicians treating sick Americans will be the same men and women with M.D. degrees who are being denounced now doesn't seem to shake the faith of these true believers in simplistic solutions. Nor does it seem to occur to many of these would-be reformers that there could be heavy costs in the transition to some new health-care mechanism and there could even turn out to be serious new problems with the proposed "solutions." Such complications tend to be ignored as the fighters against medical evil use the undoubted weaknesses of what now exists for their propaganda while assuming that their proposals would introduce a utopia.

A staple argument advanced by those who profess to see a health-care crisis is that the nation's health is well below what it might be because of the inadequacies of the present medical mechanism. To buttress this argument, the critics virtually always trot out international statistics purporting to show that the United States is way down on the list of the world's nations, being so ranked by such indicators as infant mortality and life expectancy.

In part, this argument is based upon simple naivete in statistical matters. It assumes that it is meaningful to compare small, homogenous nations concentrated on relatively tiny territories—Sweden and Holland, for two examples—with the United States, whose population is roughly 20 times as large, incredibly heterogeneous, and spread across a whole continent. Moreover, those who triumphantly cite these statistics usually ignore the problems of statistical definition that make such comparisons even more suspect. And they almost never point out that if comparisons are made between the two most nearly comparable large countries for which data are available—the Soviet Union and the United States—the Soviet Union turns out to have a much higher infant mortality rate than the United States and approximately the same life expectancy level. Why doesn't anyone talk about a Soviet health-care crisis?

But this argument has an even more fundamental fallacy, which is the assumption that in a highly developed modern urban society medical care is somehow the decisive element in such matters as infant mortality and life expectancy. This, of course, ignores all the complex social forces at work. Whatever its sins, the American medical establishment is not responsible for hunger in this country, for the automobiles that kill 50,000 or more people here annually, for the drug overdoses that claim thousands of young lives, or for the millions of Americans who court heart disease and lung cancer by overeating, exercising little or not at all, and smoking a pack or more of cigarettes daily. If a person chooses to eat or smoke his way to death despite his doctor's warning, why place the blame on the doctor?

Finally, it is curious that those who rush to use statistics to indict American medicine are so quiet about data that point in the opposite direction. Why is so little said, for example, about the dramatic decline in American infant mortality in recent years—a drop of more than 20 per cent just between 1965 and 1970? Last year, for the first time in American history, the infant mortality rate went below 20 deaths per 1,000 live births. Nor are we often reminded that, when allowance is made for the changing age distribution of the population, the death rate in this country has been dropping significantly. In 1967, the last year for which data are available, the age-adjusted death rate in this country was 7.3 per 1,000 population. Twenty years earlier, the corresponding figure, 9.0 per 1,000, was almost 25 per cent higher.

I do not mean to suggest that there is no room for further improvement. But if either want to be honest with the American people they ought to present the whole picture—including the undeniable evidence of substantial and continuing improvement, in some cases very rapid improvement—and not merely carefully selected international comparisons, the relevance or validity of which is dubious. It should be added, moreover, that the gains, i.e., the reductions, in American infant mortality and over-all mortality rates have been shared by whites and nonwhites of both sexes.

A second frequent complaint is about shortages of doctors, sometimes more generally of all health manpower and womanpower. Along with this grievance often goes the more or less explicit charge that the American Medical Association has been choking off the supply of doctors, presumably to increase the monopolistic power of its own members.

Nobody can deny that there are shortages of doctors in some places, and that the worst problems are encountered in urban slums and remote rural communities. But the United States as a whole has one of the highest ratios of physicians to population in the entire world. Between 1950 and 1970 the number of M.D.s in this country increased almost 50 percent, or substantially more than the roughly one-third population increase in the same period. Moreover, the country's rate of physician production is mounting rapidly as old medical schools expand enrollments, new medical schools begin operating, and some medical schools cut the period for M.D. training from four to three, or even two, years. In September, 1971, more than 12,000 new medical students began their studies, almost 40 percent more than the number of freshmen enrolled as recently as 1965.

The net increase of between 35,000 and 40,000 doctors in this country just since 1965 makes a mockery of the charge that the A.M.A. or any other organization is attempting to preserve some sort of monopoly. The real problems are different, and they have at least three roots. One is the trend toward specialist care and away from general prac-

tice, a trend born both of the economic advantages of being a specialist and of the increasing volume and complexity of medical knowledge. A second factor is the understandable desire of many physicians to live and practice where it is most advantageous and pleasant for them to do so, rather than in surroundings of poverty or of professional isolation; physicians are abundant on Manhattan's fashionable East Side and in affluent Westchester County, but very scarce in New York City's poorer areas. Finally, there has been a tremendous upsurge in the demand for physicians' services born of the Medicare and Medicaid revolutions of the mid-1960s, which lowered the economic barriers to medical care for millions without immediately doing anything to compensate for the provision of this care.

Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that in recent years more Americans have been receiving more—and usually better—medical care than ever before in the nation's history. But this is hardly the situation that the term "health-care crisis" brings to mind or is intended to bring to mind.

A third complaint is the rapid rise in the nation's total medical bill. Here is the way the Nixon Administration's recent White Paper on medical care put the indictment: "In fiscal year 1970, the nation spent $67 billion on health, nearly three-fifths again as much as had been spent only four years earlier. While undoubtedly there were improvements in the quality of care for at least some of the population, more than 75 per cent of the increase in expenditures for hospital care and nearly 70 per cent of the increase for physician services were the consequence of inflation."

Put this way, of course, there is a strong implication of gouging, of conscienceless profiteering at the expense of the sick. But every American knows that the last four or five years have been a period of rapid general inflation, of substantial rises in prices and wages throughout the economy. Between 1967 and 1970, for example, the Consumer Price Index shows that physicians' fees rose an average of 21.4 per cent, or almost exactly the same percentage by which average hourly earnings of workers on private nonagricultural payrolls increased over the same period. Between 1967 and 1970, the C.P.I. reports, the average price of a semiprivate hospital room rose 45.4 per cent. Hospitals, of course, are very labor-intensive institutions, and before Medicare and Medicaid many of their personnel—interns, residents, and housekeeping workers, many of the last being from minority groups—received very low wages. These last mentioned groups have particularly benefited from above-average wage raises in recent years, a circumstance that hardly makes such formerly disadvantaged workers economic criminals.

There should be no illusions in this area. Proper care of the sick—particularly of the elderly, who make up such a disproportionately high percentage of the seriously ill—is and always will be a very expensive proposition. There are, of course, inefficiencies in the existing medical-care mechanism that add to costs, but it is a delusion to think that the physically ill or the emotionally disturbed can be handled satisfactorily and humanely in ways that will compare in efficiency and cost effectiveness with the assembly-line techniques Detroit uses to build automobiles. Certainly the nation does not want the high percentage of error and neglect in its health care that car buyers find in their new vehicles.

Yet it is essentially assembly-line medicine provided by collectivized physicians that the critics suggest to meet the "health-care crisis." The road to medical utopia, many voices now tell us, is to be found by general acceptance of prepaid group practice arrangements ("health maintenance organizations," in Nixon Administration jargon) on the model of the Kaiser-Permanente groups along the West Coast. Such prescriptions are natural if one believes this country is now in a health-care crisis, which derives from the cliches the critics employ to describe present American medicine. They hold that it is "a cottage industry" consisting of "solo practitioners" working on a "fee-for-service basis" in a "non-system." Simply inverting these terms produces the notion that what is needed is a mass-production medical industry staffed by teams of doctors working independently of payment in a highly organized system.

This description of the present situation is grossly oversimplified. American medicine today is highly pluralistic. Millions of Americans have completely socialized medicine; for example, those in the Armed Forces and in Veterans Administration hospitals. Several million others belong to prepaid group practice organizations, and additional millions look to hospital emergency rooms, outpatient clinics, and the like for their primary medical care. Medicare, Medicaid, and private medical insurance, including the Blue plans, have revolutionized the economics of medical care in recent years. In short, the stereotype of the sick American going to the isolated physician and digging into his pocket for the $10 or $15 fee covers only a portion of the reality. And, except in remote areas, no physician is really isolated. Any good doctor is part of an informal system that . . . salaries, freedom from the entrepreneurial and other woes of private practice, regular hours, and the aid of other physicians and ancillary medical workers.

Patients have a fixed or semi-fixed medical cost, for which they can budget in advance, and a source of medical care available at any hour and on any day. Competing with private physicians, group practices can put economic curbs on private doctors' fees and force the private practitioners to make their own informal or formal arrangements to ensure that patients can get a doctor at 3 A.M. on a Fourth of July and on other occasions when most people are sleeping or on holiday.

But the zealous advocates of revolutionary change in American medical care go far beyond such modest and realistic claims. They see group practice or health maintenance organizations as wonder-working systems that can provide better care for lower costs while simultaneously ensuring that the population enjoys better health than ever before. It is these expectations that explain the intensity of the more extreme propagandists for universal health insurance and compulsory group practice.

However, the evidence presented for these claims is very thin, particularly since group practice in the United States has historically been limited to special groups, while what is advocated by the extremists is extension of this mode of health-care delivery to the entire population of the country.

How, for example, can group practice improve the nation's health if medical science knows so little about the causes of the degenerative and hereditary diseases that cause so much illness? And what is there about group practice that will enable it to stop smoking, overeating, lack of exercise, reckless driving, heroin addiction, alcoholism, poverty, inheritance of genetic defects, and other individual or social causes of sickness and death?

Some people argue that the end of direct financial cost for medical care will encourage people to go to doctors earlier than they might otherwise and thus catch diseases at a stage where they can be dealt with more effectively. This may be true in some cases, but the change to prepaid medical care has more complex consequences.

The end of fee-for-service removes the individual physician's economic interest in his patient, while, for the group as a whole, it is economically advantageous to do as little as possible for the patient. For the subscriber to such a group, however, the removal of additional out-of-pocket cost for a visit to the doctor creates the temptation to overuse the group's resources. Thus, a tension is automatically set up between the group physicians and their patients.

The possibilities that a national system of prepaid group practice will turn into a bureaucratic monster are enormous. The nation's real problems of medical care can best be met by measures that focus on particular trouble areas, rather than by a violent transformation of the entire complex medical system that would affect equally all parts, those working well and those working poorly.

Of course the ghettos and small towns need more doctors and medical facilities. But the Government already has authority to recruit physicians and other medical personnel to meet these needs. And if young physicians are idealistically anxious to go into these deficient areas, why shouldn't the state help them to do so?

The family of moderate means struck by catastrophic illness can be bankrupted by heavy medical bills. That problem could be solved by Government-organized, compulsory major medical insurance whose cost on a national per capita basis would be relatively small.

The upward rocketing of hospital costs might be slowed down by a variety of measures. One important need is for revision of the formulas used to reimburse hospitals under Medicare, Medicaid, Blue Cross, and other insurance schemes. These formulas—which in the past have often stressed reimbursement for costs without pressures for economy—need to be altered so that hospital administrators will be more economy-minded in the future than in the past. The escalation of medical costs could also be usefully countered by effective action on the malpractice front to curb present excesses and abuses that add significantly to the costs that patients, insurance firms, and the Government have to pay.

In an era of increasing and justified disenchantment with big government, it is astonishing that so many well-meaning and intelligent reformers essentially want to nationalize and bureaucratize American medicine, either explicitly as in Britain or implicitly as in some of the legislation before Congress. One would have thought that the postal and public school systems would have taught them long ago that nationalization does not mean efficiency, and that the telephone system would have taught them that even a private integrated system can develop serious flaws. Based on the record of the past, we have every reason to suspect that if the revolutionary proposals for transforming American medicine are adopted and implemented, medical care in this country will cost more while providing less satisfaction and poorer treatment for millions.

ACHIEVING PUBLIC EDUCATION EQUALIZATION

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems facing the individual States, and the Nation, in view of the decision by the California State Supreme Court in the case of Serrano against Priest and other re-

cent decisions, is that of reorganizing the financing of public education to comply with the 14th amendment.

A brief summary of some of these considerations and the options they pose are outlined in the following article:

ALTERNATIVE LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS FOR ACHIEVING PUBLIC EDUCATION EQUALIZATION [1]

(By John Silard)

The one clear constitutional requirement announced in *Serrano* and likely to be accepted by subsequent judicial rulings is the untying of the cost (and thus quality) of public education from the accident of a locality's aggregate taxable wealth. In considering legislative options for complying with the Fourteenth Amendment, achievement of that untying is the first and indispensable requirement.

However, there are other desirable goals which should also be considered when we review the available alternatives to our present system of education finance. One of these is the equalizing of the local tax burden (millage rate) for education. It is not clear from *Serrano* whether it did *not* result in educational inequality the maintenance of a system imposing differing tax-rate burdens on localities for the achievement of an equivalent educational fund would itself violate constitutional requirements. In any event, tax-burden equalization is a desirable goal to be advanced by a changed funding system.

Another desirable goal is maintenance of a local option to improve local public education a greater taxing (millage) effort. It is generally the *less* advantaged school districts which today are carrying a larger tax-rate effort for education. Thus, under a system which removes their wealth disadvantage the retention of a local option to impose an additional surtax for better education might enable these poorer districts to achieve the premium education they need for their culturally disadvantaged students.

Another desirable goal is facilitation of an educational disbursement system which does not become impaled on an "equal dollars per child" formula. Such a formula may look egalitarian but in fact it would result in vast inequality in educational offering due to great differences in costs of education between localities. A desirable disbursement system would permit increased dollar allocations to school districts with above-average costs in such areas as transportation, plant maintenance, and employee pay; or with special teaching burdens due to student populations with physical handicaps, illiteracy, language barriers, and cultural deprivation.

A final important consideration is political acceptability. In a state where there is no litigation pending or in the offing, political acceptability is obviously a crucial consideration in choosing among alternative courses of reform. But even in a state where a court may intervene, the process of reform will inevitably require an orchestration of judicial and legislative action wherein political acceptability remains an important factor.

In the ensuing analysis, the five desiderata briefly reviewed above are applied to the four basic options for achievement of intrastate education equalization: (I) abandoning the local property tax base for education, (II) major shift of funding burden from local to state sources, (III) power equalizing and (IV) local tax-yield equalization.

Option I. Abandoning the Local Property Tax Base for Education (Full State Funding):

This might be achieved either (i) by outright abolition of local taxes for education in favor of state income, sales, property, or other taxes, or (ii) pooling and distributing at the state level of the local revenue from a prescribed statewide millage of local property taxes for public education.

Desiderata Ratings of Option I:

+ Education untied from wealth.
+ Tax burden equalization.
− Local surtax option.
+ Facilitating equalization of education offering.
? Political acceptability.

Option II. Major Shift of Funding Burden From Local to State Soures:

The foundation plan approach initially sought equalization of education by infusion of major state money to help impoverished localities. It is conceivable that in some states a further major shift of funding from local to state sources could effectively eliminate the local wealth factor as a determinant of local educational-offering. This would be most likely in a homogenous state with a minor imbalance in local taxable wealth per pupil. However, to eliminate expenditure differentials it is likely that this approach would require even in the "homogeneous" state an increase of the state's proportion of the total public education expenditure in the state to 80 or 90 percent. The tax-burden inequalities, of course, would remain under this scheme, and state money is largely tied up in achieving dollar equalization rather than providing special assistance to districts with educational overburdens.

Desiderata Ratings of Option II:

+ Education untied from wealth.
−Tax burden equalization.
+Local surtax option.
−Facilitating equalization of education offering.
+Political acceptability.

Option III. Power Equalizing:

This system redistributes local taxes for education by shifting from tax-rich districts to poorer districts the amounts representing their taxable wealth advantage.

Desiderata Ratings of Option III:

+ Education untied from wealth.
+ Tax burden equalization.
+ Local surtax option.
— Facilitating equalization of education offering.
— Political acceptability.

Option IV. Local Tax-Yield Equalization:

A fourth possible approach would remove the local wealth factor from local educational offering, but would leave the wealthier community the advantage of achieving the local dollar input for education at a lower millage rate. Such a system might work as follows: the legislature would prescribe a statewide "local public education contribution" set at a prescribed annual per-child expenditure. Each school district would raise that local contribution by whatever millage would yield that expenditure for its students. This system would remove the existing expenditure differentials among localities, yet would leave wealthier districts with the advantage of being able to raise their "local public education contribution" at a lower millage rate than poorer districts. The State funds would be freed from the task of dollar equalization, and could provide special assistance to districts with educational overburdens.

Desiderata Ratings of Option IV:

+ Education untied from wealth.
— Tax burden equalization.
— Local surtax option.
+ Facilitating equalization of education offering.
+ Political acceptability.

The foregoing discussion attempts only to view the advantages and demerits of the four basic options for new educational funding systems which could untie education expenditures from the local taxable wealth, as *Serrano* requires. In addition to new approaches to funding sources, new approaches are required in the area of dispersement formulas. As indicated in a previous study (Silard & White, Intrastate Inequalities in Public Education, 1970 Wisconsin Law Review 1, 25–28), the goal there should be to provide equal educational opportunity to every school child, taking into account all cost variables including the learning disabilities of certain school populations.

[1] By January 1, 1972, this paper will be expanded substantially to explain more fully the types of options and their advantages and disadvantages. Updated copies will be available from R. S. Browning, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 733 Fifteenth Street, Northwest, Suite 520, Washington, D.C. 20005, phone: 202/628-7446.

TO PROVIDE FOR MORE ORDERLY PROCEDURES FOR RENEWAL OF RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING LICENSES

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and provide for more orderly procedures for the renewal of radio and television broadcasting licenses. Essentially my bill extends the maximum license period from 3 to 5 years which is a far more practical period. In addition, the bill provides that a renewal license will be granted if the applicant can demonstrate that his broadcast service over the preceding period reflected a good faith effort to meet the needs and interests of the local community in a manner consistent with the promises made in the pending and immediately prior license renewal applications. The latter provision applies only to those applicants who are financially, legally and technically qualified; a record of callous disregard for the law or the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission would prevent an applicant from having his license automatically renewed. A record of performance not in conformity with stated intentions in the immediately preceding and pending license renewal applications or a demonstrated callous disregard for law and regulations would be weighed against the renewal applicant.

The provision to extend the license period to 5 years is long overdue and recognizes several realities of the renewal process. The purpose of having a limited license period would not be changed by extending the period to a more reasonable length. The merit of a limitation is to serve as a reminder to the license that he must fulfill his obligations to the public interest, convenience or necessity. Flagrant disregard of those obligations could result in loss of the license privilege at the end of the period. Broadcasters, on the whole, have an outstanding record in fulfilling those obligations as is evidenced by the very low number of renewal applications which have been denied—only 78, as a matter of fact, between 1934 and 1969. In other words, most licensees retain their license privileges for long periods of time and are

granted renewals term after term. For that reason, there would be no noticeable difference between a 3-year and a 5-year term. The requirement that broadcasters reapply every 3 years does involve many costs and inconveniences, including the retention of outside legal assistance; the frequency of the application process actually interferes with the broadcasters' ability to serve the public, thereby imposing an unnecessary social cost as well. My bill lengthening the period to 5 years is, therefore, in the public interest and will increase the efficiency of the industry while not diminishing the attainment of regulatory objectives.

The provision on the status of the renewal applicant is necessitated by the uncertainty caused by the vacillation of the Commission and the courts about the criteria to be applied in comparative renewal hearings. Comparative hearings for broadcast license renewals became a subject of major controversy in January 1969 when the Federal Communications Commission denied WHDH's application for renewal of its television license to operate over channel 5 in Boston. The license was simultaneously awarded Boston Broadcasters, Inc., on the basis of the comparative criteria: diversification of the media and integration of ownership and operation. On the face of it, this action appeared to be the first time the Commission had awarded a license to a competing applicant in a comparative renewal proceeding. The decision sent shock waves throughout the industry. Broadcasting magazine estimated stations valued at a total of $3 billion were jeopardized by the precedent. Louis L. Jaffe, professor of law at Harvard University, referred to the decision as a "lurch to the left" on the Commission's part, especially as elaborated in Commissioner Nicholas Johnson's concurring statement. Senator PASTORE stated that a "Sword of Damocles" was hanging over the heads of broadcasters. As a precedent, the decision is of little value today, since the skirmishes of the contending troops have obscured any clear-cut policy determinations which might have been intended by the Commission at the time. The Commission's decision was by a 3-to-1 vote, barely a quorum. More importantly, the Commission denies WHDH was a regular renewal applicant since the station has operated with a temporary license for over 10 years because of charges of ex parte contacts which caused its initial license award to be withdrawn. In the meantime, the license renewal controversy has shifted to the problem of formulating new policy guidelines.

In 1969, Senator PASTORE introduced and held hearings on S. 2004 which was designed to assure that a licensee would be awarded renewal of his license if his record of performance had been in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. No competing applicants would be considered unless his application was rejected. The bill had strong support in the Senate and was allowed to die only after the Commission had issued a new policy statement on comparative license renewal proceedings in January 1970. The new policy statement said that licensees who were "substantially" meeting the needs and interests of their areas would be awarded license renewals. By "substantial" it meant "strong" or "solid" rather than merely minimal service. In issuing the policy statement, the Commission maintained that they were merely clarifying policy which had prevailed since its WBAL—Baltimore—decisions in 1951. That decision stated that a license renewal should be granted if the performance record has been "meritorious." "Actual performance" was to be weighed more heavily than "paper proposals."

Up to this point, both Congress and the Federal Communications Commission seemed to be acting purposefully to restore stability to the broadcasting industry and reinstate the only renewal policy which has really applied to broadcasting licensees, especially if we dismiss WHDH as an aberration involving unique issues. Soon thereafter, however, the courts threw the broadcast industry into a state of confusion by overturning the FCC's comparative renewal policy. The June 1971 decision, written by Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, asserted that the policy statement violated the Communications Act by undermining qualified applicants' rights to a full hearing and also that "superior performance" should not preclude competing applicants from being considered. Judge Wright emphasized the importance of the diversification of media standard as a comparative criterium. Since that decision broadcasters have been in a state of great uncertainty comparable to the period immediately following the WHDH decision.

By summarizing the regulatory and judicial framework in which radio and television broadcasters must now operate, I trust I have adequately illustrated the unjustified turmoil they face and demonstrated the need for the legislative clarification which my bill provides.

I have received many justified complaints from various stations regarding the harassing tactics of a number of the FCC inspectors, who have acted in a rude and threatening manner when carrying out their duties of inspection of stations and their records. I hope the FCC will make note of this fact and take proper action to see that these bullying tactics are stopped.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing in the Congress a bill to provide for printing as a House document certain proceedings of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and I am delighted to have my distinguished colleagues, Hon. CHARLES J. CARNEY, of Ohio, and Hon. JOHN H. DENT, of Pennsylvania, join me as cosponsors of this legislation.

It would indeed be appropriate for the Congress to extend this recognition, which is now enjoyed by other veterans' organizations, to the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States whose members have done their share to uphold and preserve the freedom and security of our beloved country.

This outstanding veterans organization is a nonprofit and nonpolitical group made up wholly and without exception of honorably discharged American war veterans. They are devoted citizens who have demonstrated splendid patriotism and dedication to the cause of freedom.

During the 91st Congress, I had introduced a similar bill which passed the House of Representatives, but the Congress adjourned before the other body had the opportunity to take final action. I do hope that, during the 92d Congress, expeditious action will be taken by both the House and Senate in order to afford this long overdue recognition to the Italian-American War Veterans.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, every year more than 50,000 people die in the United States as a result of highway accidents, and approximately half of those deaths are caused by motorists or pedestrians under the influence of alcohol.

Those are shocking statistics, and, although extensive efforts have been made to reverse the trend, the number of alcohol-related traffic fatalities has continued to rise.

More funds are needed to research new safety devices, to test new vehicle engineering methods, to conduct driver training for emergency situations, to research special lanes on freeways, and to conduct other research.

In an effort to improve highway safety, I have cosponsored H.R. 9483 which would allocate 40 percent of Federal taxes related to alcohol for such highway safety programs.

In testimony delivered before the House Committee on Public Works, I presented the case for this bill in detail, and I now request permission to insert the testimony into the RECORD.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, REPUBLICAN, OF MARYLAND, BEFORE THE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9483, FEBRUARY 24, 1972

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 9483, a bill which I was pleased to cosponsor with my good friend and the ranking Minority Member of this Committee, the Honorable William H. Harsha.

As the members of this Subcommittee are aware, this bill would amend the Highway Safety Act of 1970 to provide additional funds for highway safety programs by authorizing appropriations for such programs in an

amount equal to 40 percent of the revenue collected from Federal taxes relating to alcohol.

Certainly the members of this Subcommittee do not need to be apprised of the shocking, but nevertheless very real, connection between alcohol and highway accidents. The use of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians leads to some 25,000 deaths and a total of at least 800,000 car crashes in the United States each year. Especially tragic is the fact that much of the loss in life and limb, and property damage, involves completely innocent parties.

This relationship of alcohol and highway safety only emphasizes the need for improvements in vehicle and highway crash design. Certainly we can all appreciate the attempts which have been made in the past to control this problem, such as the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. We are really only now beginning to feel the results of that Act which led to the establishment of motor vehicle standards which have demonstrably saved many lives and reduced injuries. Notable among these achievements are the energy-absorbing steering column, improved windshields, and safety belts and harnesses. And in the next few years we can look forward to the new reinforced bumpers and the possibility of having safety air bags installed on all new cars.

Despite these advances in the direction of automobile safety devices, motor vehicle deaths continue to rise. In 1970 alone, 55,300 persons died on the highways but this alarming and depressing figure would be even higher if it were not for the programs authorized by the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act.

H.R. 9483 will allow the progress of the 1966 law to continue and to improve while, hopefully, decreasing the numbers of people killed each year on our highways. If enacted, this legislation would provide adequate funding to conduct research and development on new safety devices, to permit through testing of new and revolutionary vehicle engineering methods, to conduct realistic driver training for emergency situations, to conduct research special speed lanes on major nationwide freeways, and many other remedies which may arise from increased knowledge in this area.

Some of this activity is, of course, already being initiated under the auspices of the 1966 Highway Safety Act and individual state and local attempts to find new methods of improving safety. We have probably all read recently of the attempt to install a sniffing device in automobiles to detect the presence of an intoxicated driver and thereupon lock automatically so that the driver is unable to start the car. Unfortunately, the device is also sensitive to strong perfumes or to the presence of an intoxicated person in the automobile who may not be the driver. Despite the driver's sobriety, his car still locks. These are the types of problems which can be remedied by adequate funding for research activities. The imagination and know-how of dedicated experts can certainly devise new and better methods for road safety if given the opportunity.

A more effective though less dramatic solution, as far as I am concerned, is to deal vigorously and punitively with the drunken driver who jeopardizes the safety of us all. We must wage an all-out attack on the abusive consumption of alcohol in connection with highway use. We should recognize that all practical means for reducing the Nation's staggering highway losses, now averaging 10,000 casualties each day from all causes, must be employed to the fullest extent possible. This should include such programs as making emergency services far more effective.

In fact, my interest in this legislation was aroused because of my previous involvement with ambulance care and the availability of emergency hospital services. I was privileged to address the opening of the International Trauma Symposium in Washington, D.C., in 1970 and there to learn of the tremendous work being done in the United States through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences and throughout the world by recognized trauma experts to alleviate the pain and suffering incurred in emergency situations. Of course, many of these emergency situations result from highway accidents.

In my own State of Maryland, the State Police have, in recent years, initiated an emergency helicopter service to transport victims of highway accidents to hospital emergency centers which are equipped to treat them with the tools available to modern medical science.

All in all, the requirements of highway safety are an area of specialization in themselves and should be given the attention necessary to achieve the desired results. If we recognize that during an equivalent period, highway deaths outnumbered combat losses in Southeast Asia by a margin of 10 to 1, it seems only feasible and rational that we should devote a proportionate measure of this nation's resources to combat this killer of our people.

I urge the members of this Committee to lend their support to this legislation as a giant step forward in the quest to make our highways into safe arteries.

"DIXIE": THE ALL-AMERICAN SONG

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of one of America's most well liked and well-known songs—"Dixie".

In recent times we have read of various protests lodged against this old American song because it has played at school assemblies or sporting events. And most recently the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit addressed itself to this particular issue. I would hope that their decision will lay to rest any doubts concerning the rightful place of this song in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans.

The contention was made in the recent case by the plaintiffs that the song, "Dixie", was offensive, racially abusive, and that its playing constituted officially sanctioned racial abuse. This is completely unfounded, and I am pleased to note that the court agrees with me on this point.

I think it appropriate that we take a short look at the history of this song so that we might better understand the reasoning in the courts' decision.

Many people have claimed authorship of this song and, in fact, there have been many variations of it. But there seems to be little doubt, however, that the song was written prior to the Civil War by Daniel Decatur Emmett, a native of Ohio, as a "walk on" for a minstrel show.

In the book, Sampler of American Songs. "Dixie" is described as "a typical American song with a gay and catchy tune." Maymie Krythe in this particular book states.

Over a century ago Daniel Decatur Emmett, an American minstrel performer and composer, wrote both the words and music for "Dixie", a typical American song with a gay and catchy tune. Although he was a Northerner, his song won immediate popularity.

She goes on to write—

At the beginning of the Civil War, "Dixie" was taken over by the southerners as their confederate battle song. But today all sections of our great country sing "Dixie," termed one of the most rollicking of our national songs, known and loved throughout the world.

I think it also interesting to note in the same book the story of the song's birth. Emmett had been requested by a friend to write a song for him to use in his minstrel show the next day.

Emmett started in early the next day; it was a dark dreary, rainy and chilly Sunday morning, an atmosphere not very conducive to inspiration. At first he wasn't successful. He wanted to concoct an entirely different kind of composition, but good ideas failed to come to his mind. His wife urged him on; she tried to encourage him and said she'd be his audience. As he sat in the drab boarding-house, trying to concentrate on the job, Daniel grumbled and declared, "I wish I was in Dixie." He had traveled in the south, and when he and other showmen were back in the cold north, they would often say, "Oh, I wish I was in Dixie."

Mr. Speaker, this song was never intended to be considered a racial slur, or to be associated with slavery as a political or social institution. Rather, it was a song born out of a desire of a northern showman to return to the warm and sunny South, certainly a desire that few can question.

The song has always been a very catchy tune appealing to most everyone. During the presidential campaign of 1860, Abraham Lincoln borrowed the tune to use as a campaign song. "Dixie" was in fact a great favorite of the President and 5 years later, when many people gathered at the White House lawn to celebrate the surrender of General Lee, Lincoln asked the Marine Band to play "Dixie" and he jokingly added:

As we have captured the Confederate Army, we have also captured the Confederate tune and they both belong to us.

Arthur Farwell and W. D. Darby in their book Music in America, paid this tribute to the song:

The music of "Dixie" is so pleasing to the people that it has almost become a tune without words. Its beginning was in the minstrel show; it was dedicated as a battle song in the great uprising of the south; and in its last estate it has a place among the enduring music of the Union.

This song has become a tune without words. Today we rarely hear the words to this song used. Yet some would contend that it is offensive. Is it offensive because of its words. If so, then where will such cries stop?

Is it offensive because of its use as the battle song of the South? Are we to strike down memory of deeds of the past because our ideas and opinions have changed? Are we to forget history simply because of recent political trends?

No one is asked to agree or to adopt someone else's heritage or pride in the past, but everyone has a right to be proud of their background and respect should be shown for that pride.

"Dixie" can be said to be a song of the

past, a link to a proud history. But it is much more. It is part of America and it belongs to everyone. We cannot possibly abandon that. And how can we even be asked to do so in a day and time when people are striving to claim pride in past history and their early beginnings.

I commend the court for preserving American heritage and pride.

THE CASE FOR AMNESTY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe has established a national reputation for its forthright and courageous stands on leading public issues. Recently the Globe printed a reasoned and compassionate editorial on the subject of amnesty and I believe every Member of the House would profit by reading it and thinking seriously about the points it makes.

The editorial from the March 12 Boston Globe, follows:

THE CASE FOR AMNESTY

President Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address, March 1, 1865: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds.

Hearings have been going on in Congress on the bill Sen. Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio) to grant conditional amnesty to all draft evaders and resisters, including those who have gone into exile. The bill would condition amnesty upon a willingness to serve in the Armed Forces for a period of three years or to perform alternative service in Vista, VA hospitals, or other Federal agencies. It does not deal with men who have deserted from the military services.

Perhaps predictably, the bill has been strongly opposed by various proponents of the war in Southeast Asia.

A spokesman for President Nixon told a subcommittee hearing chaired by Sen. Kennedy that the President "clearly rejected any consideration of amnesty at this time."

John H. Geiger, national commander of the American Legion, said his organization believes that "any wholesale amnesty—whether conditional or unconditional—would make a mockery of the sacrifices of those men who did their duty."

And Martin Kelley of Dorchester, whose son was killed in Vietnam, said the subcommittee might better "engage in designing a memorial to the men who led our country in Vietnam."

To disparage these views would be wrong. They are deeply and earnestly held.

Yet the contrary view is also deeply and earnestly held.

In fact, the subcommittee heard such a view from another father bereaved by the Vietnam War. Robert C. Ransom, a New York corporation lawyer, told the subcommittee that his son had been opposed in principle to American involvement in Southeast Asia and very nearly refused to board the plane that took him there.

"My greatest regret," Mr. Ransom said, "is that I did not try to put more pressure on him to follow the dictates of his conscience."

Mr. Ransom described his son's life as "utterly wasted." He said he hoped he could "dispel forever that popular and prevalent misconception" that a grant of amnesty "to these many of our children who have opposed participation in the war" would dishonor the 56,000 Americans who have died in Southeast Asia.

We think the weight of the argument is on Mr. Ransom's side. Continued punishment and ostracism of young men who refused to go to war in Vietnam will bring back neither Mr. Kelley's nor Mr. Ransom's son, nor any other man's.

But amnesty, properly conditioned, finds profound support in notions of charity and forgiveness. And, to paraphrase Lincoln, it can help bind up the awful psychological wounds resulting from a war which has split the nation apart as no other conflict since the War Between the States.

Ten days after Lincoln made his memorable call for reconciliation in his Inaugural Address of March 1, 1865, he himself signed a presidential proclamation of amnesty for all Union deserters who would agree to return to their posts within 60 days and serve the remainder of their military tours of duty plus a period of time equal to their unauthorized absence.

Since the war at that time was nearing an end, with the Union victorious, it was plain that this grant of amnesty was not primarily made for the purpose of augmenting Union military forces, but rather for reasons of forgiveness and national unity.

American history, indeed, is replete with instances of Federal amnesty, from George Washington (amnesty for participants in the Whiskey Rebellion in 1795), to President Andrew Jackson (pardon in 1830 for all deserters previously indicted or convicted, with permission for them to return to duty, and discharge and pardon for all deserters still at large) and to President Harry Truman (pardon in 1947 for 1500 offenders against the draft act of 1940).

In the absence of any apparent intention on the part of President Nixon to extend executive clemency to young men who have refused to participate in the Vietnam War, the Congress is to be applauded for considering at this time the enactment of an appropriate amnesty law.

Reconciliation must take place, and soon, or the country can only slide further into the abyss of domestic turmoil and disunion.

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL CALLS FOR REMOVAL OF BRITISH TROOPS FROM NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has been holding hearings on the critical situation in Northern Ireland. The slaughter of innocent citizens at the hands of British troops continues and the Catholic minority lives in constant fear of violence, discrimination, and interment. Yet the United States has so far refused to use its diplomatic and moral power by calling for the withdrawal of British troops and their replacement by a United Nations peacekeeping force.

As a cosponsor of the Carey-Kennedy resolution, I was privileged to submit the following statement to the subcommittee in support of immediate congressional action to end the tragedy in Northern Ireland:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I appreciate having this opportunity to express my support for the resolutions introduced by my colleagues with my cosponsorship calling for a withdrawal of British troops in Northern Ireland and their replacement by a U.N. peacekeeping force. This, I believe is critical if the civil rights and liberties of all the citizens of Northern Ireland are to be guaranteed until a political settlement agreeable to all can be found.

I am fully aware that its charter does not entitle the U.N. to intervene in the internal affairs of another country unless requested to do so and that at the present time Northern Ireland is an integral part of Great Britain. Yet it seems to me that it would be in Britain's own self-interest to accept this alternative, and that it is incumbent upon the United States and the United Nations to use their "good offices" with Britain, as recently requested by the Irish Foreign Minister Dr. Patrick Hillery, to impress upon the British government the wisdom of this proposal. As the recent tragic events have shown us, the British troops have clearly failed in their peacekeeping efforts in Northern Ireland. If civil war is to be averted in Ulster, other alternatives should be promptly considered.

When British troops first arrived in Northern Ireland in 1969, they were greeted by the Catholic minority as protectors. They had been sent to Ulster to prevent Protestant extremists from harassing Catholic civil rights groups agitating for the redress of well-justified grievances. Their grievances included discriminatory practices in the local franchise which assured large Protestant majorities through extensive gerrymandering and the denial of the principle of one-man-one-vote, as well as discrimination in housing and employment.

Over the past three years, the British, by their actions and policies, have completely discredited their Army as an impartial peacekeeping force. They have become the instrument of the repressive Ulster government. Instead of checking the rising tide of violence and bloodshed, they have tragically contributed to it. The policy of internment without trial, introduced last August, was directed almost exclusively against Catholics, while Protestant vigilantes were left alone. Catholic homes are repeatedly broken into and subjected to humiliating searches, while the homes of Protestants are generally immune from search. Far from restoring "law and order," these practices have served only to further alienate the Catholic population and provoke new waves of violence. The senseless shooting last January 30 into a crowd of unarmed civilians which had peacefully gathered to protest the hated policy of internment has ended any kind of usefulness the British presence in Northern Ireland might have had in the search for peace.

Indeed, the very presence of British troops in Ulster has itself become an obstacle to a peaceful settlement. Internment without trial, the shameful practice of torture to extort information from those illegally detained, added to systematic military repression, have only aggravated the rift between the two communities. To protest these policies, Catholic opposition members have had no choice but to boycott the Northern Ireland Parliament. Many Catholic officials have resigned from their government posts. The I.R.A. has gained in popularity. Civil disobedience is spreading rapidly in the form of rent strikes, refusal to pay gas and electricity bills, and more protest rallies. Northern Ireland now finds itself on the brink of civil war. The British claim that if they do withdraw their troops from Ulster civil war will inevitably break out. Yet their continued presence seems to guarantee that which they

seek to avoid. Since the Army has identified itself with the Protestant majority, there appears to be no hope for a political solution to the crisis as long as it remains. A U.N. peacekeeping force holds the chance of restoring a sense of impartiality, lost by the British, which would enable leaders of the Catholic minority to resume their duties and engage in talks with the Protestants.

I am talking about the basic struggle for human rights which we as a nation are committed to seek. The struggle in Northern Ireland closely parallels that in the United States and that in the Portuguese colonies of Africa, in Rhodesia and in the Republic of South Africa.

Recently, I attended a conference of African and American legislators and government officials in Lusaka, Zambia, and at that time I had the opportunity to talk with representatives of the liberation movements in Angola and Mozambique. I also had the opportunity to speak with those who have witnessed and suffered the discrimination and subjugation of Black Rhodesians and Black South Africans by their governments.

Zambian President Kenneth D. Kuanda pointed out the moral obligation of the United States to the search for human dignity and civil rights around the globe:

"The future of African-American relations will be greatly determined by the United States policy in matters relating to self-determination in southern Africa. No major power genuinely committed to peace and the welfare of mankind can ignore the unfolding crisis in this part of the world."

I might add at this point that the United States government has hypocritically condoned the practice of racism and apartheid in our own NASA tracking station in Johannesburg, South Africa. Discriminatory policies in employment, pay scales, educational opportunities and even the use of physical facilities is the admitted practice at that American facility.

It was in 1776, nearly two centuries ago, that we pledged ourselves to the principles that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. We said that governments are instituted among men to guarantee these rights and that any government which becomes destructive of those rights may be abolished or altered by the people.

Those basic rights are at stake in Northern Ireland today, just as they are at stake in southern Africa. Those rights cannot be assured except under conditions of peace. That is why we in Congress have an obligation to make our voices heard on behalf of a peaceful settlement in Northern Ireland. A United Nations peacekeeping force would help defuse a highly explosive situation and enable the people of Northern Ireland to work out a settlement guaranteeing each citizen his human rights and civil liberties. The British must seize this chance before it is too late.

MORE FARMERS HOLD AUCTION SALES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, almost every day, I call to the attention of my colleagues the sad economic plight of countryside America.

At this time of the year, we have graphic evidence of the migration from the farms to the cities as our rural newspapers are full of farm auction sales.

Madonna Kellar, editor of the Heron Lake News, recently wrote a discerning editorial on this movement away from the farms which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MORE FARMERS HOLD AUCTION SALES

Every time a farm auction sale bill appears it is another decline in the small farm. One by one they have given up the struggle and taken jobs where they had more assurance of adequate income. Empty buildings stand out like ghosts as sentinels of the past, left to decay as time goes on. The farm families have left to seek more lucrative jobs and better living conditions.

Increased costs of living and raising families have contributed to the decline of small farm numbers, along with high costs of production of farm products. No longer can a farmer feed just what he raises to his farm animals. In that day he could make a good living even if prices were not so high. Now he must apply all kinds of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers to make his operations pay. This costs many hard earned dollars and at the end of a year of hard work, he has little to show for his efforts.

Luckily we have some men in the state and national governmental offices who are showing grave concern for the decline in small farming operations, but whether it is within their power to make it possible for the ones that remain to continue in their work remains to be seen. Certainly they will do all they can to keep prices up to a living level and will endeavor to block legislation which will curb their operations. This is not an easy task as the ones who oppose farm help, either because they are uninformed, or because they are committed along other lines, will oppose the very thing the farm leaders are working for.

Many a small farmer in the area holds down another job or his wife works to supplement the family income in a frantic effort to keep on.

The assurance of Congressmen who have the plight of the small farmer at heart gives us all hope that some miracle will happen to curb the migration from the farm to the urban areas.

Rural living seems to be appealing to city workers, but while they prefer to live in the small communities, they like to continue in their urban jobs. This increases the population count of the farming communities, but the trend to larger farming operations continues and the small operator is squeezed out.

About all we can do as individuals is to be careful of who we vote for in every election and be sure we send concerned men to the legislature who have a good understanding of the Minnesota farmer's problems and the zeal to give him all the assistance that is within their power.

At this time of year it is particularly noticeable as one auction after the other appears in the papers, each one a grim reminder that another farmer has either retired or decided to try another field of endeavor.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 5,100 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 114,500 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

DARRELL ROYAL—MR. SOUTH TEXAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, University of Texas Head Coach Darrell Royal was awarded the Mr. South Texas Award at ceremonies in Laredo, Tex., on February 21. The George Washington Birthday celebration is held each year in Texas and it is easily one of the largest and most colorful attractions held in the United States. Some of the most outstanding people in our State have been given this award; such as, former U.S. Ambassador to Australia Edward Clark, former Congressman Joe Kilgore, former Congressman Richard Kleberg, Mr. Lon Hill of Corpus Christi, and others. This year the organization selected a leader in the field of athletics and it is timely that this selection was made.

Darrell Royal has compiled one of the most impressive records in America in the win-loss column, particularly in the area of championships, but what has impressed us most is what this man has meant to the thousands of young men who have learned the meaning of competition, courage, and determination.

The introductory remarks were made by the most famous master of ceremonies in Texas, Mr. Cactus Pryor. The remarks were made in gridiron good fashion, but the high good humor that prevailed at the banquet is shown by Coach Royal's own remarks and is indicative of the great love, respect, and esteem that we hold for Darrell and Edith Royal.

The remarks of this proceeding are shown as follows:

DARRELL ROYAL'S REMARKS, PRESIDENT'S LUNCHEON, LAREDO, TEX.—GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

Thank you, Cactus. That's the warmest introduction I've received since Frank Broyles introduced me to an unsigned all-state football prospect. And Cactus, I'd like to thank you for coming down here to Laredo to introduce me. As they said, Cactus is co-host of my television show. We selected Cactus because Cactus makes me look good. As a matter of fact, compared to Cactus ANYONE would look good.

I'm especially happy to participate in this celebration because I've always been an admirer of George Washington. I admired him especially because he never told a lie. 'Course he never lost two straight to Oklahoma and Arkansas and had an alumni club to keep happy either. That George Washington pageant the other night was beautiful. It kinda shook me up to see George and Martha come driving up in a Cadillac. But what I really would like to have seen was when Pepe Martin was George Washington. George sporting a powdered mustache eating a taco must have been wild.

I am honored that you have chosen me Mr South Texas. I have to admit that I'm a little humbled by the list of the past recipients of this honor. Men like John Connally, who is now in charge of the depression . . . Joe Kilgore, Richard Kleberg, H. B. Zachary, Ambassador Ed Clark . . . when I consider the stature of these men and count myself among them, I wonder how the hell Penn State managed to beat us.

Speaking of football, I want to take this opportunity to thank Governor Smith for those plays he sent me to use in the Cotton Bowl. And Governor, I think it was obvious that we used every one of them . . . in the second half. I don't want to alibi, but injuries did hurt us pretty badly last fall. It got so bad that during the Oklahoma game, I had Oral Roberts sit on the bench with our team. It didn't help our game, but it cleared up every pimple on the squad.

Our trainer, Frank Medina, took care of so many injuries, he got groggy. After the O.U. game, one of our players gave Frank the hook-em-horn sign and Frank put two splints on his fingers.

About the only one who escaped injuries was our little split end Dean Campbell. Oh, he did have a slight concussion. It happened when our tackle Robert Guevera dropped one of his socks on Dean's head. But, I'm proud of our '71 Longhorns. They did fight off the injuries and setbacks and win the Southwest Conference championship.

And I'm sincerely very proud of this honor you do me today.

You know, I've got more Texas in my blood than Oklahoma. Both my parents and my grandparents were Texans. And I'm not sure but what I was born in Texas. The area where I grew up around Hollis was disputed territory. The Red River divided Oklahoma from Texas and every now and then the river would change course. And one time the river took a big bite out of what had been Oklahoma and both states were claiming it as their own. So there was a big legal battle, and Oklahoma lost when they won the case. But, I thank you for clearing up the doubt as to whether I am a Texan or Oklahoman. This beautiful plaque naming me Mr. South Texas is proof that I am a Texan to stay.

And while I'd like to stand up here and humbly accept these honors, I must follow the lead of the man who's birthday you honor on this occasion and tell the truth. Without this little lady sitting beside me, there wouldn't be anyone in this room who would know my name. I'd like to present the best thing to happen to this football coach . . . or any other . . . my wife, Edith.

I assume this also makes Edith an official Texan.

CACTUS PRYOR'S REMARKS AT PRESIDENT'S LUNCHEON 1972, LAREDO, GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

Thank you. I haven't seen this many state officials together since the last Brown & Root testimonial dinner.

I want to thank the Independent Club for allowing me to appear.

Governor Smith, it looks like you're the only survivor remaining from the celebration among the gubernatorial candidates.

Lt. Governor Barnes is under the weather. He made the mistake of eating a meal on this side of the border and came down with an attack of Davy Crockett's revenge. No, actually Ben had to leave because he's due to begin his whistlestop train tour tomorrow. He's boarding his own train in Amarillo and will campaign via train all the way to Houston. Two of the Dallas Cowboys will be with him . . . Bob Lilly and Walt Garrison.

Governor Smith, not to be outdone, leaves at the same time from Waxachachie in a Volkswagen with Gene Stahlings.

Personally, I like all of the gubernatorial candidates. I like Ben Barnes because he's so modest. Most people brag about how much money they have. Ben brags about how much money he doesn't have.

And I like Governor Smith for many reasons. One thing, I feel a certain obligation to him. He appointed me to the Texas Tourist Development Board; and if he follows my #1 recommendation, things are really going to pick up around here . . . topless border guards.

And I like Dolph Briscoe because we've been friends for a long time. One thing though, I can't understand why Dolph wants to get into Texas politics. He's already rich. Dolph's so rich he tips Allan Shivers.

They say that at Dolph's ranch, the Briscoe Hilton, he throws fabulous weekend parties for state politicos. On some Saturday nights you can find more politicians sleeping there at the same time than in the House of Representatives.

Governor Smith really upset the applecart by announcing for re-election. That was the biggest surprise in Texas politics since Ma Ferguson addressed the Legislature in hot pants.

But, despite the rivalry, these men remain good friends. Just a while ago, I heard the Governor call Ben Barnes "son". I just caught part of it, I think.

Governor Smith is really making a sacrifice to be here at this occasion honoring Darrell Royal, because he's a big Texas Tech booster. As a matter of fact, he's trying to get a bill passed that would make beating Texas Tech a felony. If it passes, that would make Darrell a lifer.

I'm happy to see a good friend and a man I admire very much here today . . . a former Ambassador to Australia, Ed Clark. Ambassador Clark has done more to improve Texas-Mexican relationships than Kayopectate.

I'm sure President Johnson would have enjoyed being here today because he's the Longhorn's #1 fan . . . and a great admirer of Darrell Royal. But he's tied up. He's supervising the construction of his birthplace.

I notice that we have two other Presidents represented here today. Mr. Phillip Sanchez representing President Nixon who is in China giving their table tennis teams some new plays. President Nixon is a George Washington admirer. He's always quoting George in his speeches. I've always thought that George Washington had the hardest job of all our Presidents. He had no previous Presidents to quote.

And Juan Barona Lobato representing the President of Mexico Señor Lobato "Mucho gusto al viera usted aque. Mi lingua is gringa . . . mi corezon es Mexicana." I think I just said, "give the check to Pepe Martin."

But, I'm proud to have the opportunity to introduce Coach Darrell Royal and delighted that you have so wisely chosen Mr. South Texas. Central Oklahoma has come a long way.

Coach Royal is the greatest coach we've ever had at Texas. And we are proud that this year's team was the first to win a 4th straight SWC Championship.

Of course, there were a few rough spots along the way. We got the wrong end of the wishbone against Oklahoma. But we were proud of our Texas boys that day . . . including the one's who played for the Longhorns. And Arkansas was about as hospitable as Royal Wright at a Billy Hall testimonial. We had a bit of a crop failure in the Cotton Bowl.

But Darrell, the people of South Texas have overlooked those games while not overlooking your many positive accomplishments and qualities. And I'm happy to present this plaque proclaiming you Mr. South Texas . . . the first from the world of sports so honored. And they've left the plaque blank because, knowing you, they figured you'd rather compose your own inscription.

And Darrell, I'm delighted at this time to read a telegram that expresses all of our feelings:

"I join the people of Texas in honoring Darrell Royal as Mr. South Texas. You have chosen well. He is an asset not only to his adopted state, the game of football, but to the nation as well. His contributions as a citizen and as a coach provide a goal for all purposeful Americans to follow. He is in the tradition of the man who's birthday you observe with your celebration. I'm sorry that Mrs. Nixon and I are not able to be with you on this worthy occasion."

SAM NIXON, *Falfurias, Tex.*

BOB HOPE NAMES ED DALY USO MAN OF YEAR

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally men in private enterprise gain a perspective beyond the confines and parameters of their particular job and relate in a multidisciplined manner across the spectrum of the problems we are faced with in our international relations. Such a man is Edward J. Daly, a self-made private enterpriser, who developed one of the world's largest independent supplemental airlines practically from scratch over the past 20 years.

Ed used his capacities and know-how to fantastic social benefit in pioneering a 50-percent serviceman's cut rate to Vietnam for nonofficial travel; thereby substantially alleviating the hardships imposed on thousands of our personnel on that particular duty assignment.

Last Thursday night, I was privileged to be in Boston with Ed Daly, who was singled out for the special award of the United Service Organization for 1972. The following is a brief news release which describes Ed's performance not only in the Vietnam effort but in a host of other areas which reflect his strong concern for his fellow man:

Edward J. Daly, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of World Airways, Inc. will be the recipient of the USO's special award for 1972. Mr. Daly will receive the award on March 9, 1972 at the annual banquet of the USO's National Council at the Boston Statler Hilton Hotel. The award is being given in recognition of Mr. Daly's personal and corporate commitment to the welfare of the men and women in America's armed services.

The special award is presented only when the USO National Board of Governors determines that someone is especially deserving. It is not given each year. Past recipients have included Mrs. Bob Hope, Martha Raye and Robert Dechert. The USO National Council annual banquet, of which Bob Hope will be the master of ceremonies, will cap a week long meeting of USO volunteers and staff.

In choosing Mr. Daly for the 1972 Special Award, the Awards Selection Committee of the USO National Board of Governors underscored Mr. Daly's abiding humanitarian concern which has been demonstrated so well through his many activities in behalf of American servicemen. High among these ac-

tivities is last year's World Airways/USO homecoming program. This program successfully provided low-cost round trip air fares from Vietnam to the U.S. and enabled more than 23,000 servicemen to visit families and friends at home during their tour of duty in Vietnam.

In three months Mr. Daly made three extended visits to Vietnam to inaugurate, review and constantly improve the homecoming USO program. On each occasion he visited servicemen and troop commanders at headquarters, at firebases and at the USO clubs from the Delta to DMZ, to insure them the best possible opportunities for visiting home. For those servicemen needing loans in order to take advantage of their home leave, Mr. Daly offered his personal guarantee for bank loans.

While in the process of setting up the homecoming program Mr. Daly further evidenced his concern for servicemen by personally arranging and participating in the distribution of holiday gifts such as turkeys and Christmas trees, to the men serving in Vietnam. On his first trip to develop the homecoming program, he was accompanied by actor Fess Parker, a director of World Airways, who participated in the distribution of gifts to the American servicemen in Vietnam.

Between his visits to Vietnam to oversee the homecoming program, Mr. Daly took time to assist the USO in responding to an unusual petition from servicemen stationed in Alaska, a petition that requested a Bob Hope show. Mr. Daly personally provided free transportation for Bob Hope and the huge troupe of entertainers and USO volunteers that brought the hopes of the servicemen in Alaska to happy fruition. He accompanied the troupe to ensure that all arrangements for the trip were handled in a first-class manner.

Mr. Daly's humanitarian concerns have taken many other forms. He has served as chairman of the board of regents of the University of Santa Clara. He currently is a member of the university's board of founders and the board of trustees. The Edward J. Daly Science Center at the university was dedicated on April 13, 1966.

Originally appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, and then reappointed by President Richard M. Nixon, Mr. Daly served as the chairman of the Oakland Metropolitan Area of the National Alliance of Businessmen, an organization which has successfully spearheaded an effective program to increase the number of jobs available to unemployed and under-employed citizens of all races. He served longer than any other metropolitan chairman in the Nation. He received another appointment from President Johnson and then was reappointed by President Nixon. This time as one of the original incorporators of the National Corporation for Housing Partnerships, a venture in which some of the Nation's most prominent businessmen have successfully set out to develop new ways of improving the supply of low income and middle income housing for the United States.

Mr. Daly has served as a volunteer fund raising chairman for the Cerebral Palsy Fund, the United Negro College Fund, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; serves on the advisory council of the San Francisco Bay Area Council of Boy Scouts; is a member and director of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce; a trustee of the Bay Area Council; a director of the Oakland Boys Club; a director of KQED—the Bay Area educational T.V. station; a director of the German/American Chamber of Commerce of the Pacific Coast; and vice president and director of the American Irish Foundation.

"MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM" BY NOLA FAY LAIR

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. The theme for this year's speeches was "My Responsibility to Freedom," and I am informed by Mr. Cooper Holt, the executive director of that great organization, that nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the national event.

I am proud to say that the winning speech from Arkansas was delivered by a talented young lady from my district, Miss Nola Fay Lair, of Monticello.

Miss Lair's remarks concerning young people's responsibilities to their Government are particularly appropriate for an election year which will see a great mass of new young voters entering the polling booths. She is pointed in her ideas. She displays vision in her thoughts. She shows great maturity in her message.

I hope that her provocative realism is heeded and understood by Arkansas and Americans of all ages.

It is an honor for me to insert Miss Lair's speech in the RECORD at this time:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

I am a soldier. I fight a battle. If I lose this battle the whole world loses. I fight for freedom. My weapons are the truth, and the knowledge that I am right.

It is common to think of freedom on the national and world levels first but freedom, real freedom has to start in the home. Children can't be oppressed by parental authority to the point that freedom of thought and speech is infringed. If children aren't allowed freedom of expression how will they learn to form their own opinions and make their own decisions as must be done in a democracy? But while children must have freedom of expression, they must also learn to follow the rules of a family and the laws of a nation.

I must then turn my attention not to the state, not to the national level but to the local city governments. Freedom in government starts here. It is my responsibility to find out about my local government, what it is doing and who is in office. How many of us know who our councilmen are? It is my responsibility to give my councilmen my opinions of activities taking place in my city. It is my responsibility to vote in city, as well as state and national elections.

I have the duty of writing my legislators in my state government to inform them of my opinion of the bills under consideration. It is my duty to uncover any underhanded, crooked deals by some few politicians. I must fight the corporate control of my congressmen and senators with my vote. I can fight these corporate and outside interest groups by checking my lawmakers voting records before I vote in elections and by keeping myself well-informed of world happenings.

Too many of the young people, people in my generation scream rights, rights, but what about the responsibilities that go along with these rights. All right the eighteen-year-olds got the vote, but what are we going to do with it? Will we be responsible citizens seeing our responsibilities and living up to them, or will we throw caution to the winds and pull the plug letting the United States go right down the drain. Will we live up to the responsibility of checking voting records, or will we vote like our friends are voting, or will we vote for the candidate who looks best in living color on our television screens? Will we read current events magazines to keep up with what is happening in our world, or will we read modern pot boilers and underground magazines?

Many young people are against the war in Vietnam. I believe the United States must, as a democracy keep Red China from impairing Vietnamese chances of freedom. Any war is a tragedy and I believe we must try to live up to the ideal in democracy of talking our problems out. We, as a democracy, must set an example to nations that aren't free.

People in Pakistan and India are starving and we say: Well it's not the United States' responsibility to feed and educate the world. And these creatures are humans too and you can't teach democracy to a starving person or an illiterate populous, and after all isn't that what we want, a free world at peace? America's whole governmental system is based on a belief in God and in God's eyes we're all brothers. Well don't my brothers deserve a chance at freedom too? I'd like to say one more thing. Eternal vigilance isn't enough. To preserve freedom we have to fight for it. Fight not with guns, but with education, votes, words, speeches, demonstrations, and as a last resort, we must then be prepared to back up our words with actions, if our rights and freedoms are infringed.

THE HAND THAT ROCKS THE CRADLE IS ALSO ROCKING THE POLITICAL BOAT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, February 12 the National Observer published an article describing how women are reaching for political power long denied them. From Maine to Texas women are working to gain their rightful places in the national nominating process. Three Minnesotans—Koryne Horbal, Mary Ziegenhogen and Jeri Rasmussen—are mentioned in Nina Totenberg's Observer story. This movement will change the makeup of our national political conventions and could have immense influence on American politics.

I am certain that my colleagues will be interested in reading about this revolution in progress. The article follows:

WOMEN OUT TO BE LIFE OF THE PARTIES

(By Nina Totenberg)

Men have never been stingy about letting women share in the quadrennial rite of nominating Presidential candidates. For their share the men took the important posts, the decision making, the power, and the credit. They gladly gave women the errands, the telephoning, the stamp licking, the coffee serving, and the anonymity.

Not any more. This year the hand that rocks the cradle is rocking the political boat too.

From Maine to Texas a grass-roots movement for female political power is gaining strength every day. It could have immense

influence on the entire scope of American politics. Its special impact—and the one that will be felt soonest—will be on the Presidential conventions.

Because this year women could come close to running them.

In 1968 both major political conventions were overwhelmingly male. Women made up only 13 per cent of the Democratic delegates, 17 per cent of the Republican. But this year, because of new party rules, the Democrats expect 40 to 50 per cent of their delegates to be women. The GOP is also aiming for a more equal sex ratio, but it has no new rules to enforce that goal.

When the Democratic National Committee (DNC) reformed its rules after the disastrous 1968 convention, one major reform required state delegations to reflect more representatively the female, young, and black populations of their states. Ideally, DNC sources say, the 1972 Democratic convention should be 50 per cent female, 11 per cent black, and 25 per cent young people.

The National Women's Political Caucus immediately seized on the guideline for women and organized in 35 states to make it a reality. The caucus and other groups have been holding state and regional meetings to teach women the recipe for becoming a delegate. Despite 20-below-zero cold, about 75 Midwestern women came to Des Moines recently for one such session.

PRESSURE ON THE GOP

The women's caucus also met with the GOP national chairman, Sen. Robert Dole of Kansas. Afterward he began encouraging GOP state chairmen to increase their number of women delegates this year. Senator Dole says he hopes the Republican convention will be 30 to 35 per cent female.

A simple fact of political life is behind the whole movement: Women will no longer tolerate being left out of politics at the decision-making level.

Take Anne C. Martindell, the wealthy, socially prominent Democratic vice chairman in New Jersey. Last November she created a *cause celebre* that reverberated throughout New Jersey. She learned that Salvatore A. Bontempo, the state Democratic chairman, was meeting secretly at his house with the state's only Democratic U.S. senator, two former governors, and chairmen of the six largest counties to discuss delegate selection.

Mrs. Martindell phoned Bontempo to inquire why she, his second in command, had been excluded. Bontempo forbade her to come. Furious, Mrs. Martindell promptly drove in her chauffeured Rolls-Royce to Bontempo's house and forced her way inside. One of the men told her that she'd have been welcome except that the men wanted to relax, and, well, maybe use bad language. The proper Mrs. Martindell drew herself up to her full height and declared: "I don't give a s——— what language you use."

She stayed, later admitting: "I've never used that word in my life before. I practiced all the way over there."

Says Anne Wexler, executive director of Citizens for Muskie: "I've always operated under the theory that women do all the work in politics anyway, and its about time they got the credit for it.

"This [women's movement] has the biggest potential of anything in the country," she adds. "We've got to make women see the connection between the nominating process and the issues that matter to them—issues like day-care and garbage removal, more street lights, more police. Women can see to it that people are nominated in local and national government who are good on these issues."

A lot of women see their potential already, and they're not above using a little muscle to achieve it. In Pennsylvania recently two factions of women were holding concurrent political breakfasts. Feminist Gloria Steinem was speaking at one breakfast when, midway through her speech, a burly man rose from the audience, marched to the dais, picked her up, and carried her off to the other breakfast—where his wife, its sponsor, wanted Gloria to speak too.

Usually, however, women gang up on men in demanding political equality. In Tennessee, for example, a group called the Democratic Women's Roundtable almost singlehandedly forced the Democratic state committee to rewrite its rules to comply with the reform guidelines. First the women forced the state party to hold state-wide hearings. Then they organized, testified at each hearing, and packed each audience with women.

When the state party wrote—and the DNC approved—new rules that the women considered lacking, "there was smoke out of Tennessee," one male politician says. The state party quickly redrafted the rules, but the women, still unsatisfied with one section, are threatening to sue unless it's rewritten again.

MINNESOTA WOMEN ORGANIZE

In Minnesota, women of all political persuasions have formed a nonpartisan women's caucus with 2,000 members. Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party women have formed a separate caucus that has 4,000 active members and expects to fill at least half of Minnesota's delegate slots at the Democratic National Convention. These women have done all this in less than six months.

My education in the women's political revolution began on the plane to Des Moines, where an arm of the National Women's Political Caucus had organized a bipartisan conference on how to become a convention delegate. My traveling companions were Carol Casey from the DNC and Phyllis Segal of the Women's Caucus. I asked Carol if there was any difficulty getting women to run for the delegate jobs.

"Yes, in some places," she said. Her lip curled patronizingly: "Some women are afraid to run because their husbands don't want them to. It might be bad for business if wifey was too involved in politics. And a lot of the poor dear boys don't want their wives to go away to the convention because they don't like to fix their own din-dins." Cost is another deterrent, she added, although many women's groups are raising money to pay delegates' expenses.

The women at the Des Moines conference ranged in age from mid-20s to mid-50s. Although the conference was organized in just nine days, one woman came all the way from St. Louis. Mo., and three women drove five hours from Minnesota to be there.

Betty Durden, chairman of the Iowa Governor's Commission on the Status of Women, opened the conference. "You will hear today from women who are partisan," she said. "They may not represent your point of view, but they will show you how to get things done." Then we split up into workshops to learn how.

"Please, don't assume we know anything," pleaded a woman in a red sweater at a workshop run by Miss Casey and Pat Bain, the GOP state committeewoman for the district encompassing Des Moines.

"Traditionally the precinct committeewoman does all the secretarial work and the man makes all the decisions," Mrs. Bain began. "So when he says, 'Do you take shorthand?' you say, 'No, do you?' "

Mrs. Bain then passed out charts showing the two parties' organization in Iowa. She and Miss Casey began explaining what happens at a precinct caucus, how to demand your rights, why the precinct caucus is important, and why you don't have a chance of winning unless you bring lots of friends to vote for you.

The first rule, the women are told, is to make sure a fair and impartial caucus chairman is elected.

"But how can a chairman ignore a raised hand?" the audience asks. "You'd be surprised how blind they can be," the two pros laugh.

How do you know when and where the precinct caucus is being held? Check in the back of the newspaper, near the death notices, the two pros reply. One woman tells of arriving at her first precinct caucus five minutes late and finding the meeting over. Miss Casey replies that the record for brevity goes to a delegate-selection meeting that lasted 15 seconds. This year, she explains, the new party rules say the meetings must begin at 8 p.m. but that delegate election can't start until 8:30.

The red-sweater lady offers some practical suggestions on two problems. "I guess maybe you should plan to lay aside a little extra money for baby sitters or to eat dinner out on the night of the caucus," she says. "And maybe you should get someone in to help you with the ironing that week because the family is getting hostile without fresh clothes."

"There are all sorts of solutions," Miss Casey adds, "You can even arrange to have a separate room at the meeting where mothers can deposit their children, and then get a few high-school kids to take care of them."

MOCK CAUCUS FOR LUNCH

The teaching continued through lunch time, when the women watched a mock precinct caucus while munching on box lunches. Then came another workshop, this one conducted by three Minnesota women, each the mother of two children.

One of the three, Koryne Horbal, is the Minnesota Democratic state chairwoman and a supporter of Sen. Hubert Humphrey. But first, she says, she is a woman. "In the past six months the Republican state chairman and I probably have had lunch together more than any other two political strategists in the state, and that's because we know where we stand as women: We are not accepted in our parties at the highest decision-making level, and we are going to change that."

To illustrate her point, Mrs. Horbal notes that her male counterpart, the Democratic state chairman, is paid $18,500 a year plus a car and expenses. She is unpaid and does not even get expenses.

Mrs. Horbal told how politically aware women have quite literally taken Minnesota by storm. They organized awareness seminars in every congressional district. They did a complete study of women's role in Minnesota politics and then used it to show other women how they had been exploited and ignored.

They got every Democratic candidate for President to pledge himself to delegate slates of at least 50 per cent women. They are holding fund raisers to pay the expenses of women convention delegates so that no woman's family budget will prevent her from going. They are developing money-credit systems for hours worked by campaign drones, usually women; these can be turned in for tickets to the lavish parties thrown for big contributors. They are considering raising money to pay for household help for women political candidates and charging it off as a legitimate campaign expense. They are developing a voucher system that would force candidates to commit themselves to certain women's issues before women's groups give their support.

Women have become so powerful in Minnesota, Mrs. Horbal says, that they demanded a new election when more men than women were elected delegates at a recent city convention in St. Paul. The men caved right in, resigning so that a new election could be held. "Of course," Mrs. Horbal notes, "the first man to resign was a state legislator, and I think he was wise. Oh yes, very wise."

The students listen, all enraptured, many knitting furiously, as the lecturing continues. One Republican woman says it might be a good idea if the money raised by GOP women's clubs were reserved for women candidates, or to pay household expenses so women could run for office. Everyone nods approvingly. No more turning the money over to the party.

"The average woman lives to 74," says Mary Ziegenhagen, another of the Minnesota women. "She has her last child by the time she is 29, and that child is in school by the time she is 35. That leaves nearly 40 years. If you can't spend some of that time being a citizen . . . then democracy is a sham. . . . It's about time women grew up and stopped expecting men to provide all the leadership and happiness in their lives and all that stuff at the end of the rainbow."

"We have to demystify political caucuses," says Jeri Rasmussen, another of the Minnesota female pols. "It's just a meeting of your neighbors of the same political persuasion. Most women are expert politicians: Just look at the way they lobby for that new dress or davenport. Even though women usually outnumber men at the precinct-caucus level, they traditionally take a back seat to the men because the men wear pants or something."

"If I were organizing a precinct caucus," adds Mrs. Horbal, who began her political career that way, "I'd first find out how many people showed up for it last time. That way I would know how many I'd need to bring to win. And remember there is nothing wrong with overkill. If I saw there were 30 people at the caucus last time, I'd try to bring 130. Also, check to see how many of the people there last time were women. If there weren't many, I'd start giving little coffees.

"Don't elect a woman just because she is a woman," Mrs. Horbal adds. "If she is just someone's wife and not concerned with women's issues, we don't want her. . . . And when you're pledging yourself to a candidate, as I have [to Senator Humphrey], make your support contingent on his continued commitment to women's issues."

LOADING THE BAND WAGON

Indeed, it appears that the only band wagon in the Democratic Party so far this year is full of women—and a lot of men are scrambling to get aboard. Says DNC Chairman Lawrence O'Brien: "We haven't gotten much flack on this yet, but it could well be that the old stalwarts haven't quite realized what has happened yet. And they probably won't until they see that half the faces at the convention are female."

The female pols point out that there's a difference between losing a delegate race and being discriminated against, but the difference will be hard for state delegations to prove. State delegations with less than 50 percent women can be, and probably will be, challenged. And the burden of proof falls on the delegation.

Unless the delegation can prove that it tried to recruit women to run for delegate spots, it can be disqualified. The first offical challenge came in mid-January in Illinois, where Sen. George McGovern's office announced that it would challenge a Sen. Edmund Muskie slate because it lacked women.

The biggest obstacle women have to overcome is probably themselves. "Women have all kinds of self barriers," Mrs. Horbal explains. "They are always asking themselves, 'Am I qualified?' A man doesn't scrutinize himself; he just assumes he is qualified." Women also face external barriers such as family objections and lack of time and money.

Women are nonetheless emerging from their political cocoons, and the signs all say that the evolutionary process can't be stopped. But will it make any difference that a lot of 1972 delegates will be women occupying seats that men filled in 1968?

NOT A SEXUAL QUALITY

Some of the women's caucus activists don't think so, except that women will get to participate. But many professional politicians—male and female—think it will make a big difference. "There are women who are hacks, as well as men; it's not a sexual quality," says Ken Bode, who was a key staffer on the Democratic reform commission. But he adds: "I think women are more susceptible to change. I think women in general are to the left of men on issues they are concerned with: the economy, women's rights, the war."

Democratic Chairman O'Brien agrees: "I'm sure there will be as many divergent views among the women at the convention as in the convention as a whole. But the women who come probably will have been activists in their local communities. And women are more liberal with respect to wanting to effect change and being dissatisfied with procedures. . . . It's not new to me that women will be in a minority group, and their views will prevail.

"The women who would be coming to the convention would be uniformly aggressive, articulate, and probably will make a greater proportionate contribution to the platform, for example, than the men. Most of the women will be new arrivals and highly motivated, while most of the men will probably be repeaters," O'Brien adds.

"Elections have usually revolved around the male way of doing things, the cult of personality, and issues be hanged," says Minnesota's Jeri Rasmussen. "We're going to change that."

How much women will change American politics, beginning with next summer's conventions, remains to be seen. But politicians of every stripe are coming to realize that there may be prophecy in Rep. Bella Abzug's comment that, "a woman's place is in the House . . . in the Senate, and on the Supreme Court."

A COMING OF AGE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's trip to China recently is still a matter of much discussion throughout the world. Here at home, the news analysts are continuing in their effort to assess the trip, the reactions of the participants, and future consequences. But beyond all of this hypothesizing, the trip marks this country's "coming of age" in the diplomatic community.

I think this sentiment is particularly well discussed—as is the trip—in a recent editorial in the Standard Times of New Bedford, Mass. The editorial lists several of the concrete assurances that came out of the President's talks with representatives of the Peoples' Republic, and looks to our new attitude toward Taiwan. It compares our current posture on Nationalist China with our posture in Vietnam, and concludes that America has shown its confidence in itself and of our fundamental desire for world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial, entitled "Agreement with China," is worthwhile, not only because it comes from a city that sent whaling ships around the world to open up new dialogs with other countries, but because it is a thoughtful study of the beginnings of our future course in the Far East. The editorial is in my view worthwhile reading for my colleagues in Congress.

TODAY'S VIEWPOINTS: AGREEMENT WITH CHINA

"This was the week that changed the world."

So President Nixon summed up his historic visit to China.

It is an apt summary. Little else can be said with such positiveness. The world has changed, but in precisely what ways and to what degree is a matter for the future to reveal.

Beyond these generalities, the impact of the trip is hard to assess. There is a danger in reading too much into what few facts we have.

These facts amount to a few hundred words and some very subjective tidbits relating to everything from the expression on the faces of the negotiators, to the choice of such things as a revolutionary ballet and gymnastics as entertainment for the President.

Obviously the week was carefully planned and the Chinese were trying to leave us with some definite impressions of them. As a result, we know far more about the Communist Chinese than we did a week ago. But we still know less about them than we do about the people of any other major country in the world.

Still, we can say with some assurance that:

—There has been a major diplomatic breakthrough in the direction of easing relations between the United States and China.

—Changed relationships between the U.S. and China will cause many other countries to re-examine their policy towards the U.S. and China.

—Coverage of this major diplomatic event has caused an educational awakening of the people in both countries toward one another.

In terms of specifics, there now seems to be an understanding on our relationship to Taiwan and upon Taiwan's relationship to China. This nation now agrees that the question of Taiwan's future is an internal problem to be resolved by Chinese, not by Americans.

The Nationalists on Taiwan always have maintained there is just one China. The Communists on the mainland have maintained there is just one China. What President Nixon has done is formally recognize this state of affairs and maintained that if the two groups can settle their differences peacefully, we will stand aside.

The reduction of our military forces in Taiwan is not unlike our withdrawal from Vietnam. The joint communique issued by the Chinese and Americans spelled out clearly our position in this respect:

"The United States Government . . . reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves. With this prospect in mind, it affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes."

In summary, the President has made a fine start in the direction of peace. His actions are a sign of diplomatic maturity in America, of our own confidence in our strength and of our fundamental desire for a peaceful world.

BELLA ABZUG AND CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, lately, the legislatures of the several States have been busily engaged in redistricting their congressional districts. The need for this decennial task arises due to population changes recorded by the 1970 census.

While the Supreme Court has gone part of the way in attempting to make reapportionment fair and equitable by requiring equal population in legislative districts, the politics of the status quo still manages to operate by means of gerrymandering. The interesting ways in which new districts are drawn remind us that the old guard of American politics has it own methods for disposing of those who would bring about change in our society.

One of the most blatant and outrageous examples of gerrymandering to surface this year took place in the State of New York, where BELLA ABZUG's district was sliced into no less than four—count them, four—pieces. There are those who claim that she is not effective, but the fact that the power structure is going so far out of its way to cut her down is proof positive of the contrary.

Nicholas von Hoffman had an excellent column on this subject in this morning's Washington Post, and I include it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There is a slim possibility that the courts will have something to say about this sort of chicanery, but I rather doubt it. The only route remaining is for the people to stand up on election day and state with their votes that they will not stand for the decimation of the handful of legislators who really represent them.

The column follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RE-DISTRICTING

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Bella of the wide-brimmed hat has been up in New York snorting, ripping and letting it be known she will not die dainty. "I don't plan to let that gang of enemies cut me down," she was saying from the ruins of her congressional district. For Bella Abzug hasn't been redistricted, she has been de-districted, her old constituency cut up and split in four different ways.

She has been domolished, the political map redesigned to put her out of politics forever. She says she's going to fight back and fight on, and maybe she will and maybe she will win. She is Bella, after all, but that's why Nelson Rockefeller and the conservative Democrats wanted to get her and beat her brains out. They did indeed liquidate her inelegantly because, as she says, "When you have all the power, you don't need to be clever."

Why they did it is interesting. Bella has zilch seniority, nor is she regarded as being especially effective in Congress. She has stood for something, however. There is in her chemistry an uncrackable element which resists being reduced to the House of Representatives' ordinary bipartisan sludge. That makes her dangerous. She attracts people, excites them, gets them into politics, and if there were too many like her, we would begin to discern a difference in our two major political parties.

Another congressman who's getting shafted is Ken Hechler, a Democrat from West Virginia, and when Hechler goes, that's the end of the state. It will be strip mined into mud, gravel and pulmonary disease. Not only is Hechler the only pro-coal miner member of a state congressional delegation that's so bad it makes you giggle, he is being blotted out by a congressman who once testified he favored strip mining because it lets the sun shine in the forests.

This chap's name is James Kee, and he, his mother and father have held the seat since 1932, and "I'm going to make goddamn sure I keep it," he says. He deserves it, too, the way he serves his constituents. More than 15,000 miners and their widows living in his district have been denied black lung compensation from the government. But Kee is working on it. He's got his daughter on his own payroll at $22,000 a year as a "black lung specialist," and when the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette asked him about the young woman who majored in music at school, he answered that, "We only hire the best people for the job in my office. It don't make a damn bit of difference who they are. I'll put my daughter up against anybody. Nepotism is a grossly misused word . . . she's right up to snuff on this black lung and I'll tell you or anybody else that wants to know that Kirsten earns her pay."

In Indiana they've savaged young Rep. Andy Jacobs' district. Probably because of C–5A. "Cee" is Jacobs' great dane, named after the flying turkey military cargo plane because, like it, the dog also just grew and grew. It is said that the late L. Mendel Rivers, the chairman of the committee that approved the money for this multi-billion dollar goose, once made the mistake of telling Jacobs what a fine animal C–5A was. "Thank you, Mr. Chairman," the younger man replied, "but every time old C–5A here comes in for a landing one of his legs falls off."

That tells you why he got it. Abner Mikva of Illinois isn't as funny but his record is just as good. William Green of Philadelphia has been unseated and is trying to survive against a "67-year-old super hawk and organization minion," as he puts it, for the sin of having run against Frank Rizzo for mayor.

The cumulative effect of a couple of generations of such decapitations is a Florida primary, which is what you get when the distinctive people are knocked off at the bottom. For it is at the local and the congressional level that you hope to build a party politics with meaning and an abiding direction, one that can raise up presidential candidates who have organic connection with a definite group of people and a coherent set of ideas.

When you don't have that, you have a Florida. Mobs of loud, cynical, suspiciously wealthy pols running around with opinion surveyors hoping their numerologists can tell them when to say yea and nay. With a Florida you get these frenzied men picking their political positions by checking where their rivals are; if Wallace is far right, then Jackson will be reasonable right, and Humphrey will be iddy-bitty center which shoves Muskie a couple of centimeters to the left . . . like 11 piglets trying to nurse a sow with 10 teats. And one leftover, squealing, frantic, scrambling porker.

With a Florida, you get the political stars, the celebs undisciplined by the long nurture of growing inside a school of thought . . . You get the Gene McCarthys who feel they owe their followers nothing and so can betray them out of celebish eccentricity.

Yes, when they do in Bella, they not only give it to her now, but all of us later.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION'S 26TH ANNUAL PUBLIC SERVANTS MERIT AWARDS LUNCHEON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1972, the Cuyahoga County Bar Association held its 26th annual public servants merit awards luncheon. The occasion is always unique in that the bar association pays tribute to those persons who have devoted their careers to smooth administration of the law. The individuals honored are usually those who have worked quietly and with little recognition.

Those who received honors this year were Marie J. Carlin, assistant secretary to the county clerk, Emil J. Masgay; Mary R. Grealis, secretary to common pleas court administrator John J. Lavelle; Josephus F. Hicks, casework supervisor of the juvenile court; Irving Klein, deputy clerk, Cleveland Municipal Court; and Billie Reed, supervisor of the docket department, probate court.

Marie Carlin went to work as a deputy in the clerk of courts' office 31 years ago. Prior to becoming deputy clerk, she held a variety of positions within the clerk's office. Today her spare time is devoted to charitable work within the St. Francis Xavier Mission Circle and the Holy Family Cancer Home Guild. Marie Carlin has been active in Democratic politics all her life. She plays an energetic role in the 16th ward of Cleveland and in the county Democratic Women's Club. She is a graduate of St. Edward's Commercial Academy.

Mary Rita Grealis has been a public servant for 29 years. She began her career in the Cleveland division of motor vehicle maintenance in March 1943. In 1949, she began working for the department of domestic relations of the court of common pleas. Seven years later she transferred to the divorce assignment room, and on March 1, 1958, was appointed to her present position as personal secretary to John J. Lavelle, court administrator. Miss Grealis is a graduate of St. Rose Elementary School, Lourdes Academy, and Dyke Business College.

Josephus F. Hicks was born in Newbury, S.C., on May 4, 1908. Upon graduation from South Carolina State College, he entered public service. In 1937, he moved to Cleveland and into the position of relief administrator for the Cleveland Welfare Department. From 1940 until 1943, Mr. Hicks served as the Cleveland Recreation Department's recreation center director. In 1943, he was appointed to the position of probation officer of the juvenile court. He subsequently advanced steadily through several positions until reaching his present important post as casework supervisor for the court.

Hicks earned a degree in applied social science from Western Reserve University in 1940. He was president of the Wade Park Allotment Association in 1966

and, in 1967, served as head of the Glenville Area Community Council. He is the juvenile court's representative to the central community council.

He has the distinction of having organized the Pride program, a cooperative effort between the juvenile court and the Cleveland Board of Education, designed to prevent delinquency among elementary schoolchildren. In his spare time, Mr. Hicks teaches juvenile court procedures at Cleveland Community College; engages in his photography hobby; and serves on the board of managers of the Cedar YMCA and the St. John's AME Church's board of stewards and trustees. He is married to the former Ellen E. Ward and has two sons, Kenneth, 31, and Joel, 24.

Irving Klein has, for the past 3 years, been issuing summons in his role of deputy clerk for the Cleveland Municipal Court, but for 29 years before that he taught many fledgling lawyers the art of processing a case through the court. He has taught innumerable attorneys the procedural aspects of working in a clerk's office, from obtaining a cognovit note judgment to securing a court cost refund.

Mr. Klein has been in the public employ since June 1932, when he went to work for the building department of the city of Cleveland. Before joining the clerk's office in 1940, he worked with the county auditor for 3 years and with the city utilities division for 1 year.

Mr. Klein attended Kennard Junior High School and Longwood Commerce High, from which he graduated in 1924. In 1925, he attended Spencerian Business College and, from 1929 to 1932, took a night course in accounting and commercial law at Dyke Business College.

Mrs. Billie Reed, docket supervisor at probate court, came to Cleveland in 1939, after graduating from Wilberforce University with a B.S. degree in social administration. In June 1941, she started working for the probate court as a deputy clerk. She attended elementary and high school in Richmond, Ind. Mrs. Reed devotes her spare time to the Community AME Church, her garden, and to her favorite leisurely pastime, fishing.

The testimonial luncheon was arranged by Attorney Franklin A. Polk, chairman; Dale Powers, narrator; William A. Weiss, coordinator; Harry Auslander, secretary; Judge Perry B. Jackson; Otto Themann, Nelson N. Moss; Andrew J. Lukcso; Lucien B. Karlovec, Jr.; and Raymond D. Metzner, the program's originator.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting these five public servants, who have contributed so much to the city of Cleveland.

MORE ON THE FRENCH CONNECTION TO HEROIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, with the recent discovery of a Turkish Senator smuggling morphine base into France and the seizure of nearly 1,000 pounds of pure heroin processed in southern France by French Customs officials, the French Government is at last resuming its investigation of the Delouette-Fournier narcotics trafficking affair.

Judge Gabriel Roussel, a French investigating magistrate, has finally arrived in the United States to question Roger Delouette, the self-proclaimed drug smuggler who was convicted of shipping 96 pounds of heroin into this country last April. Delouette has maintained that Col. Paul Fournier, a top-level French counterespionage official, was intimately involved in the smuggling ring, but Fournier has refused to come to the United States for questioning.

While it is, indeed, a hopeful sign that Roussel has arrived here to investigate this affair, we in Congress should not be satisfied with that alone. The Department of State and the Department of Justice should insist that Herbert Stern, the U.S. attorney for the State of New Jersey, be permitted by the French Government to travel to Paris and question Colonel Fournier. If we are to make any progress against those who traffic in dangerous drugs, then international cooperation—not defiance—must be the key.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article from the New York Times in the RECORD at this point on Judge Roussel's visit.

FRENCH JUDGE COMES TO QUERY HEROIN SMUGGLER

(By Eric Pace)

France's chief judicial expert on narcotics smuggling arrived here yesterday to seek information from and about a Frenchman who has pleaded guilty to smuggling $12-million worth of heroin from France to New Jersey.

Judge Gabriel Roussel, an investigating magistrate, is expected to meet today with his compatriot, Roger Delouette, now a prisoner-chef at Somerset County Jail in New Jersey, where he is becoming noted for his tuna souffles.

"Je suit tres optimiste," the lanky judge declaimed when asked about the prospects for his inquiry. In France he has questioned Col. Paul Fournier, a French counter-espionage expert who, Delouette says, masterminded the smuggling plot.

Judge Roussel's visit here, made at the behest of the French Ministry of Justice, followed a wave of antinarcotics activity by officials in France. After Washington had complained for years that French officials were lenient with international drug smugglers, they cracked down when narcotics abuse spread markedly within France.

A figure of magisterial dignity in a velvet trimmed topcoat, the judge was met by a delegation of American law enforcement officials when his Air France Boeing 707 from Paris arrived, 20 minutes late, at Kennedy International Airport.

Chief among the American officials was Herbert Stern, the United States Attorney for New Jersey. The judge shook his hand, but did not embrace him, and Mr. Stern declared that "he has come here to carry out the French investigation and to question Delouette."

The warden of Somerset County Jail, Louis Balent, said Delouette had not yet been sentenced. When he pleaded guilty to a conspiracy charge in November, sentencing was deferred pending a probation report, and Delouette was remanded to his jail cell with his $500,000 bail continued.

Reached at the jail yesterday, Warden Balent said he assumed the sentencing was being postponed pending "negotiations with the French consulate and the examining magistrate."

Judge Roussel said he also hoped to confer with Mr. Stern, who last year challenged Colonel Fournier to come to this country to stand trial. The colonel replied, "If I am guilty, Mr. Stern, prove it and justice will follow its course."

Yesterday Mr. Stern declined to discuss details of the case, which came to light when heroin was discovered in a Volkswagen camper that had been shipped to Delouette at port Elizabeth, N.J.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER'S FINE SPEECH

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this year's Veterans of Foreign Wars' "Voice of Democracy" contest in Iowa was won by a constituent of mine, David William Hostetler of 2836 Rownd Street in Cedar Falls, Iowa.

I know that his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roger E. Hostetler, his five sisters and brothers, and all who know him are as proud of this fine young man's achievement as I am.

It is a privilege to have the opportunity to insert David's winning speech in the RECORD at this point:

I HAVE PLANS

(By David William Hostetler)

Against Nature's silence I use action
In the vast indifference I invent meaning
I don't watch unmoved, I intervene
And say that this and this are wrong
And I work to alter them and improve them.
What we do is just a shadow of what we want to do
And the only truths we can point to are the ever-changing truths of our own experience
You'll see it all one day
I have plans.

These words from Marat-Sade by Peter Wiess express the importance of finding meaning in life, of using action to solve problems, and of maintaining a constant hope. Meaning, hope, and action are all around us.

In the middle of our world there stands a forest. A forest alive with all the beauty, calmness and growth of nature. This forest stands as an endless continuum of creation and a constant renewal of life. But in the distant is a burning, raging destruction, covering all the land. The fire comes, destroys, and then moves on, forever destroying. All that remains are the burnt branches, the ashes, and the lifeless bodies of those animals that couldn't escape. A forest once filled with the beauty of nature turns to bleakness.

But through the ashes, the lifelessness and remains there stands one lonely jackpine. A very common tree that grows only where there has been a forest fire. Protecting within the cone is the seed that is released only under intense heat. In the midst of destruction there stands this vitality of nature. A persistent hope in the dark.

Fires are raging in America today. We are told by some that our population will double by the year 2000. We are told by others that China is becoming a nuclear super-power with enough atomic weapons to destroy much of the world in a single blow. There is poverty and hunger across our land. There is war and the threat of other wars.

Frank Ericson is a jackpine. He loves the outdoors and conservation has become a

major commitment in his life. All of his concerns fell into perspective when he read an article about the ecological damage we're doing in Vietnam from mass bombing and bio-chemical war. He's seen the effects near his home town where the Army's nerve gas killed over 6,000 sheep. Frank Ericson got a draft deferment to work in ecology. He said "I do owe my country something. How can I be a conservationist and destroy South-East Asia? I'm trying to do something positive. So he uses action. He doesn't watch unmoved, but intervenes and says that this and this are wrong and he works to alter and improve them. Frank Ericson has plans.

I haven't experienced war or poverty. I am not in a position to see the nuclear threat China poses. I don't even know what it's like to go for days without a meal. I have not experienced the fire. However, we are all jackpines. Like the jackpine protected within each one of us is this infinite hope built into life. Like the jackpine this hope is not released unless we experience the fire.

My responsibility to freedom rests in experiencing and finding meaning in life, using action to solve problems and maintaining a constant hope. Unless we build our own prisons, we are free to experience life. All of us have the potential to be a jackpine. In the midst of despair we can be that vitality of nature, that persistent hope in the dark. You'll see it all one day. For I have plans.

ELIMINATE THE STRIKE AND SAVE ON SHOE LEATHER

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the recent west coast dock strike cost agriculture millions of dollars in lost sales. Other segments of our economy suffer equally when there is a work stoppage. It is generally agreed that no one wins a strike.

This reasoning was well developed in an editorial by Charles W. Rather in the St. Cloud Daily Times in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which I would like to insert in the RECORD:

ELIMINATE THE STRIKE AND SAVE ON SHOE LEATHER

George Meany, head of the 16-million member AFL–CIO, says strikes no longer make sense and suggests voluntary binding arbitration as a substitute for them. What he is offering is a lot of pants-warming at the bargaining table to save shoe leather on the picket line. And why not.

Meany says strikes are outdated because workers simply can't afford them because with incomes of more than $7,500 (and that's well below the national average wage) they've got so many commitments to home and family they're flat on their backs in a week on the strike line.

That's a good enough reason for the AFL–CIO to begin digging for a formula for reaching binding contract agreements on a voluntary basis and it ought to be good enough for others to endorse it.

But there are other reasons. There is a growing public aversion to the strike. It's a nuisance at the very least and a costly affair at the most. In the evolution of this economy there is a vast public stake in these disruptions. For far from putting a few people on a picket line in an isolated area as once may have been the case, strikes are now potent weapons of great force able to shut down entire sectors of the economy and cripple other related industries.

Congress seems in no mood now, or in the near future, to do anything permanent about the labor relations picture and maybe they shouldn't have to. It is a growing and complex issue of national structure, to be sure, but maybe the country is not ready to accept a ban on strikes as a federal policy or failing that accept a complicated intrusion of government into what ought to be a face-to-face situation. Meany's idea couched in economic terms we all understand in a better way.

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the conference report on S. 18, to provide assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, was filed, and hopefully, final action will be taken by the House and Senate in the early future.

The conference report provides $36 million for fiscal year 1972 for RFE and RL, and also establishes a temporary commission to conduct a one-time study and evaluation of international radio broadcasting as well as the related activities of RFE and RL.

In this connection, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an open letter about Radio Free Europe which appeared in the March 7 edition of the Polish Daily Zgoda, an outstanding ethnic newspaper serving the Chicagoland area, and also to an editorial which appeared in today's Washington Post entitled "Radio Free Europe and Detente."

Both the open letter written by Aloysius A. Mazewski, distinguished president of the Polish American Congress, and the editorial underline and reiterate the great need for continuing free discourse to which these international broadcasts contribute in large measure.

The open letter and the editorial follow:

RADIO FREE EUROPE

DEAR SIR: According to information coming from the Senate-House conference on certain disputed items of foreign expenditures, you have threatened to veto, singlehandedly, modest appropriation for Radio Free Europe.

Your contentions seem to be that in view of President Nixon's forthcoming visit to Moscow, we should be "nice" to the Russians, or they will revert back to their old intransigence, and block our policy of accomodation which is to supercede that of confrontation.

You are entitled to your opinion. And although sharply disagreeing with it, I respect it.

However, your rather autocratic statement at the conference that you will not allow Radio Free Europe to continue its activities, brings to my mind the concept of the "arrogance of power" which you misapplied in your dissertations on America's noble post war efforts in foreign aid.

Actually, arrogance of power came into being much earlier, during the Yalta conference in 1945.

It was then, that the United States, through its diplomacy, acceded to the power of politics of the Soviet Union and tacitly agreed to the application of the arrogance of power, sealing the fate of 150 million people in Central and Eastern Europe without consulting them and against their national will.

Through diplomacy, we, as one of the victorious powers, have consented to give to Soviet dominations vast lands which were not ours to give.

We have tacitly agreed to the destruction of the basic liberties and fundamental rights of man in entire nation with historic tradition of democracy and millennial ties with the Western civilization and culture.

Official explanation of these give-aways to which we had no right was, that the compelling reason for them has been the forlorn hope that Soviet Union will be less truculent in post war dealings with the free nations of the West.

History proved otherwise. After the Yalta agreement and shortly after the cessation of hostilities in Europe, we entered the era of Cold War.

An earnest contest for the mind of the modern man has begun.

In his struggle, Radio Free Europe stands out as the most effective instrument in reaching the people cut off by the Iron Curtain from the free flow of objective news and the interplay of ideas of the open societies of the West.

For those people, whose fate was sealed by the arrogance of power at Yalta, the Orvellian nightmare arrived much sooner than 1984.

The "Big Brother" concept of a closed, totalitarian society with concomitant thought control, directed news and commentaries, and educational system geared to bring up young generations in restrictive communist sophistries, have become the way of life for nations of the Eastern half of Europe.

For them, the only contact with the West, the only source of objective news, the only breath of freedom comes through the Radio Free Europe facilities.

As any institution of man, RFE is not perfect. However, it has learned respect, confidence and unprecedented popularity among the people living under communist tyranny and longing for freedom.

Whatever it is, RFE is not an aggressive or offensive weapon. Its only mission is truthful, objective reporting of events on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

What can the Soviet Union give in exchange for the liquidation of Radio Free Europe? Nothing in this particular area of news dissemination.

The Soviet Union does not need any facility similar to Radio Free Europe, since every Communist party in the West is in fact a propaganda agency for Moscow.

To close down Radio Free Europe just because it is inconvenient to the tyrants of Moscow and their satraps in satellite countries would be equivalent to telling the subjugated nations that the United States is no longer interested in their present travail or in their future.

It would, indeed, be a raw and inhuman display of the arrogance of power.

I do not believe American people would accept this newest concession to the Soviet Union at the expense of the people who believe in our good will and see in the United States the hope and the promise of a better future for humanity.

I hope that as a scholar statesman of considerable knowledge, experience and influence you will reconsider your position regarding RFE and take under advisement its intrinsic value and revelancy which far surpasses any shortcomings it may have in term of political expediency.

Respectfully,

ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI,
President.

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

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND DETENTE

Senator Fulbright's opposition to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty raises a seri-

ous and legitimate question about detente. He is right, of course, that these broadcasts—which will end on June 30, if he has his way—are a form of intervention in the internal affairs of East Europe and the Soviet Union: not a cold-war provocation but an attempt to nourish precisely those liberal, reformist and democratic elements which are personified so well by Mr. Fulbright in the United States but which are discouraged if not altogether suppressed by their Communist rulers. And as the senator states, the broadcasts do irritate East European and Soviet governments—even though, as he himself fairmindedly concedes, there is no evidence that their irritation has proved an obstacle to actual diplomacy. Mr. Fulbright contends only that the broadcasts are inconsistent with detente and may raise doubts about American sincerity.

The question remains: even if the Kremlin's and East Europe's irritation does not spill over into negotiations, is it worth irritating them by continuing the broadcasts? We submit the answer is yes. It seems to us every bit as right and reasonable for RFE and RL to speak to those who care to listen, their governments' irritation notwithstanding, as it is for senators to voice their dissent from a president, his irritation notwithstanding. Granted, it is hard to establish that such broadcasts actually will help create a more democratic and, presumably, a more detente-minded socialist community, just as it is hard to establish the effects of a senator's dissents. In both situations, however, irritation is a relatively small and manageable price to pay in order to serve the larger values of an open society, in particular, dedication to free discourse and peaceable change. The rationale of RFE and RL is not, as Mr. Fulbright suggests, "the arrogant belief that people around the world will act like we want them to act if we only tell them how." The proper rationale is our belief in a free society. Fortunately, detente requires neither Americans nor Russians to set their fundamental values aside.

This is not to say that RFE and RL, formerly supported by CIA, must continue as before. In fact, thanks in large part to Fulbright's assault, they cannot. He said on March 6 that the stations should be liquidated "unless perhaps our European allies are willing to pick up their fair share of the financial burden." On Feb. 17, however, he had expressed the judgment, which is shared even by the stations' friends, that there is not "any indication that (our allies) can be talked into putting up some money to support these radios." Indeed, to convert a 20-year American operation into an alliance project, under the June 30 gun now held by Senator Fulbright, is simply not feasible. We do not have dogmatic views on how RFE and RL should henceforth be financed, or on how their funds and programs should be related to those of the official station, the Voice of America. We earnestly believe, however, that these are problems which can be reasonably solved, if Mr. Fulbright will permit.

THE TALE OF TWO GROCERS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper recently carried the tale of two grocers in Brooklyn, N.Y. The one grocer who had a gun and used it is alive; the second grocer who did not have a gun lies near death.

Strangely, those constitutionalist advocates of the first and fifth amendments remain silent as to the second amendment guarantee also being extended by the 14th amendment to the States.

I include the related newsclipping at this point:

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

GROCERS' DILEMMA: KILL OR BE KILLED

(By Stephen Isaacs)

BROOKLYN, N.Y.—"If every businessman be like me," says Vidal Nunez, "I don't think there be so many holdups."

"When they push you around," he says in his broken but determined English, "they walk on you. I know. I lived in Harlem one time."

To "be like me," from the 5-foot, 2-inch vantage point of Nunez, is to be tough, carry a gun, and use it.

Which is exactly what he did around midnight on Jan. 15, 1971, in his little bodega on New Lots Avenue in the tough East New York section here.

By the time the echoes of the three explosions from Nunez's .25-caliber Beretta had subsided, a crowd of curious (and angry) blacks stood outside, peering at the fresh corpse of a young black man who had tried to "walk on" Vidal Nunez—to steal a 59-cent jar of mayonnaise from his store and to grab Mr. Nunez's wallet.

"Right now," says Nunez, "I am poor and I am small, but these guys, they know they can't do much with me. In this town, people are too soft with them. They walk all over the white people in this country."

A week ago, New York Supreme Court Justice Joseph R. Corso sentenced Vidal Nunez to five years' probation for the murder of the young man, who had been unarmed.

Meanwhile, across the East River in Manhattan, Jose Ferrer speaks more softly, since that is all the breath he can summon, from his hospital bed in the intensive care unit of Metropolitan Hospital, where he has lain near death since last Dec. 18.

Ferrer, 42, had operated a bodega on 97th Street, at the southern edge of Spanish Harlem. Two young men came into his store, and Ferrer had no gun.

The bullet that tore into Ferrer's chest, collapsed his right lung, skimmed the left and somehow managed to sever his liver and end up (where it still is) lodged next to his spinal column about halfway down his back.

Why didn't he have a gun to protect himself?

"I never felt like having anything like that. You know, you feel you might do something crazy."

But how do you stop the kids who are constantly coming into the store, dipping into the cash register, swiping a six-pack of beer?

Not with a gun, says Jose Ferrer. "You don't kill a man for that. A life is too much."

"The law says you should not have had a gun," Justice Corso had told Nunez before sentencing him. "The law says that under the circumstances, you should not have killed, but I can appreciate the problem that decent businessmen have in trying to protect their business in this fun city that we are living in.

"This man (Nunez) is 55 years of age. He has had a generally good record. He has tried to earn a decent, lawful living. He has been robbed; he has been assaulted; he has been harassed, and he has been shot at. It is unfortunate that a life was taken. While he has violated the law, I could not in good conscience do anything more than sentence this defendant to probation for five years."

Sitting in his cluttered office upstairs in the dingy 5th precinct stationhouse in Chinatown, Deputy Inspector Emile Racine head of New York's Crime Prevention Squad, shakes his head at the cases of Vidal Nunez and Jose Ferrer.

"In past years I've tried to discourage these shopkeepers from getting gun licenses," he says.

"It's just not a matter of slinging on a six-shooter and feeling all your problems are solved.

"After all, most holdup men would just let a holdup take its natural course. If you undertake to reach for a six-gun, you undertake the awesome responsibility of the return fire you're going to draw from the holdup man."

And, Inspector Racine points out, even if the shopkeeper wins the gun battle, he may not win the war. "In some instances," he says, "you find return harassment by the kin of the shot individual."

It is something that Nunez understands. Since he killed the youth in his store, he says, he has heard that three or four friends of the youth are out to get him.

But Nunez will not back down a bit—even though he has pledged to the court not to get another gun. "If you show fear," he says, "they'll attack you. That's why they attack the old ladies.

"Those three or four friends. They know now what I can do to them. If I can kill one, I can kill two or three or four more."

Even before the incident for which Nunez ended up charged with murder, the neighbors around his store feared Nunez—some of them had heard that he had even killed one young tough who had tried to hold him up.

Having that kind of reputation, Nunez feels, is the only way to stay in business in New York City if you're a small groceryman.

"Lots of citizens argue with me about it, says Inspector Racine. "They say, 'Your policy is to let criminals have the guns, but not let the law-abiding people have them. If more people were armed, these people would be more respected.

"We did that once—in the old West—and you could die in an afternoon, over something like whose glass is fuller."

"I'm a realist," says the inspector, who was born in Brooklyn himself. "I know that Nunez thought he was doing the right thing at the moment. How was he to know the guy didn't have a gun? He's just as frightened if the guy had his hand on an empty smoking pipe."

"What are these little shopkeepers to do?" asks Sara Halbert, the attorney for both Nunez and Ferrer. "Nunez told me about the problems there. What should he do? They wouldn't give him a gun. They've all been held up."

She points to her law partner's two brothers, both of whom operated groceries in Brooklyn. One got out of the business after 11 holdups, the other after seven.

She feels that every shopkeeper in the city, or any city, should not have a gun, but wonders what else a man can do. Nunez, she says, "overreacted. He's trigger-happy. That's why I didn't take a chance on going to the jury. As the judge said, it's not a question of sympathy, it's a question of the facts."

"I told Nunez, when he asked me what he should do the next time some one holds him up and he hasn't got a gun, that you'll just have to die."

To get Nunez off without a sentence, Mrs. Halbert followed a typical legal pattern. She shopped around for a judge who could be lenient with her client, and then "plea bargained."

But she remains unsettled by the case, as do most of those involved.

As for Nunez, he is scared, because he has seen such a history of violence in the stores he has operated.

An Inca who immigrated to the United States from Peru in 1953, Nunez has operated a number of stores in Brooklyn.

The first time he was held up, he says, was in 1962, when "three young guys came into the store with a .22 gun. It was on Sunday. They said, 'This is holdup. Give us your money.' And I pulled a watergun out of my pocket, real fast, and put against the neck of one of these guys and he shouted, 'No, no, Nunez, don't shoot' and they run."

Twice, says Nunez, he applied to police precincts for pistol permits. But each time he was told that his volume of business did not justify a permit. So he got a gun anyway. He used to carry it in his right front trousers pocket.

"I never used to show it," he says, "but they knew I had it."

The store in which the fatal shooting occured was held up four times in all, says Nunez, and broken into and looted repeatedly at night * * * on Dec. 22, 1969, when three youths came in to hold him up and, when he made a quick movement, shot him. The bullet passed through his left arm.

The youth he killed a year ago, says Nunez, was the same youth who twice before had pilfered from his shelves. He says he shot the youth not because of the jar of mayonnaise, but because the youth, when challenged, swung at him and then, when Nunez ducked, reached for Nunez's wallet, which was in his back pocket. In the same motion as the youth went for the wallet, Nunez says, he went for his own pocket and his gun and fired three quick shots.

Nunez and Ferrer have been wiped out financially by their most recent violent experiences.

After he was jailed on a murder charge, Nunez's store and his apartment were broken into and most of what he owned was stolen. He is now operating a store 40 blocks distant. The new store is in another man's name since, with a homicide conviction, Nunez himself cannot obtain a license to sell beer. He is deeply in debt, and his three children are in foster homes.

Ferrer's family is even worse off, since they have no income and their outgo includes $60 a month in tuition payments to parochial schools for three of their four daughters.

"I want to pay my debts," he says. "Those people need the money, too. They're part of my family but, you know, they need, too."

He figures he will lose his store and probably have to take a job washing dishes for $50 or $60 a week.

Both men and their families are casualties of the street war, and both feel that most of the people who have broken into their stores, have held them up, have shot at them, are narcotics addicts who desperately need the money.

All the stores in both their neighborhoods are hit repeatedly. The 75th precinct, where Nunez shot the youth, recorded 2,413 robberies last year, 4,970 burglaries, 1,040 felonious assaults.

No easy solutions for the problem exist, according to Racine. Certainly New York City, with its overwhelming volume of crime (88,994 robberies, 181,331 burglaries, 33,865 assaults, 1,468 murders in 1971) seems to be the place where the problem is most acute—not because it is highest in per capita crime, but because of the great number of addicts who need money to feed their habits. Estimates of their numbers here range from 150,000 to 400,000.

"The answer," he says, "lies outside, in how to get this guy not to need the $135-a-day habit. Those guys need that fix. They don't know right from wrong. You can't talk morals to these kids. They're in a different corridor of the building, and that corridor's got no door. These guys are in another world, and until you get them back into this corridor of the building, there's no way, no way, until you can get people not to want the goddamned stuff.

"It's almost impossible to stop a holdup man."

What he is finding in New York, he says, is that many citizens understand that impossibility and are flouting the law by arming themselves.

"You find these women with tear gas guns, the cabbies with the lead pipes or the knives or the guns under the seat, or the grocers. What they feel is, 'I don't care about a technical charge. It's my life you're talking about.'

"It just can't go to jungle warfare. We won't be able to leave our families during the day. We'll all have to go back to living in stockades."

"Maybe," says the policeman, "some doctor—say like a Dr. Salk—could invent a vaccine that would make an addict pop out in warts or something. That would solve a hell of a lot of this."

Meanwhile, on the streets and in the shops, no solution is at hand.

Nunez, who grew up where alpacas and vicunas run free and condors soar overhead, spends his nights sleeping on a cot wedged into a corner of his little store in Flatbush, with a 150-pound German Shepherd as company, lest another break-in be attempted.

And Ferrer, who came to New York in 1947 because he did not want his life's work to be cane cutting in Puerto Rico, is hoping that the infectious material will stop accumulating in his liver and that the only other operation he will need (he has undergone two already) will be to cut the bullet out of his back.

RESTORE DRUG EDUCATION FUNDS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 12 of my colleagues representing New York City have joined me in appealing to legislative leaders in Albany to prevent a planned cutoff in State funding for drug education programs in the public schools.

In view of the overwhelming importance of drug education efforts, we are urging swift action on legislation to continue funding these programs. Present State budget plans call for cutting off funds for drug education and prevention programs while continuing the drug treatment efforts.

To so neglect education and prevention is being insensitive to the needs of our young people and our society. The final victims of the cuts in our drug education programs are our children, and the only beneficiaries are the drug pushers. Many of the approximately 200,000 addicts in New York City are teenagers, and we want to insure that no more children are added to that grotesque figure.

The drug education programs have been administered by the 31 local school boards and the board of education. The year-old efforts have reached 160,000 students with information and counseling on the hazards of drug abuse.

I am inserting our letters in the RECORD at this point:

THE FOLLOWING LETTER WAS SENT TO THE HONORABLE WARREN M. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND THE HONORABLE WILLIS H. STEVENS, CHAIRMAN, WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN THE ASSEMBLY IN THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to urge you to take immediate and positive action to restore funding for school-based drug education programs. This is the time to strengthen these valuable programs, not to weaken them.

The drug abuse problem needs no new documentation. We are all well aware that it begins in the elementary schools and involvement of our children increases as they grow older. Our jails are full of addicts and our cities are full of their victims. Institutions throughout our society, from the schools themselves to the armed forces, are seriously damaged by drug abusers. The best time to combat this enormous threat is early, and the best place is the school. The School Prevention of Addiction Through Rehabilitation and Knowledge program (SPARK) and the efforts of New York's 31 school districts, are vital in the attempt to prevent drug abuse and must receive full refunding.

It is not enough to fund only treatment programs. Such decisions admit defeat in preventing drug abuse and this is one war which we can never give up. To neglect education and prevention programs strikes us as unbalanced and insensitive to the needs of our young people and our society.

We are aware that different school districts have utilized funds available to them at different rates and with varying degrees of success. We are also aware that evaluation in this very human, non-technical area is extremely difficult. Nevertheless, these obstacles must not be allowed to obscure the overwhelming importance of drug education efforts. The factual information our students are provided, in addition to the individual and group counseling troubled youths receive, is absolutely crucial in any effort aimed at protecting them against the drug threat.

The drug education programs have already helped abusers to become non-users; non-users have been given incentives and support to remain healthy and safe. The final victims of the cuts in our drug education programs are our children, and the only beneficiaries are the drug pushers.

As you know, there are already some 200,000 addicts in New York City. Please help us to ensure that no more children are added to that grotesque figure.

Sincerely,

Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Bella S. Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, Herman Badillo, Mario Biaggi, Jonathan B. Bingham, Emanuel Celler, James J. Delaney, Seymour Halpern, Edward I. Koch, William F. Ryan, Lester Wolff, John W. Wydler.

THE FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the Asian-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce has released a comprehensive statement in opposition to the proposed Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972. Because of the importance of this proposal and the impact which it would have upon American firms, I share this analysis with my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

THE FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972—HARTKE-BURKE BILL

The Asian Pacific Council of the American Chambers of Commerce request that the proposed Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 or any portions thereof be voted against and that legislation be enacted to

tackle the real problems of multinational corporations and free trade. These Bills (S. 2592 and HR 10914) in their present formats would stifle U.S. economic and corporate growth by increasing the reasons for not investing in the United States. Many companies would probably be forced to actually move their facilities from the United States to foreign countries. Their assets would include buildings, banking and capital, their management, and worst of all, their technological resources. U.S. companies would be forced to treat the United States as an export market from a foreign base with little or no return to the U.S. economy.

If this proposed Act is passed, specifically:

1. It will reduce the market area for U.S. products produced in the United States and now sold overseas.

2. It will increase the price on goods sold in the United States because of the rising cost of research and of limited access to foreign goods.

3. It would virtually eliminate our reciprocal access to foreign technology which again would assist in raising consumer prices in the United States.

4. It would reduce the dividends now received on multinational stock in the United States.

5. It would lead indirectly to more international conflict by reducing the capital, technology and management expertise now available to stabilize foreign economies.

6. It would in the long run lead to greater unemployment in the U.S. with the loss of export markets.

The proposed restrictions of these bills will force U.S. multinational corporations to look at the following points much more closely.

1. Move Research and Development Facilities outside the United States to avoid possible U.S. restrictions on world wide use of patents at a time when the need to amortize the increasingly higher cost of research and development requires a world wide market.

2. Replace its U.S. employees with personnel of other nationalities overseas to avoid higher U.S. personal income tax on existing U.S. employees just to remain competitive.

3. Relocate its corporate offices outside of the United States and serve it as an export market from a foreign base to avoid the double taxation and restrictions on technological transfers.

These are just a few of the doomsday choices available to the U.S. consumer, labor, and the U.S. multinational corporations if the proposed Foreign Trade and Investment Act is adopted.

The United States of America is the most successful common market in the world today. However, if any individual state limited the technological flow to other states, penalized its workers for working in other states, enacted prejudicial taxes on its registered companies setting up subsidiaries in other states, or imposed trade quotas on imports from other states, America's current level of prosperity would never have been achieved. Indeed, its residents and the companies they work for would have moved to other locations long ago. We have been able to eliminate a great deal of civil strife and at the same time raise our standard of living within our United States. There is no reason to think that this kind of existence cannot be carried on outside our national boundaries.

The growing interdependence of world economies will not perimt the United States of America, let alone a single state of our Union, to economically and thereby politically secede from the growing global union. The Foreign Trade and Investment Act, in effect, proposes that the United States secede. With this secession, it would give up its role as the world economic and trading leader. We cannot make the point strong enough that the result of this would be to lose the bulk of the export market and returns from U.S. capital investment overseas.

A multitude of studies are currently being carried out by several responsible academic oragnizations, both public and private, in the United States which will fully document the U.S. multinationals positive balance of assets against liabilities. The Asian Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce, "APCAC", does not propose to review these studies here, but instead wishes to offer responsible alternatives to these Bills. These suggestions are offered as a possible means of enhancing the leadership role of the United States of America and to redress the current imbalance in the U.S. economy. If this is not firmly met it will culminate in our country's economic and political isolation.

The proposed Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 must be rejected. In its place, we offer that the U.S. Executive and Legislative Branches of the Government take the following action.

1. Inform the U.S. consumer of the advantages of freer, rather than increasingly more restrictive trade policies and practices.

2. Subsidize government studies of world wide economic trends, as Japan does, so that adequate plans could be prepared for the future economic needs of the United States. This information should be disseminated to both labor, multinational management, and developing countries.

3. Eliminate restrictive and discriminatory trade and investment practices and policies. We recommend that the United States dismantle both tariff and non-tariff barriers on a reciprocal guarantee basis by country.

4. A recognition that multinationals are the most effective economic mechanism for foreign development and assistance. Their ability to move resources, technology and management efficiently and at a profit is undisputed.

5. Foster the multinationalisation of labor overseas. Labor already has a common interest; we wish to also add a common identity and purpose with the U.S. multinationals.

6. Inform all levels of labor with unbiased information. Specifically here, we wish to mention the benefits accruing to them through the maintaining of the economic health of the multinationals, such as Union pension funds that are dependent very heavily on the performance of multinationals for their members' ultimate security and welfare.

7. Establish adequate worker retraining and plant adaptation funds, subsidies, and programs to phase out inefficient U.S. producers and introduce more productive facilities and equipment.

Rather than handcuff the most dynamic force of the United States economy with retrogressive measures, we feel that legislation and executive action should be taken to prepare labor and business for the future economic realities of freer, not more restrictive, trade and investment policies. Legislation such as the proposed Foreign Trade and Investment Act clearly chooses to ignore these opportunities for a dynamic future; it chooses instead to protect the bones of the buried past. Should any part of this legislation be enacted now it will adversely affect the U.S. economic and political opportunities, not only in the Asian Pacific area, but throughout the rest of the world.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP. IN SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my own remarks and a statement concerning the Georgia-Pacific Corp. which recently appeared in the Augusta Chronicle. I hope everyone who receives the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take time to read this statement.

I do not know of any company that has done more to relieve unemployment and also increase the standard of living in South Carolina than the Georgia-Pacific Corp. I do hope Congress will never pass legislation that will impress upon the rights of these great industrial organizations, as they are certainly one of the outstanding reasons for the progress we have made in South Carolina during the past 25 years. The article follows:

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Mar. 5, 1972]

"INCREDIBLE" DOESN'T DESCRIBE IT

(By Louis C. Harris)

Back when I was courting my wife-to-be, lo these many moons ago, Russellville, S.C.—near which she lived—wasn't even a wide place in the road. That deficiency was due in large measure to the fact that if the back-country road leading to Russellville had been any wider, half of it probably would have been in the adjacent swamp.

In other words, one could hardly have described Russellville as a thriving city. As a matter of fact, folks residing more than 25 miles from it may not have known that it even existed. Its claim to fame was that it supported a small sawmill which gave employment there to a few hardy souls and sustained, by way of its small payroll, a couple or so general stores.

Today, the Berkeley County town is still a long way from being a metropolis. It still remains off the beaten path and there is a good possibility that many a South Carolinian couldn't tell you where Russellville is because he may not have ever heard of it.

But the town looks like one now and, one of these days, it may look more like a city than a town. The road connecting Russellville to Highway 52 and Moncks Corner has been widened and paved. Scores of new residences have been constructed, new business establishments have opened and Russellville's economy, as well as that of nearby St. Stephen, is booming.

People are happier because there's now a reason for living. Folks who were at the poverty level for years suddenly have good jobs and good pay. They not only have food in their tummies and clothing on their backs; they have money in their pockets. The good life has come to Russellville.

The metamorphosis has been dramatic, and the credit belongs to the Georgia-Pacific Corporation. It has created, in the backwoods of Berkeley—at a cost of more than $20 million in capital investment—a brand spanking new forestry products complex—a plywood factory, particle board plant, chip-and-saw mill and supporting logging operations—which currently gives work to almost a thousand residents of Berkeley and Williamsburg Counties. In addition to providing an annual payroll approximating $6½ million, G-P is spending, for local purchase of raw materials and supplies, in excess of $10 million a year.

And, you know what? The federal government is now taking action which could lead to the curtailment—and possible elimination—of the good life that has come to this one-time economically depressed and culturally starved community!

Slightly more than a year ago—in January of 1971—the Federal Trade Commission challenged the purchase by Georgia-Pacific of 16 forestry products firms and ordered the Augusta-born company to divest itself of five of 13 plywood plants it had built in several of the Southern states. One was at Russellville.

The government contention is that G-P action lessens competition and creates a monopoly.

It would be ludicrous if it wasn't such a deadly serious matter affecting the future of so many people. If FTC is permitted to force G-P to sell its plant at Russellville, for instance, what makes the bureaucrats think that a monopoly won't eventually exist again? Any firm large enough to purchase it will be one already with extensive forestry products holdings. It most probably will ship raw materials from its own plants to the Russellville plywood plant and, if that occurs, what happens to the satellite chip-and-saw mill and particle board plant at Russellville? One of two things: They will be forced to curtail operations and cut off personnel or, as could be the case, be sold to the firm which will have bought the plywood plant, setting up again the very "monopoly" which the FTC is undertaking to eliminate!

The Government contends that Georgia-Pacific accounts for the production and sale of more than 35 per cent of the softwood plywood produced in the South. That is true. But, seen from G–P's viewpoint, this is a loss, not a gain. It is a considerable drop from the 100 per cent Georgia-Pacific enjoyed after it had pioneered in the development of softwood plywood and brought to the South from the West Coast a manufacturing process in which it invested millions of dollars and created thousands of new jobs.

In other words, since Georgia-Pacific made the first plywood from Southern pine trees, other manufacturing concerns have gotten into the act and G–P no longer has the "monopoly" it actually did enjoy at the outset.

As a matter of fact, instead of throwing governmental monkey wrenches into G–P's machinery, the FTC—and other government agencies, as well—should applaud the corporation's success in building plants which are keeping thousands of persons back on the farm, as it were, and out of the overly-populated cities. For that, alone, if for no other reason, the government should pin a medal on G–P, not tag it with a lawsuit.

Just last month, when Georgia-Pacific dedicated its plants at Russellville and at Emporia, Va., the governors of both Virginia and South Carolina said as much.

Said Gov. Linwood Holton of Virginia: "It's incredible to me that a giant supplier of jobs and materials has to stop and defend itself against such an order. I ask now that the FTC reconsider its order."

At Russellville, Gov. John West of South Carolina said: "As we view this plant and see firsthand the significant investment that has been made and realize the great impact that this will have on the economy of this section of our state, I find it difficult to comprehend that the plywood plant here is named in an action by the Federal Trade Commission. . . . We see all about us today indications that the government is interested in trying to stimulate employment and economic activity, and it is incredible that Georgia-Pacific has to defend itself for making this kind of contribution to the economy of the area."

The governors are eminently right. It is incredible. And when you consider that the price of plywood is well below what it was 10 and 20 years ago, the FTC action not only is incredible, it is unreasonable, unfair and unwarranted.

If you don't believe it, ask the folks at Russellville.

KATHY BOLAND'S WINNING ESSAY

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, this year, an estimated half a million high school students throughout the Nation participated in the annual Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and VFW Auxiliary. The students, competing for five national scholarships, submitted essays on the theme "My Responsibility to Freedom."

I was delighted to learn that the Wyoming State winner is Miss Kathlynn Ann Boland, the daughter of Ed and Arden Boland of Casper, my good friends over many years. I have every confidence that in the example of her parents, whose many labors for the Democratic Party are known throughout Wyoming, Kathy found renewed faith in the political process and the validity of choosing a path of active involvement in the making of a better world.

Kathy's receipt of the Voice of Democracy honor is only the latest accomplishment in an admirable academic career. She is a senior at Natrona County High School, where her activities include student body coordinator, vice president of choir, secretary of the National Forensic League, secretary of French Club, chairman of the Ecology Club, editor of the annual, and member of the Natrona County Educational Appraisal Committee.

She won the Wyoming competition for the William Randolph Hearst Senate Youth contest, the American Civil Liberties Union 50th anniversary essay contest, the JoAnn Blower trophy for outstanding interpreter and was named to the Wyoming mathematics team, the Wyoming Parents Teachers Association Council and to the National Honor Society.

I insert for the RECORD Kathy's winning essay with the hope that her ringing affirmation of freedom is representative of her generation:

FREEDOM IS DETERMINING ONE'S OWN DESTINY

When we were children, our lives were filled with gossamer-winged fairy queens, afternoon sojourns to launch popsicle-stick ships and frequent visits to the arms of the most available tree when great plans about your life had to be made. A unique form of freedom was available to us as children, for our naiveté and detachment from the realistic world provided us with an opportunity to legitimately shirk responsibility without endangering the welfare of others.

However, this freedom was slowly removed, for as we stepped from the illusive world of make-believe, our emotional and physical maturation created a new awareness to the world of reality. This transition from crayons to perfume can be traumatic, for the sudden realization that one is a self-contained individual with responsibility for the welfare of others, as well as himself, can provide a rude awakening to the duties of adulthood. When stepping from the world of make-believe into the world of reality, we are provided with another form of freedom—the freedom to choose between participating towards the betterment of our society or stepping aside and allowing others to determine the destiny of humanity.

Since our country is merely a macrocosm of societal niches, our government is a disciplinary agent that attempts to unify similar concepts that individual facets of society have deemed necessary for a harmonic existence. Therefore, as a new eighteen-year-old voter, I now have the freedom to either choose to participate within the structure of the government or I may choose to travel an apathetic road. This is the ultimate in freedom in my opinion, for no matter which road I choose, I am still responsible for my destiny.

Yet, the most practical avenue to travel would be to participate in the workings of our government, because our primary freedom to choose between activism or apathy is guaranteed in the Bill of Rights; which must be upheld and preserved through strong involvement. However, I can sympathize with the tendency to shrug one's shoulders in apathy, for I too am skeptical about the integrity of our nation's leader's! You see, it's very difficult to step out of the sheltered world of naiveté into the painful realities of *The Pentagon Papers,* Mai Lai and the moral chaos of the No-win war in Viet Nam!

Yes, it is difficult to step into the world of reality without having a few repercussions about choosing to work within the structure of our government—the very same government that created the aforementioned travesties. I guess one could merely turn around and walk away . . . but, that's how children solve problems . . . and after all, we're mature adults, with wisdom. . . . Aren't we?

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which were awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom."

The winning contestant from each State was brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Enclosed is a copy of the winning speech from my district as delivered by John Thomas Archer, Mount Vernon, Ill.

I am privileged to enclose for printing the winning essay of John Archer:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By John Archer)

It was a warm, crowded courtroom scene, nestled in the city of New York, August, 1735. A middle-aged man sat tightly in his chair, awaiting a verdict which was to decide not only his future, but also many aspects of the long years that lay ahead for his children.

John Peter Zenger, newspaperman, who edited pro-Revolution writings, was acquitted of treason against England. A victory for the free press.

Lexington, dawn, April 19, 1775. Five bells had just been sounded in a wooden church tower near the small Massachusetts community. As the sounds of bells ringing drifted off, other enormous sounds came to take their place. About 1,200 people heard the bells at Lexington that morning. Millions heard the shots that followed . . . millions around the world.

Yorktown, Virginia, 1781. A short man, white powdered wig on his head, accepted a sword from another man named Cornwallis. America was born this very instant. Along with the new sword he carried home with him, George Washington must have known he had won a prize far greater and more precious than any other ever granted a group of thirteen colonies.

The cries of glee from Peter Zenger, the shots at Lexington, sword at Yorktown . . .

so our revolution marked the beginning of freedom, let me correct myself . . . freedoms.

Today, 1971, it seems the shots of our revolution have been lost somewhere in two centuries of enormous growth. Our job, yours and mine, and the job of every person, large or small . . . . is to let those sounds ring again.

Now, don't get me wrong, I'm not saying, let's have another revolution, I'm merely stating my responsibility to freedom, that being . . . to bring forth in myself, the spirit our forefathers had when they won the American revolution, and then to recognize all my freedoms, and use them to their full potential.

This spirit of gaining new freedoms I spoke of: let's be sure we have the correct idea. I don't mean to try to gain some new freedoms today . . . . . I am speaking of the generous freedoms we were given when we were born in this country. How can we do this? Easily. Try picking up a copy of our United States Constitution and look at the first ten amendments. I'll even go farther than that . . . . . take a look at the first amendment.

This first amendment gave us freedom of speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition.

Freedom of speech—saying what you please . . . yet . . . how many times have you or I just shut-up and thought, "oh well, it's not my worry."

Freedom of religion—the right to believe as you please . . . yet . . . how many times have you or I denied another person this right by condemning him for his beliefs.

Freedom of press—the right for you to print a letter in your community paper saying what you think is right. How many times did you or I gripe about some problems to our family instead of taking real action.

Freedom of assembly—the right to get together and peacefully talk over problems or just have a good time. Yet, how many meetings have you had at your house.

The last, freedom of petition—the right to send a letter to your Congressman. How many times have you said, "Heck what good does a letter do. He'll just toss it in the wastebasket!"

Points itself out, doesn't it! Our five most basic freedoms, ... and how many times can you or I remember pushing them aside. In reality, it's just like pushing our forefathers aside. Those thousands who willingly died, not only in our revolution, but in all the other costly American wars to save our freedoms.

My responsibility to freedom is your responsibility as well. Let's wake up, recognize all our freedoms, and get out there and use them.

You know, I wouldn't be able to sit back and think all those people who gave their lives did it for little or nothing at all. Would you?

OPPOSES NATIONAL DEBT CEILING INCREASE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose any efforts which would increase the ceiling on our national debt. The astronomical figure of $450 billion is a negative approach to solving our financial problems. It merely puts off until tomorrow a problem which should be dealt with today.

When President Nixon took office in January of 1969, the actual national debt was at $359 billion. Today that figure has risen to $429 billion. This is contrary to the earlier promise made by the administration to lower the public debt.

The initial intent of the debt limit legislation was to restrain our indebtedness. This concept is useless if we go along with every request of the President to raise the ceiling on this debt. Someday we are going to have to face up to the fact that we cannot continually and automatically increase our debt limit every time the administration asks us to. This has been the trend, however, and the ceiling continues to rise.

The current proposal is the forth such increase since President Nixon took office. In 1969 the ceiling on the national debt was $365 billion. Subsequent increases were in April of 1969 to $377 billion; June of 1970 to $395 billion; March of 1971 to $430 billion; and now in March of 1972 to $450 billion. Continued and unchallenged increases in the national debt ceiling is a blank check to further wasteful and unessential Federal expenditures such as we have witnessed in recent years. Only by holding the line on these increases can we force a reevaluation of our Federal programs to eliminate wasteful spending.

The interest on the national debt alone is staggering. The cost now amounts to nearly $110 annually for every man, woman, and child in this country. This must be paid for either by taxes or more borrowing. The interest on the public debt is now increasing from $1 billion to $2 billion every year. The interest cost for fiscal 1973 alone is estimated in excess of $22 billion. This is more than twice the amount that the Federal Government spends on all health programs excluding trust funds. These payments hurt the middle- and low-income citizens of this country who must provide the tax dollars necessary to pay off this interest.

Mr. Speaker, the public debt is no longer solely attributable to the cost of war. It has now become a way of life even in a peacetime economy. We now have the largest deficit since World War II. The time has come to reverse this trend and pay off this debt.

We can no longer rely on the projections of our national debt from the administration. This poor economic forecasting will only lead us down the road to financial ruin. The administration will be back again in June requesting yet another increase in the public debt ceiling. I will vote against an increase now, I will vote against an increase then, and I will continue to urge my colleagues to do the same until this trend of living out of a national pocketbook which is far larger than what we can afford is reversed.

ITT CASE CASTS A CLOUD OVER WASHINGTON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial points out that the settlement of the antitrust suit against International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. has cast a cloud over the administration.

Unfortunately this flagrant example of the influence of big business on the Federal Government casts a cloud over the entire governmental process—and every effort should be made to explore every aspect and every facet of this matter to demonstrate to the American people the responsibility of their Government.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter I place the editorial from the Tennessean in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

THE ITT CASE PUTS CLOUD OVER THE ADMINISTRATION

The life style of the Republicans is that of wheeling and dealing with vested interests, whether it is by trying to peddle the Teapot Dome oil reserves or fitting a White House aide for a vicuna coat.

Considering the track record, it is hardly surprising the Republicans are embroiled in a current controversy over an anti-trust settlement and a bit of big business largesse to the GOP national convention. The whole thing would make a fiction writer itch to get to his typewriter.

The hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee continue to turn up new and fascinating bits of information, including some that are contrary to what has been publicly stated by those involved. And those involved make quite a cast of characters.

There is a women lobbyist and an incriminating memo linking the anti-trust settlement of cases involving International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation and a financial commitment by a subsidiary to the GOP convention in San Diego.

There is Judge Richard McLaren, the chief anti-trust lawyer for the Justice Department who, after the ITT settlement, was suddenly named to a federal judgeship. There is Mr. Richard Kleindienst, the deputy attorney general and nominee to succeed Mr. John Mitchell as the chief law enforcement officer. There is Mr. Peter Flanigan, a top presidential aide, who recommended an outside anlayst to the Justice Department who made a report favorable to ITT. There is an Arlington physician who testified that the woman lobbyist said she was "mad and disturbed" when she wrote the memo, publicized by Columnist Jack Anderson. And there is Mr. John Mitchell, former attorney general now in charge of Mr. Nixon's campaign. Last, there is Mr. Nixon who had his heart set on having the convention in San Diego.

Statements by the various parties about the murky circumstances involved in the ITT settlement have been contradictory and inconsistent with the known facts. Some have been plainly ridiculous on their face.

Mr. Mitchell has denied any role at all in the neogtiations on ITT or negotiations to hold the convention in San Diego, and denied Mr. Nixon ever said anything about ITT. But Mr. Mitchell knew of the ITT settlement and long before that he was told of the ITT subsidiary pledge to the convention. Mr. Mitchell could have raised the proper questions then, but he did not.

Mr. Kleindienst, his deputy, first said he took no part in the negotiations. Subsequently he conceded that he had arranged and attended the meeting at which ITT's financial specialists made the economic presentation to Mr. McLaren. He also disclosed he had four private meetings with an ITT director.

Mr. Kleindienst also said he had no knowledge of the pledge of money to San Diego until late November or early December. Yet

at least two people, including Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, the Democratic national committee chairman, wrote to him shortly after the ITT settlement was announced.

Mr. Mitchell has done his best to absolve the White House, but why did a top presidential aide, close to the President, recommend a financial analyst from a New York brokerage firm to be hired by the Justice Department, when the government has all kinds of capable economists at its disposal. The outside analyst made a report favorable to ITT.

Did Mr. Flanigan involve himself in a Justice Department case without the knowledge of the President? If so, Mr. Nixon ought to have fired him. Instead, Mr. Nixon gave him a promotion as top assistant for international economic matters.

The questions could go on and on, but they would only increase the peculiar odors of this case.

In a burst of pique last week, Judge McLaren denounced the hearings as an "outrage." That is an apt word, but not in the way Mr. McLaren meant. The outrage ought to come from the public over the strange way this administration operates in dealing with affairs of public interest.

NORTHEAST PHILADELPHIA POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, there are many organizations in this country which do an excellent job of providing our young people with meaningful activities to occupy their spare time.

Among the best of these programs is the Police Athletic League which operates in some 100 cities along the east coast, the South and the Midwest.

PAL is a partnership made up of the young people of our urban centers, the police, private industry, and interested citizens. It provides young people—many from inner-city neighborhoods—with an alternative to "the streets" as a place to "hang out" and spend their free time.

Although the organization's name emphasizes sports, PAL provides a full range of activities including arts and crafts, music, entertainment, recreation and a free lunch program for those children who need it.

PAL is open to all children. There are no restrictions because of prior incidents or behavior. All that is required is the young person's desire to participate.

In my city, Philadelphia, PAL has been active for 25 years. There are now 22 chapters, some with more than 1000 members.

In the district I represent, Northeast Philadelphia, we have a unique PAL operation. Area residents and businessmen wanted to establish a PAL center in the area, but because of the high cost of real estate they have not yet been able to establish a permanent site for the club house.

However, the interest in the program is so great that northeast PAL has become an active organization despite this handicap.

It has become a service organization which provides equipment and assistance to the many athletic organizations and Boys and Girls Clubs located in the area it serves, the 7th police district.

PAL is an organization which deserves our aid and respect and at this time I enter into the RECORD a history of the Northeast Philadelphia Police Athletic League.

HISTORY OF NORTHEAST PAL
(7TH POLICE DISTRICT)

Although the citizens of Northeast Philadelphia who reside in the 7th Police District do not physically have a PAL Club, their interest in PAL was so great that in 1969, a citizens committee was formed to represent the 7th District PAL and Mr. Frank Masters, a Northeast businessman was elected Chairman and Mr. Steve McSain as Treasurer. Francis J. Lederer, a member of the Police Athletic League Executive Committee and Board Director was appointed to coordinate the activities between the city-wide PAL and the 7th District PAL.

After several meetings between Mr. Lederer and Mr. Masters, it was decided that until such time as land or property became available, the Northeast PAL would operate in such a way as to appropriate equipment and assistance to the many athletic associations and Boys and Girls Club located within the boundaries of the 7th Police District. (It should be noted that land and property values in the area are being discussed is so high that it would take more money that would ordinarily be available to operate a PAL Center in other areas of the City of Philadelphia).

Since 1969, through the close cooperation of former Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo, now the Mayor of Philadelphia and Deputy Police Commissioner Harry Fox, this permanent PAL Committee has continued to be of great assistance upon request to numerous civic and church agencies. Their programs have included emergency food programs funding athletic teams with equipment and other ventures.

The Crown Cork & Seal Company, Inc., a manufacturer of beverage cans, located at 9300 Ashton Road in North Philadelphia, assigned Francis J. Lederer to devote as much time as would be needed to assist the Northeast PAL Committee.

Mr. Lederer is also the Corporate Community Relations representative for this Company and his experience in community and government work covers a period of twenty (20) years in the Philadelphia community.

It remains the objective of the PAL and the Northeast PAL to find a permanent place for the housing of a PAL Center within the boundaries of the 7th Police District sometime in the not to distant future.

The identity of such a center with the youth in this heavily populated section of Philadelphia will be a great aid in crime prevention and drug abuse.

CAN FREE CHINA SURVIVE?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, now that the dust has temporarily settled on the issue of United States-China relations, the future of the Republic of China is of genuine concern to those who remember the vital World War II role played by Nationalist China in the Pacific Theater and who, in addition, can never forget the tragic policies of our Nation which helped wrench basic freedoms from the Chinese people in 1949.

A note of encouragement is sounded by Prof. David Nelson Rowe of Yale University, an authority on Chinese affairs who was born in Nanking in 1905 and who has followed developments in that area most of his adult life. An educator and author, Dr. Rowe's extensive background was acquired through his associations with academic and governmental sources dating back to the mid-1930's. The following observations by Dr. Rowe review briefly recent U.S. policies on China, her recent economic progress, necessary military requirements for an adequate defense, and the heartening will to survive which motivates the Republic of China today. I insert his observations in the RECORD at this point:

CAN FREE CHINA SURVIVE?

(By David Nelson Rowe, Yale University)

The Republic of China (ROC) includes not only Taiwan and the neighboring Pescadores Islands, but the Matsu and Kiamen (Quemoy) groups close up to the Communist mainland. In these territories there are now over 15,000,000 people who enjoy the fruits of the Modernizing Chinese Revolution of our time. To this Revolution the ROC is the sole heir, and it continues to carry it on with unabated energy, determination, skill and devotion.

Today, as a result of its expulsion from the United Nations and the admission of the Chinese Communist regime there, the ROC has once again come to an important crisis in its life. What is it, and what does it mean?

By way of background, President Nixon in his State of the World message of Feb. 25, 1971, while opening the door to UN membership for the Chinese Communists, had promised to continue to resist attempts "to deprive the Republic of China of its place as a member of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies." (p. 108) A simple majority vote in favor of expelling the ROC from the UN and for admitting the Red Chinese had been cast in the UN General Assembly in 1970. It thus became clear that the so-called "important question" technique of requiring a two-thirds majority for expulsion would probably be ineffectual in 1971. Nevertheless the United States held to this technique. The ROC loyally went along and did not invoke the other main provisions of the UN Charter that clearly applied to the matter.

In this respect, Secretary of State Rogers and other US officials repeatedly, and correctly, labelled the UN action toward the ROC as "expulsion" of a member. Under the UN Charter such expulsion of a Permanent Member of the Security Council by a simple majority of the General Assembly was clearly illegal. Under U.S. law the Charter, as a Treaty to which we are a signatory, is part of the "supreme law of the land." This supreme law has been violated in this instance.

To the Government and people of the ROC the announcement on July 15, 1971, of President Nixon's visit to Communist China had seemed to maximize the chances of a reaction and against them in the coming UN session. When his foreign affairs advisor Dr. Kissinger, made his second visit to Peking just at the time of the voting in the General Assembly, they believed it had certainly helped swing votes away from them. Announcements came from the State Department to the effect that the question of "Taiwan" (as it is usually mis-named) was still unsettled since the end of World War II. Dr. Kissinger implied that this should

be a matter for negotiation between the ROC and the Chinese Communists.

All this made it very difficult to take at face value the continuous stream of statements by US officialdom that even after the expulsion of the ROC from the UN the United States would continue to recognize the ROC and to come to its defense in case of attack, as provided in the mutual security treaty of 1955. After all, in 1949–50 President Truman had refused further military assistance to the ROC. In January, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson had declared both South Korea and Formosa (Taiwan) to be beyond our defense perimeter in the Western Pacific. Was the United States about to revert to these policies of the past?

In 1945 the United States had decided that the ROC must be brought into a coalition government with its sworn enemy and inveterate opponent, the Chinese Communist party. Was Dr. Kissinger now trying to revive some such strategy by urging negotiations between the ROC and the Chinese Communists? Like the try at coalition in 1945–47, the Nixon two-Chinas policy in the UN had failed in 1971. Both were attempts at securing a modus vivendi between Chinese Nationalists and Communists. But the 1971 two-Chinas policy resulted in a complete victory of the Communists in the UN and the complete defeat of the ROC there. Would President Nixon's trip to Peking carry this defeat still further?

These apprehensions combined with a wave of shock, anger and bitterness in the government and people of the Republic of China. We must remember that many of those who had come over from the mainland twenty years before had lost everything they owned to the Communists. Was disaster to engulf them again? But the tradition of revolutionary persistence in the face of defeat and even of seeming disaster is still as strong as ever in the Republic of China. A very few people decided to liquidate their holdings in the local economy, but were soon to see all values climb higher than before. No major defections of any kind have been indicated. The resolution and steadfastness of the people of Free China, from President Chiang Kai-shek on down, is often capable of surprising even those who know it best.

Being forced out of the UN was a bitter blow to prestige, and a cruel injustice, undeserved on the record. But the dignity and assurance of the Republic of China survives unharmed. Furthermore, the ROC has simply proceeded to adjust and innovate on every hand.

In foreign affairs, for instance, a new flexible policy has already been initiated. Dealings of all sorts, on a pragmatic basis, with any and all countries, no matter what their ideologies, will be undertaken in the future, if only the countries involved are not "hostile" to the ROC. Every case will be worked out on its merits, without regard to legalisms or technicalities. This would seem to forecast possible trade relations, for example, with any member of the Communist bloc except Communist China. The ROC has simply accepted, however unwillingly, the new developments as to its international status, and has decided to make the best of them.

Internally, there are also strong tendencies toward generalizing still further the political representation and participation of the people in government, while revitalizing administration by the introduction of more new and vigorous young talents. Changes of this kind have been under way for a number of years. Power has been flowing steadily away from the older functionaries and into the hands of younger and modern scientifically trained personnel. Much of the ROC's progress in the last twenty years has come from this.

Most evident as a reaction to the current emergency are policies aimed at still more rapid and progressive development of the economy. Certainly the UN defeat and other developments in the foreign field have by no means hindered economic growth. On the contrary, 1971 was the best year ever for business in the ROC, with the gross national product climbing by 11.4% to a figure of US$6,237.5 million at current prices. Per capita income increased by 10% to a figure of US$329 per annum, one of the highest in Asia. Foreign trade increased during 1971 by 32% to a total volume of over US$4 billion. This is very close to the total figure for the entire Communist mainland with at least 47 times as many people.

The US Ambassador to the ROC, Mr. Walter McConaughy, predicted in a speech before the American Chamber of Commerce in Taipei on Jan. 19, 1972, that the total foreign trade of the ROC would exceed that of the Chinese mainland by as much as US$1 billion by 1974, and that by 1975 this "margin is likely to be even bigger." (Note: in terms of value, about 28% of Red China's exports are of narcotics.)

Economic development in the ROC is firmly based on a substructure of high quality education, with nine years of free education for all. There is increasing emphasis upon vocational training. Basic research is stressed, and will be continuously developed in the future, taking into full account the skills being imported from abroad along with capital funds. American investments in the ROC are steadily increasing and will soon be worth US$500 million.

Increasing attention is being given to manpower problems, particularly in view of the steady drift of labor from agriculture into industry. The primary problems of manpower are qualitative ones. On these matters the best brainpower in both the USA and the ROC is being mobilized to work out solutions. Included are some very comprehensive plans for mechanization and land consolidation in agriculture, as answers to growing shortages of agricultural labor. The population grows at a rate of around 2.3% per year, but the rate is slowly being decreased.

Rapid economic and technological development is bound to bring new problems, particularly as to social welfare, labor, and income. Much of the industrial growth is based upon the lower wage scales prevalent in the ROC, even compared to Japan and Hongkong, as well as to the high trainability and hard working habits of labor. But the ROC has successfully dealt with the wage problem by effective controls upon wages, money supply, commodity prices and currency values. No substantial wage-price inflationary spiral is likely in the near foreseeable future. This, in turn, induces capital inflow, accompanied by advanced technology. This increases productivity of labor and leads to a natural healthy growth in labor's income and standard of living. This is a politico-economic fact of great importance. The accompanying growth of social services, such as health insurance, is in fact spearheaded by the Nationalist Party itself, not the least of whose interests is naturally that of political mobiliaztion.

All this is related directly to the problem of internal security of the ROC. There is no doubt but that the drastic shift in the world position of the ROC will accentuate opportunities for the development of opposition to the Government, from a variety of reasons and sources. The assumption must be made by the Government now, even more than before, that some of this will emanate from a desire for the destructive subversion of the Republic of China. But this has never constituted a major problem for the security agencies of the ROC, and it is not likely to become such in the near future.

There is no doubt of the glowing pride of the people of Free China in the social, cultural and economic achievements of the past twenty years. To them this is a living proof of the continuing validity, over the years, of their own solutions of the problems of the Modernizing Chinese Revolution of our time. This is a fact of Chinese life, of which the people on the mainland and in the Republic of China are all aware. It is also a fact of the continuing political warfare between Communist China and the Republic of China. But here, of course, is the danger, namely that the greater the successes of the Republic of China and the grosser the failures of the fluctuating and expediential policies of the Chinese Communists, the more the latter must, in self defense, resolve to "liberate" the people of the ROC by force, saying, as they do, that "no force on earth" can stop them.

It is natural, therefore, to hear the top echelons of the Government of the ROC saying that "economic strength is the only means to military power." Here, while accepting the limitations natural to a people of only fifteen million with a highly restricted area and natural resource base, the Republic of China will undoubtedly develop its armed strength to the highest degree consistent with orderly and swift economic and social development. In this as in other things, it "does a lot for less." Aside from regular armed forces of about 600,000, it has huge trained military reserves several times larger, along with the necessary weapons and command structure.

Military development will no doubt be accentuated by the drop in credibility ratings of previously relied upon "guarantees" as to their external security. In spite of all assurances from the "highest quarters" in the US government that it will sustain its treaty for the ROC's security against armed attack, there remains the steady question as to just what these guarantees may mean in actuality.

For example, the Chinese Communists for a long time have demanded the "total removal of US forces from Taiwan." President Nixon can hardly accede to this demand without helping to create the same situation in respect to the ROC that Mr. Acheson did for the Republic of Korea by his announcement that it was "beyond our defense perimeter in the Western Pacific," which certainly helped bring on the Korean War about six months later. The likelihood might be stronger, therefore, of some actions which at the start might be described as "merely symbolic." They could start, for instance, with a pledge by President Nixon to close down all US Air Force stations on the Island of Taiwan. Perhaps the single most important of these involves the USAF use of the big Chinese air base in central Taiwan as a way station in air logistics for the war in Southeast Asia. This might happen soon anyway, as the war in Vietnam phases down or out. Another possibility is that the US Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) might be removed. Such an action would, it seems, be far more important symbolically than materially, although its material significance cannot be completely downgraded.

The increasing self-sufficiency of the Republic of China's armed forces, and their capacity for maintenance, repair and replacement of military equipment have been well noted. Their Air Force is in serious need of more modern planes for defense, but the US Government has not been willing to supply them. Removal of the US MAAG might well stimulate the Republic of China to spend some of its foreign currency reserves upon such weapons. Even though this could by no means satisfy the requirement, it would constitute a "counter symbolism" to help offset effects of possible US withdrawal of its advisory group.

Much farther up on the list of possible options would be the withdrawal of the American component of the joint Sino-American Taiwan Defense Command (TDC). This organization, logically called for by the joint security arrangements between the two

countries, is headed by an American admiral who is schematically second in command under President Chiang Kai-shek, Commander in Chief of ROC armed forces. However, even if these joint security arrangements are themselves to be unilaterally put out of effect by the USA, contrary to every specific guarantee that has been repeated so many times since the UN defeat, something like the TDC is essential to the interests of the USA in respect to the preservation of security in the area. Otherwise the ROC would be left in complete control of the options as to defense against aggression in the area. If only for such reasons, TDC removal at this time is deemed improbable.

Finally, what of the idea that the Chinese Communists would, *for the time being at least*, be satisfied if only the Republic of China would evacuate all its armed forces from the offshore island groups of Kinmen (Quemoy) and Matsu? These islands are in no sense bases for any possible ROC attack against the Chinese mainland. They have been strongly attacked *from* the Communist-held mainland, notably twice, in 1949 and 1958. Both attacks failed.

As things now stand, the Republic of China cannot conceivably be "talked out" of the offshore islands, and will not even discuss the matter. They have developed the defenses of these islands to the place where they believe that, given adequacy of air cover, they are solidly defensible. But even if not, they will have to be driven out of them by force, since they consider them indispensable forward positions for the defense of Taiwan and the Pescadores from attack from the mainland. It is merely natural and logical that their unjustifiable expulsion from the UN has hardened their will against giving up as much as one square inch of their national territory.

But what if the discussions between Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai and President Nixon in Peking should take a more general line, involving, for example the idea that in return for a pledge by the Chinese Communists not to use force in the Taiwan Strait, the USA would pledge no further military support at all for the Republic of China? It is most doubtful, no matter what is promised on either side, that American diplomacy at this time can really succeed in the aim of getting the Chinese Communists to abjure the use of force in the Taiwan Strait, something our diplomacy has been trying to secure ever since the days of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. And in the last analysis, any Chinese Communist promises along this line would not be worth the paper they were written on.

But, it will be said, at present the Chinese Communists have special reason to make some agreement. They are, it is claimed, desirous of "doing business" with us because they want to use us to help balance off the Russians who threaten them with thirty-five or more divisions of heavily armed troops along their northern borders. The exploitation of the balance of power potentialities of the so-called Sino-Soviet split is, in fact, widely considered around the world to be the main reason for the Nixon intiative toward Communist China and for Mao Tse-tung's willingness to have him visit and talk in Peking. In fact it goes beyond this, even to the point where many are convinced that the troubles between Peking and Moscow have resulted in conversations between authorities of the ROC and those of both the Chinese Communists and the Russians! The Chinese Communists have themselves planted stories to the effect that the ROC had been talking and negotiating with them. On this, President Chiang Kai-shek's New Year's Day message to his own people, of 1972 stated:

"The only contacts between us and the enemy are those of blood and steel in the operations in front of and behind the enemy's lines. There are absolutely no contacts of any other kind."

In fact the balance of power game here is far from being a relatively simple question of Communist China, Russia and the USA, but must involve a number of other countries as well. The current initiatives of Moscow toward Tokyo show how hard it is to keep such a game within bounds. What would it profit President Nixon to gain a few odds and ends from the Communists in China, only to lose as far as Japan is concerned? Here the Russians hold some high cards in the shape of Japanese territories they have held since the end of World War II. By contrast with the Nixon diplomacy toward Okinawa, the Russians have held these territories until a vital *quid pro quo* could be secured for any concessions regarding them.

President Nixon no doubt entertains the notion of playing around the margins of the problems of Sino-Soviet relations and thus avoiding any entanglement with either party which would be dangerous. But if the Russians are suspicious of what he may be doing in this respect, we know already that the Chinese Communists are not merely suspicious: they are convinced from the start that President Nixon, who made his political start in life as a hard anti-Communist, could never be trusted even if he were to say only "Two plus two equals four."

Seen in this way, President Nixon's Peking trip and his later trip to Moscow are not believed in the Republic of China to be likely to change things for the better. They are also convinced that whatever may *seem* visibly to come out of these meetings, the unannounced results, even perhaps the secret agreements for the future, will be more important to them than what is in the communique, if there is one.

Therefore it follows, many in the ROC believe, that the way must be explored toward alternate sources of security in case the United States really and in secret seems to be deserting them, and no matter how long such a desertion could take. For a long time they have been trying to build up regional security arrangements with such nations as the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, and South Vietnam. The United States has, seemingly, always discouraged these efforts, on the basis that none of these countries need any more security guarantees than are given by the USA.

This argument now begins to fall on rather deaf ears not only in the ROC, but in all the other countries involved in the area. But the missing element is Japan, as to whose direction in the field of national defense no one can be sure. Even the current slow but steady rise in the military budget in Japan raises severe political problems there, not the least of which are caused by the strong aim in many quarters to "normalize" relations with Communist China.

Such "normalization" already faces the staggering obstacle of Japan's previously stated and now reaffirmed position as to the ROC, as of Jan. 11, 1972, namely that the security of "Taiwan" is of vital importance to Japan. This so-called "Taiwan clause" was originally contained in the joint Nixon-Sato communique of Nov. 19, 1969. But now, as then, any relevance it has to the security of the ROC is, purely and simply, a function of US security arrangements on behalf of the ROC. Japan plays no part in any such arrangements. And, in fact, no US forces on bases in Japan can be used for this or any other purpose without prior consultation with Japan and Japan's consent. This will soon apply to our bases on Okinawa.

Only a sufficient and autonomous Japanese military establishment can provide any meaning or any sanctions behind Japanese desires and plans for the security of areas nearby to herself and in which her political and economic as well as strategic vital interests are involved. This may well be a very long time in coming. But this too will depend very much upon the Japanese interpretation of the results of the Nixon visits to Peking and Moscow.

The pressure in the Japanese media for "normalization" of relations with the Chinese Communists has to be seen to be believed. Even anti-Communist circles in Japan appear to have been at least partially brainwashed by this constant pressure. Some Japanese are now beginning to urge, for example, that the Republic of China should cease to identify itself with China at all, and should abandon its title as Republic of China in favor of one which would identify it as a "separate country." Perhaps they believe that this is the only way in which it can possibly escape a takeover by the Chinese Communists. But there is little chance that the Chinese Communists would settle for anything as trifling as this. They want nothing less than the destruction of the Government of the Republic of China and the takeover of its territories, people, armed forces and total assets. And the Government of President Chiang Kai-shek will never give up its present title, no matter what is advocated along these lines either at home or abroad.

The Republic of China, post-United Nations, thus presents a picture of calm, resolute and determined self-confidence in the face of the injustice and evil treatment which it suffered in the United Nations. It is, in fact, the UN which has come out badly in this matter. By contrast with the Republic of China, the United Nations has lost the confidence of millions of its supporters both in the United States and around the world, and has set its feet on the pathway towards dissolution and total impotence.

In fact, the Republic of China is today stronger than ever before. Its friends and admirers on every continent have even more reason to support it than ever. Long Life to the Republic of China!

CRIMINALS AND CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation designed to deny the use of the mails by correspondence schools which teach locksmithing unless they have obtained criminal record checks on those who apply for such courses.

This problem was brought to light by an enterprising correspondent for the New York Daily News, Mr. Robert Crane. His article in the March 5, 1972, edition of the News, described in detail an overlooked aspect of the Nation's battle against crime.

While hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent by beleaguered frightened city dwellers across the country on ever-fancier and more sophisticated security devices, successful burglaries and break-ins continued unabated. In New York City last year, for example, there were 181,331 burglaries—34,571 of these were committed in the Bronx, which means that 7 percent of the homes and apartments in the Bronx were burglarized last year.

It is a horrible irony, as Mr. Crane

discovered, that while residents try to tighten up home security with new locks, burglars can sharpen up their skills by enrolling in correspondence schools for locksmithing intended for the dedicated, legitimate apprentice.

Mr. Crane said:

For $300 anyone can receive instructions on jimmying doors, filing keys, picking locks and other occupational skills. Tools come with the lessons; practice locks are provided for home work.

The article also discussed, for example, the case of one burglar who was accepted for enrollment in a locksmithing course after 12 arrests and five convictions for petty larceny, grand larceny, and burglary.

I do not think this should be tolerated. The legislation I am introducing today would prevent known criminals from gaining access to such courses. It would require that the Postal Service request a check through the identification records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the criminal history of any applicant for such courses before the school would be allowed to enroll him. If an applicant has been convicted of a felony, the Postal Service would indicate to the correspondence school that the applicant was not cleared for enrollment. I am convinced that this rejection would be necessary only rarely, since I have no reason to believe that most of those who enroll in locksmithing courses are anything but honest individuals intent on learning a legitimate trade.

This legislation would simply prevent criminals from gaining access to this source of information on how to pick locks. It is a small but significant loophole in our efforts to prevent crime which can be easily plugged. The following is the text of the bill:

H.R. 13821

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to restrict the mailing of certain matter pertaining to correspondence courses of instruction in locksmithery, and for other puposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, is a nended by adding immediately after section 3002 thereof the following new section:

§ 3002a. Nonmailable matter relating to locksmithery.

"(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection and subsection (c) of this section, matter consisting of or including material which relates to any correspondence course of instruction in locksmithery (other than advertisements of such course of instruction) is nonmailable matter and shall not be carried or delivered by mail unless—

"(1) the matter is mailed by or to any school offering a correspondence course of instruction in locksmithery and consists solely of material constituting or responding to applications for, or requests for information in connection with, enrollment in such correspondence course; or

"(2) the matter consists solely of instructional or test materials of a correspondence course of instruction in locksmithery mailed by any school offering such course to any person enrolled in such course who is not prohibited from receiving such matter through the mail by subsection (b) of this section or consists solely of material mailed by such person to such school in connection with the taking of such course.

"(b) The Postal Service shall require, as a condition of conveying any matter in the mails under subsection (a)(2) of this section, that each person enrolled in a correspondence course of instruction in locksmithery be checked by the Attorney General through the identification records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in order to determine whether, on the basis of such records, any matter proposed to be transmitted in the mails under such subsection is to be transmitted by or to a person who has been convicted of a felony, consisting of an offense against persons or property, under Federal law or the law of any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or a territory or possession of the United States. At the request of the Postal Service, the Attorney General shall furnish to the Postal Service, on the basis of such records, information as to whether such person has been so convicted and has been legally pardoned for the offense concerned. Matter shall not be conveyed in the mails under subsection (a)(2) of this section by or to any person with respect to whom such records disclose such conviction and who has not been legally pardoned for the offense concerned. Information furnished by the Attorney General under this subsection shall be used by the Postal Service only for the administration of this section.

"(c) The Postal Service is authorized to make such additional exemptions from the prohibition in subsection (a) of this section as it considers necessary in the public interest.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, 'correspondence course of instruction in locksmithery' means a course of instruction in the making, repair, and operation of locks and other fastenings operated by a key or similar device or by a combination or mechanism functioning or moved by the sequence of numbers, letters, or marks chosen in setting the lock or fastening."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 30 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"3002a. Nonmailable matter relating to locksmithery."

immediately below—

"3002. Nonmailable motor vehicle master keys."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately following section 1716A thereof the following new section:

"§ 1716B. Nonmailable matter relating to locksmithery.

"Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction, thereon, or at any place to which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any matter which is nonmailable under section 3002a of title 39, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.".

(b) The table of sections of chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"1716B. Nonmailable matter relating to locksmithery."

immediately below—

"1716A. Nonmailable motor vehicle master keys.".

SEC. 3. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SURRENDER AT PEKING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill, describing Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain at the time of the Munich agreement, in "The Gathering Storm," said:

His all-pervading hope was to go down in history as the Great Peacemaker, and for this he was prepared to strive continually in the teeth of facts, and face great risks for himself and his country.

On February 23, as President Nixon dined sumptuously and conferred cordially with his mass murderer hosts in Peking, I said, in reference to Taiwan, that "the final sacrifice of the last 15 million free Chinese on the altar of appeasement is being prepared." At Peking, on February 28, that sacrifice was offered up to the false god of peace through surrender.

We need not join in any of the semantic rock and roll of which Presidential assistant Henry Kissinger is so fond, in order to understand exactly what the Peking communique, signed by President Nixon and Chou En-lai, really meant. It is enough to review very briefly the last 8 months of United States-Chinese diplomatic history.

Early last July it was still our position—as it has always been until then—that there is just one China, whose legitimate government is the Nationalist regime of President Chiang Kai-shek, now located on Taiwan. Then, after the President announced he would go to Peking and consent to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, the administration assured us that we now had a "two China" policy, according to which we would deal with Red China, but also honor and protect Free China. Again and again, during that period, I explained that a "two China" policy was impossible, that neither Peking nor Taipei nor Washington could possibly accept it. The final proof of that comes in the February 28 communique from Peking, in which the United States states officially that there is only one China and Taiwan is a part of it, in the same paragraph in which we pledge "the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan." Is anyone still naive enough to believe that the new "one China" we are talking about is anything other than the Red regime which we joined in issuing this communique?

So in just 8 months we have gone from recognition of one free China, to pretending to recognize both the free and the slave China, to in effect recognizing only the slave China. Compared with these hard policy realities, the diplomatic window-dressing of whom we exchange ambassadors with, pales into insignificance.

The Chou-Nixon communique was so bad that its defenders have been reduced to claiming, without a shred of evidence, that the President must have made some advantageous "secret deal" not mentioned or even hinted at in the communique. But if this is the case, then what are we to make of the President's unequivocal public declaration on his return to this country that he made no secret deals in Peking? If he is telling the truth, then we have sacrificed Taiwan for nothing. If he is not telling the truth, then his word cannot be trusted. It is one or the other; there can be no third alternative.

Almost exactly a year ago I was told of the impending sellout by international intelligence analyst Hilaire du Berrier, who had learned from his European sources that our Government was putting pressure on the two famous Soong sisters—Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and Mme. Sun Yat-sen, of Free China and Red China respectively—to meet on the island of Hainan to begin working out new arrangements between the Free and Red Chinese because we were preparing to unveil a drastic change in our China policy. I alluded to this in my newsletter of April 7, 1971, mentioning "reports that elements in our Government are attempting to bring about a change of attitudes of the Government of Nationalist China toward the enslavers of the Chinese people," even though I knew that many of my readers would find it hard to believe that such reports could be true. Now, a year later, the report is not only readily believable, but seems positively tame compared to what has actually happened.

Finally, the communique included this language:

The Chinese side states: Wherever there is oppression, there is resistance . . . it firmly supports the struggle of all oppressed people and nations.

Communists define oppression as a condition existing solely because of the existence of a class society—which to them means any non-Communist society. So in this communique the Chinese are explicitly committing themselves to go right on fomenting revolution against all non-Communist governments. While they tell us this, we are telling them that we are no longer particularly interested in the fate of their next potential victims on Taiwan, the object of their lasting hatred, who have attained great prosperity and have resolutely held the fort against the enemy of all free men for more than 20 years.

Never since Yalta has the United States of America so cruelly betrayed a friend.

NEED INCENTIVES TO INCREASE OIL AND GAS RESERVES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Murphy bill on gas is essential to America's progress. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill that would stimulate the search for more gas reserves.

Last year the consumption of gas in the United States far exceeded the new discoveries. The demand for gas is growing more intense every year.

Enclosed is a news story written by UPI in yesterday's Dallas Times Herald:

SEARCH FOR MORE GAS RESERVES

Some energy experts are wondering if former President Lyndon B. Johnson had the benefit of a crystal ball during his "save electricity" days in the White House.

Oil men in particular—those who produce 75 per cent of the free world's energy—are recalling Johnson's actions to make their point that production of this country's natural resources isn't keeping up with demand.

"It was a funny situation only a few years ago when President Johnson went around the White House turning off lights," said Wayne E. Glenn, western division president of Continental Oil. "Now, a lot of people are thinking that maybe LBJ had a pretty good idea."

Low-cost power from oil, gas, coal and water used to be taken for granted in this country. Not anymore.

Industries in some areas are being told they can't build or expand factories because there isn't enough gas or electricity to operate and heat them. Private home builders in some areas are being advised to scrap plans to heat new homes with gas.

Consolidated Edison, the New York City utility, has switched from promoting more energy consumption to asking customers to "save a watt." Cities Service Oil Co., in Tulsa, Okla., was recently awarded a citation for outdoor lighting of its new office building, and on the same day was criticized for "conspicuous consumption."

"The message seems to be getting through—at long last that our standard of living, virtually our entire economy, depends on energy," Glenn said.

"Someone has calculated that between 1850 and 1950—in just 100 years—the world used about half as much energy as it had in the entire 18½ centuries since Christ," Glenn said. "But in the second half of this century—in the 50 years between 1950 and 2000—the world will consume as much energy as was used in the preceding 1,950 years."

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT NEEDS ITS ORGANIC ACT

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, because roughly two-thirds of the State of Idaho is owned by the Federal Government, we have more than a passing interest in proposals to change administrative procedures on public lands. At the present time, the proposed Organic Act is subject to a great deal of conversation and study in Idaho. I think that the remarks of one newspaper editor are particularly enlightening and insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

BLM NEEDS ITS ORGANIC ACT

In the place of the assorted jumble of 3,000 inadequate and confusing laws governing management of the nation's 450 million acres of public lands, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management clearly needs the integrity of the proposed new organic act.

The laws are so inadequate, in fact, that the Bureau of Land Management does not even have enforcement authority to protect the lands from growing public-use abuses.

Idaho, with most of its federal lands under BLM management, has a special stake in the adoption of the proposed new act. It is amazing, in fact, that the BLM has been able to do what it has in the face of the mission-muted framework it has operated under all too long.

The new act would establish as management objectives for these lands, to be called the National Resource Lands, multiple use, sustained yield, environmental quality and assurance of their continued value for present and future generations. Much of this framework was suggested in the U.S. Public Land Law Review Commission study and the proposed organic act is an outgrowth of this study although it is not an exclusive commission flowering. Essentially, the act gives the Secretary of the Interior the authority he needs for the proper management and highly selective disposition of the public lands.

While the BLM has attempted to apply multiple use and sustained yield to its management stance, it has not been able to consistently achieve it. The Department of Interior itself admits that "excessive exploitation of resources and headlong modification of ecological relationships have taken place, and much needs to be done to correct errors and to redirect activities . . . for the maximum benefit of the general public."

One of the things which the new act would permit would be the maintenance of an up-to-date land use plans. Tragically, all levels of government—federal, state and local—have not advanced broad but serviceable land use blueprints which will provide the most effective yet sustaining use of our lands. One can look around Idaho and see wild, unplanned developments, from sub-divisions on the Salmon River to conflicting land uses in one concentrated area to realize the importance of recognizing the need and applying an overall blueprint in which all developments and growth can be wholesomely assigned.

Owyhee County, for example, is a bristling case in point. In that county, in the vicinity of both the Bruneau River and the Snake River southeast of Boise, there are a welter of conflicts. There are conflicts in water development plans, in grazing (which would be supplanted by the water development) in recreation, in wildlife displacement, and road and highway planning. Some integrity which would incorporate the maximum public benefit in a wisdom of sharing, needs to be outlined.

The Boise Front, considered a model of coordinated planning, is another example. It took huge mud-carrying floods into the streets of Boise, for the people of Boise and the different government stratas there to wake up to the need of integrated planning and development. There were private lands, BLM, Forest Service, City of Boise, and public recreation uses all separately going their conflicting courses on the over-burdened land for many years—and with increasing velocity. So a cooperative plan was developed and a sharing of responsibility. The result was the Boise Front, a highly coordinated land use plan where the abused land was salvaged and where everyone benefits, both man and animal.

The tragedy of the Boise Front, however—like the tragedy of the Morgan Creek Mountain Sheep rescue project—is that it is a small island of endeavor in a sea of emergency. The Boise Front does not even cover all of the Boise Front geography. Morgan Creek in Custer County is only one of several critical range problems which the BLM and other private and government groups are attempting to retrieve after many years of uncoordinated neglect.

Idahoans should not delude themselves: Boise Front and Morgan Creek are showpieces, models of what can be done and nothing more. There is too much critical range elsewhere over Idaho despite the comparatively impressive and energetic cooperative projects of ranchers and the BLM to restore range.

The BLM needs its organic act and we hope Congress will not tarry with it.

AIRPORTS ARE BAD NEIGHBORS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, airports are bad neighbors. They and the airlines that use them often display what

appears to be contempt for the community surrounding them.

They are deaf to complaints of noise pollution and blind to the problems of air pollution.

And yet they wonder why communities resist their plea for expansion.

My own constituents are plagued by the noise of LaGuardia Airport. I have called on the Port of New York Authority and the airlines to voluntarily work out a curb on noise during normal sleeping hours. I suggested a 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. curfew on takeoffs and landings. This would mean a minor inconvenience to the airlines but it would be far outweighed by the benefits to the people who live nearby and under the flight paths. The airlines and Port Authority have responded with silence. That, in my opinion, is further evidence of their lack of concern over the problem of noise pollution.

I intend next week to introduce, with the support of some two dozen colleagues, the first legislation aimed at establishing noise curfews nationwide. This is not an ultimate solution but rather a first step with immediate, tangible results.

LaGuardia is more the rule than the exception to the problem of airports as neighbors. In the January–February 1972 issue of City, published by the National Urban Coalition, Caryl Rivers and Alan Lupo have written a very insightful article entitled "How To Succeed in the Fight to Contain Airports." Writing of Boston's Logan International Airport, they observed—

As a good neighbor, Logan is on a par with Attila the Hun.

The same can be said for many others.

I am inserting their article in the RECORD at this point:

HOW TO SUCCEED IN THE FIGHT TO CONTAIN AIRPORTS

(NOTE.—Caryl Rivers and Alan Lupo are husband and wife. She is a former Washington correspondent now doing freelance. He is a former Boston Globe reporter who now moderates "The Reporters," a nightly show on public TV in Boston.)

"We won't give up. We've been fighting and we'll keep on. We'll fight them from every rooftop of every house if we have to." The source of that quote is not Che Guevara, H. Rap Brown, Jerry Rubin, or Mao Tse Tung, but a kindly Italian grandmother: Anna DeFronzo of Jeffries Point in East Boston.

Mrs. DeFronzo is not exactly the prototype of a revolutionary. She has a smile that lifts and lights her whole face and a body suitable for an Italian grandmother who makes a lasagna that melts in the mouth and settles on the hips. Her will to fight, however, has more the consistency of wrought iron than pasta.

She has picked a formidable enemy: the jet airplane. Anna DeFronzo's East Boston is shoulder-to-shoulder with Logan International Airport. As a good neighbor, Logan is on a par with Attila the Hun. It has gobbled up the community's waterside park, packed large chunks of Boston Harbor with landfill, and stuffed the air with the whine and soot of jet engines.

Anna DeFonzo does not want East Boston to become a runway or a terminal or a place where the air is so shattered by noise that it is unlivable. Two years ago she led a phalanx of women into the street to stop the trucks that rumbled down a residential street on their way to the airport. East Boston's cold war with Logan turned hot.

It was the sort of battle ushered in by the Jet Age, with the shadow of its sleek, swept-back wings, and fought by little knots of people, irate but powerless against the American version of progress. They were Don Quixotes, tilting at airplanes instead of windmills. In East Boston and Hempstead, N.Y., in Playa del Rey, Calif., and in dozens of other communities across the nation, they raised their voices and were drowned out by the roar of the jets.

The Don Quixotes have, amazingly, become Davids. Goliath has been rocked. God is not, perhaps, always on the side of the big battalions. Anna DeFronzo may beat the Jet Age. The shooting down of the American SST on the drawing boards may have been the Gettysburg in the battle of Airports vs. People. Its carcass (which could yet resurrect itself) is a token of the fact that the American love affair with size and speed—damn the cost—is cooling down.

The SST was only the most publicized of the battles against jet noise and pollution. Pressure from citizens and environmentalists halted a huge jetport in the Florida Everglades. California has passed a law setting state limits on airplane noise—the first one in the nation. It went into effect December 1. Other states, including Massachusetts and New York, have similar regulations in the works. A National Academy of Sciences panel issued a report last February that came out strongly against a major expansion of JFK Airport into Jamaica Bay. The expansion was halted.

In Boston, the long and bitter fight against airport expansion came to a dramatic climax last July when Governor Francis W. Sargent faced television lights and newsmen, and said: "What is the best transportation available for the future? Technology has a ready reply—the old ready reply: Fast equals good and therefore fast equals best. And with a parent's pride, technology points to its quickest child, the jet aircraft. Thus technology's answer: The jet airplane is the fastest, therefore the best, transportation. I disagree."

The governor opposed the plans for a major expansion of Logan, and, in what many people felt was an extremely enlightened statement of transportation policy, called for a carefully planned and balanced transportation system which would take into account both environmental factors and the quality of human life.

Score one—a big one—for Anna DeFronzo.

The story of how the anti-jetport forces in Boston grew from a small, ragged army to a political force begins on Maverick Street in East Boston. The street does not display the thick dirt of the inner-city slum. It is smudged and worn, like anything handed down from one generation to the next, but dirty it is not. The daughters and granddaughters of Abruzzi scrub floors and sweep steps with all the attention of a crusader hunting Saracens.

There are Maverick Streets all over this country. They usually are white and Catholic, and they feature a pattern of zoning that produces coronaries in schools of design: a single-family home next to a three-decker next to a bakery next to a somewhat empty variety store (the 1948 Moxie or White Rock poster in the window and the empty shelves mean the establishment is really a social club, which is a nice white ethnic way of saying, Put me down for $2 on so-and-so at Suffolk Downs). Maverick Street is a neighborhood, and this means that a lot of people who live on the street want to stay there. But in the last decade it has lost a lot of the qualities that mold a neighborhood, including housing and parks—thanks to its neighbor, the airport. (A billboard at Logan proudly announces, "World's Eighth Busiest," and like the city's ball teams, it would like to move up in the standings.)

The airport is run by the Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport), a creature of the state legislature with a lot of political clout. It owns more tax-exempt property in Boston than the universities, hospitals, or churches, and it pays three lobbyists to watch over its interests at the statehouse. For years, the people who protested in East Boston and other nearby communities were written off as obstructionists. The press and the pols played ball with Massport.

But something happened on Maverick Street one fall day in 1968 that marked the beginning of a change. Huge trucks loaded with gravel had been using the street as a route to Logan, where they dumped the fill into the harbor. By that autumn, 400 trucks a day rumbled by late into the night, filling the air with noise and dirt, tearing up the street, and making every mother worry about her kids.

Residents pleaded with Massport to use a route on its own property that crossed a little-used taxiway. The Port refused. So the Italo-Americans of the neighborhood, with Anna DeFronzo in the front lines, went into the street and blocked it with their bodies.

They found an ally at city hall. Kevin White, elected on a pledge to return city government to the people, backed the neighborhood all the way. After a week of action on the streets and in the court, Massport agreed to use the other route. For a lot of white Bostonians, the era of civil disobedience had began.

The movement intensified. Half a dozen times in 1969 East Boston residents practiced guerilla warfare on Massport, with stall-ins on the bridge and tunnel leading to the airport that slowed traffic to a crawl. The neighborhood council wrote and submitted more than 180 bills to the legislature. None passed.

Even more significant was the beginning of "regionalization" of the protest. East Boston linked up with a group called the Greater Boston Committee on the Transportation Crisis, a mixed-bag alliance of working-class whites, suburbanites, and blacks which had successfully fought interstate highways that would have sliced through the city. The Jaycees of Winthrop, a neighboring beach town of 22,000 which was racked by noise, formed MAPNAC (Massachusetts Air Pollution and Noise Abatement Committee), patterned after the anti-airport group in Hempstead. MAPNAC started as a local organization, but grew to be a major arm of all the communities fighting the airport. The coalition brought in conservationists from the Sierra Club, battle-scarred Irish pols from South Boston, blacks from a housing project under the flight path. They began intensive political lobbying. Now they had more troops. Equally important, theirs was an idea whose time had come.

The anti-airport groups, who three or four years ago were used to hearing themselves called nuts, now hear their arguments echoed in places of power and prestige. The National Academy of Sciences now says that the federal government must choose environmentally suitable sites for airports, that "environmentally hazardous" airports must be closed or replaced, and that all jets should be retrofitted with anti-noise devices by 1975. Massachusetts Governor Sargent says what anti-airport groups have long said: Airports cannot go on getting bigger while traffic on the ground strangles and the airlines operate inefficiently.

In the past, anti-airport forces also have heard themselves called the enemies of air travel, people who hold parochial interests dearer than the development of a fast, efficient system of transportation. The leaders of the movement reject this picture. They see themselves as the real ally of the traveling public.

"We have nothing against airplanes or airports," says Randall Hurlburt, environmental standards supervisor of the city of Inglewood, Calif. "We feel that much more can be done within reason to reduce noise with-

out inconveniencing passengers or hurting the economy."

John Vitagliano, executive director of MAPNAC, says that because there has not been an effort to insure a balanced mixture of air and ground transportation in this country, it is the traveler who winds up being odd man out. "You have a large consumer market that is saddled with one choice of transportation mode," says Vitagliano. "You should have at least two. One reason for the imbalance is the priorities of the federal government. Before the jet age they were subsidizing the airline industry at the rate of about $10 per passenger. They didn't spend anywhere near the same amount for rapid rail or other ground mass transit."

An effective rapid rail service in the Northeast corridor could help relieve badly clogged airports, Vitagliano believes. A third of the air traffic out of Logan goes to New York. A train that could make the run in two hours between Boston and New York and Washington and New York would attract large numbers of passengers. Vitagliano points to the Metroliner now operating between Washington and New York: "That's not really a very high-speed train, but even with its limited service, there's been a 1- to 2-percent drop in the air shuttle. Eastern Airlines has applied to the CAB to get out of the air shuttle between New York and Washington."

Governor Sargent called a special meeting in August of New England governors and a representative of Governor Rockefeller to discuss high-speed rail service for the corridor. He said: "The men who say two-hour rail service between Boston and New York is practical are either hopeless dreamers or hard-nosed realists. It's time to know which they are."

The "new politics" of transportation, of which the anti-airport groups are a sizable part, have forced the beginnings of this rethinking of transportation policies. John Vitagliano thinks even more future-think is needed. Vitagliano, 29, is a graduate engineer and an Air Force vet with a private pilot's license. He has deserted engineering for the financially perilous but rarely dull career of community activist.

"We have to be willing to start from scratch with a new set of air transportation facilities," he says. "Today we are trying to accommodate a mode of transportation (the jet) that is a decade old with facilities that were designed 30 or 40 years ago. We don't have any choice but to start from scratch."

The huge jetports close to densely populated areas like JFK, Logan, and Los Angeles have outlived their time. Vitagliano thinks the offshore airport complex may be the answer. He talks of an airport five miles out in Boston Harbor, and says that engineering studies have proved the concept feasible. The terminal buildings at the existing site could be maintained, linked by causeways or air-cushion craft to the oceanport. The rest of the land now occupied by runways and storage facilities could be put to other uses.

"The mind boggles at what could be done," he says. "A whole new town could be built. Or perhaps the area could be devoted to recreational use."

The offshore airport idea is not pie-in-the-sea. Architect Larry Lerner specializes in "environmetrics," which he calls "the science of the things people use and the places in which they use them." His firm (Saphier, Lerner & Schindler) has been granted $400,000 by the Federal Aviation Administration for a feasibility study of the offshore airport concept. He has been working on a plan for an airport-shipping-power complex in the ocean five miles off Long Beach, N.Y. It would cost $8 billion and could be paid for in part, he says, by intelligent conversion of the land the city now owns at JFK and along the Manhattan waterfront.

Offshore airports also have been proposed for Southern California and in the Great Lakes. However, the Lakes projects have caused concern among environmentalists because of the severe pollution problems that already exist there. Opponents of a Lake Michigan jetport have banded together in a group called SAIL (Stop the Airport in the Lake).

John Vitagliano calls the ocean ports the least damaging socially and environmentally. The costs of creating such facilities may seem huge, but the costs of airports staying where they are may be even greater. The city of Los Angeles has just spent $300 million to buy homes in three residential neighborhoods on the borders of L.A. International Airport, and it fears it may have to spend another $1.6 billion buying an additional 65,000 homes. There also are some $3 billion in damage claims against the airport grinding through the courts.

The fact is that if new concepts of air transport facilities are not developed, there won't be any more new airports. New York tried to find a site for a fourth jetport for 10 years. The citizens of Morris and Hunterdon counties in New Jersey defeated it; so did Westchester, N.Y. Governor Rockefeller has settled on Stewart Air Force Base in Newburgh, but some in Newburgh are reluctant to accept the gift.

Even when the site is remote, there is opposition. A desert site in Palmdale, Calif., selected for a huge airport for the Los Angeles area, is under siege from conservationists who claim it would ruin the desert's ecology.

Anti-airport groups say that in many areas there is no need for expansion. If the airlines operated efficiently, most of their problems would be solved. "Historically the airline industry has scheduled flights very uneconomically," says Clifford Deeds of TVASNAC. "Fifty percent of capacity or less. If they cut the number of flights they would force up the percentage of occupancy in their planes. Braniff did this the first half of the year and doubled its net revenue."

Would prodding the airlines to schedule fewer flights make the traveler unhappy? Doesn't he want a wide choice? "The guy who's sitting out there on the runway in a plane with 30 people in it can look out and see that he's being held up because there are two other planes out there, each with 30 people," says John Vitagliano. "He'd rather be on one plane with 90 people that would get him where he's going with no delays."

Undoubtedly the major complaint against the jet is contained in a single word: noise. It is the thing that damages eardrums, sours the digestion, wrecks marital harmony, drowns out the crucial sentence in the TV mystery, wakes the baby, ruins the dinner party, and shakes loose a few psychological nuts and bolts.

The airline industry says that because the new generation of jet aircraft now rolling off the assembly lines is considerably quieter than existing jets, the noise problem will solve itself. But the anti-airport groups aren't buying this rationale. "All indications point to the fact that the existing jets will be around a long time," says John Vitagliano. "First, those jets were designed to last as long as possible. And given the present financial state of the airlines, you can't expect any sizable phaseouts for some time."

The anti-airport groups have a simple solution: muffle the noise at the source. A retrofit program would do just that. There are two bills now before Congress that would require retrofitting of the jet fleet. The FAA also has issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on retrofitting, which means they're thinking about it.

The airlines have opposed a retrofit program, saying that the result would be only "marginal" noise reduction. But Clifford Deeds cites engineers' claims that interior alterations could reduce noise by 17 decibels or more. "That's down to one-seventh of what it is now," says Deeds.

The FAA is the agency charged with setting noise regulations for airplanes, but the anti-airport groups view it with suspicion. They claim it sees its role as a booster for the aviation industry and is wedded to the status quo. "Putting the FAA in charge of noise regulation is like putting a fox in charge of a henhouse," says Clifford Deeds. "The FAA has a narrow view of its role," says an aid of Senator Edward Brooke, author of one of the two retrofit bills. "Their job is building airports. Anything that gets in the way of that, they don't like." He says he sent a copy of the Brooke bill to the FAA for comment and it stayed there six months—before he gave up on them.

The lack of strong federal regulation has led to state laws that set aircraft noise levels—like California's. Municipalities have tried it before. The town of Hempstead fought for its noise regulations all the way up to the Supreme Court. (The section of the town affected by jet noise has a quarter of a million people, larger in population than 11 states.)

So far, the courts have struck down such laws because they interfere with the federal right to regulate interstate commerce. Though state action may force the federal government to act, anti-airport groups fear that regulations passed by the FAA may be too lenient.

Damage suits against airlines continue to proliferate. In some cases preliminary rulings have been made, holding airlines and airplane manufacturers liable for damage to health or property. If the courts ultimately uphold such rulings, it would leave the companies open to staggering financial settlements.

All these pressures point to change in the transportation patterns in the U.S. This can only be good news for the traveler and for people who worry about urban America. As Governor Frank Sargent points out, there must be thorough examination of the alternatives instead of the haphazard growth of the past decade. If there is not, he say, "We will not be the master of this change, we will be its victim. We must act to be its master."

THE 1972 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DAV

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Edward T. Conroy, presented the 1972 legislative program of the DAV to the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I would like to bring his thoughts to the attention of my colleagues. The speech follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD T. CONROY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

This is, indeed, a very high honor and privilege to come before you and present the 1972 Legislative Program of the Disabled American Veterans.

I am particularly pleased to share this very special occasion with a deeply dedicated group of DAV Department and National Officers who have journeyed here from all sections of the Nation to take part in our Mid-Winter Conference. These meetings, which occur annually, achieve two objectives—they allow for a series of discussions on matters of urgent concern to the DAV membership and, at the same time, serve to assure a continuity of interest in the fundamental purpose for which our Organization was

created. That purpose, in part, urges all of us to do what is necessary "to advance the interest and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured and otherwise disabled war veterans." This objective—rightly and justifiably—includes consideration of the veteran's obligation to his family. Accordingly, the concerns of the disabled veteran's dependents and survivors must also be considered in any meaningful and rewarding assistance programs.

The primary mission of our Organization is carried out principally through our National Service Officers who are stationed in offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country. These 168 full time national employees—63 of whom are Vietnam veterans—assist veterans with their claims for compensation, pension, hospitalization, medical treatment, educational and vocational training, and sundry other benefits which have been provided by this Committee and the Congress. These services are extended with no charge to the veteran.

Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, of the profound sense of pride I feel for the DAV service program and the prominence it has attained through the dedicated efforts of our National Service Officers.

The DAV participates actively in other programs which, although not too widely known, nevertheless, serve a very useful and humanitarian purpose.

Our scholarship program provides four years of college to needy children of service-connected disabled veterans. At present, we have approximately 47 students involved in the program.

Another on-going and growing program initiated by our Organization is the DAV Scouting for the Handicapped. The Disabled American Veterans is the only veteran organization that has committed itself to a formal partnership with the Boy Scouts of America to help carry the load of scouting for the handicapped. The DAV's participation in this highly successful program reflects, in our view, a genuine desire to recognize the dignity of disabled youngsters, and to deliver the service which they need and which, indeed, they deserve and enjoy.

Our Employment Assistance Program involves itself deeply in the employment problems of disabled war veterans. Our National Interim Employment Committee is currently developing an expanded program of employment services to disabled veterans of the Vietnam era. We have recently sent questionnaires to these young veterans to determine the utilization and effectiveness of the Public Employment Service. Our survey indicates that approximately 50 percent of those responding are not registered with that Agency. We have, therefore, instituted a pilot program which, at present, involves the States of Illinois, Connecticut and Arkansas. We have enlisted the cooperation of Veterans Employment Representatives and other officials to provide special counseling and placement assistance for those disabled veterans whose returned questionnaires indicate a need for such assistance.

We plan to expand this phase of our program to other states, and to establish contact with employers so as to improve their hiring practices with respect to disabled veterans. Hopefully, our efforts—in conjunction with employment service personnel—will result in substantially greater training and employment opportunities for thousands of disabled war veterans.

Before proceeding to the substance of our Legislative Program, Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to commend and to thank you and the Committee members for the legislative achievements of the 1st Session of the 92nd Congress. They represent the latest addition to an already well-established record of affirmative Committee actions on behalf of the nation's disabled war veterans, their dependents and survivors.

The increases in pension payments, the increases in dependency and indemnity compensation, the improvements in the home loan and medical programs are welcomed and appreciated by all members of the DAV and its Auxiliary.

We have great hope for what this distinguished Committee will accomplish this year. Indeed, we of the Disabled American Veterans, have been heartened by the overall atmosphere of hope and concern that has preceded this hearing. The proposed VA budget is at an all-time high and its medical budget is also the highest ever. Surely, this is encouraging.

On this note, Mr. Chairman, I would like now to turn directly to the heart of our testimony.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, DAV Legislative Programs spring from resolutions approved by our National Conventions and our National Executive Committee. On the basis of National Convention resolutions adopted last August, we believe our Organization has fashioned a Legislative Program that is sound and reasonable—a kind of program that blends what we think is important, positive and feasible. It is recognized, of course, that time does not permit a full discussion of all facets of our program. However, it is my hope that when your Committee holds later hearings, you will allow us to appear and discuss in detail some of the matters I shall touch upon only briefly here today.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. Chairman, this Committee and the Congress throughout the years have given steadfast recognition to the concept that disabilities incurred as a result of service in our Armed Forces entitled the sufferer to very special recognition and gratitude from the nation. It has been accepted that compensation payments should be adequate to meet the particular needs of the service-connected disabled—and to meet those needs by providing payments based on the ingredients of compassion and understanding.

The basic rates of compensation payable in the wartime cases currently range from $25 for a 10 percent disability to $450 per month for total disability.

It is the feeling of the DAV that there should be a substantial, and immediate, increase in these monthly payments. We feel that the increase must be so subtantial as to take into account not only the loss in purchasing value since the last increase in July, 1970, but also an estimate of the additional loss which will occur between the present and the next review of the Disability Compensation Program.

Of the more than 2 million veterans on the VA compensation rolls, there are approximately 123,000 whose income is limited solely to monthly compensation payments.

Compared with average earnings, the present monthly rate for the totally disabled war veteran is grossly inadequate. Available statistical data show that the 1971 average earnings for production workers in private manufacturing industries was $7,809.36. while the compensation for the severely disabled unemployed war veteran is $5,400.00 per year. We do not believe that this veteran should be left behind in the "earnings" race.

Other data show that the median annual income of male veterans in the civilian population for calendar year 1970 was $8,660. Wages in both the public and private sectors have been increased approximately 12 percent since July, 1970. In this same period, non-service-connected disability payments have been raised on two occasions for a total of 16 percent.

It is our hope that serious study and thoughtful consideration of the facts set forth above will lead your Committee to give the highest priority to recommendations for well-deserved increases in the basic rates of service-connected disability compensation.

There are other compensation matters of high importance to the DAV which will draw our attention during the course of the year. We are particularly interested in legislation providing for dependency allowances for veterans whose disabilities are rated less than 50 percent, and a clothing allowance for veterans who, because of service-connected disability, wear prosthetic appliances which tear or wear out their clothing.

We think there is a very justifiable case for increases in the dependency allowances to restore their purchasing value; and a specially urgent case for increases to those veterans who receive the $47 monthly award for anatomical loss or loss of use of body organs. These special awards were last increased in 1952. The DAV has sponsored legislation to increase the $47 on numerous occasions with no headway. It is now more than 20 years after the last increase and the proposal is still prominently in our program.

During this entire period, the Veterans Administration has persistently opposed legislation to provide an increase in these awards on the pretext that it is conducting a study to "validate" the Disability Rating Schedule. We are told that recommendations based on the study may be available on April 1, 1972. However, we would point out that while the so-called validation may change some of the disability "percentage evaluations," it can have no effect on the supplemental statutory rate which the Congress authorized in consideration of factors "other than the economic loss" suffered by the veteran.

In its action, the Congress recognized that there was no way to adequately compensate a veteran who has lost a limb or an eye, or a veteran who has suffered irreparable psychological damage in the service of his country. Accordingly, the Congress rightfully sought to repay these disabled American veterans for the pain and suffering, the loss of physical and mental integrity, which these disabilities by their very nature often bring.

As mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these and other items relating to the disability compensation program at future Committee hearings.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Mr. Chairman, we think it is generally accepted by the American people that those who serve in our Armed Forces bear a disproportionate burden of citizenship. While they are off serving their country, others of their age are preparing for occupational or professional careers. We think it only fair that the ex-serviceman be given the opportunity to secure educational and training advantages lost during his period of active military duty.

This opportunity was enhanced when your Committee on February 29th favorably reported H.R. 12828. This legislation, which has since passed the House, contains a wide variety of features, some of which would satisfy resolutions adopted by our most recent National Convention. Among other things, it provides a well-deserved increase in the monthly subsistence allowances paid to severely disabled veterans receiving training under the VA vocational rehabilitation program. Another provision would increase the monthly rates of educational assistance payable to veterans, and to wives, widows and children of service-connected totally disabled and deceased veterans under the War Orphans' and Widows' Educational Assistance Act.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

In previous appearances before this Committee, the DAV outlined its position with respect to the National Cemetery System as

it is currently operated. We have consistently urged—as we do now—that the operational jurisdiction and control of the system be transferred from the Department of the Army to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Legislation to bring this about is presently under consideration in the Congress.

If enacted, the legislation would, in our opinion, eliminate the confusing and uncertain conditions currently associated with the cemetery program, and would result in the establishment of a unified and orderly system.

The officers and resources of our national Organization are ready and on call to assist in helping resolve this urgent problem.

VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

Another item of real significance to the DAV relates to the program of hospital and medical care for disabled war veterans.

We believe that the well-being of the disabled veteran and the debt his nation owes him commands aggressive action to make certain he receives a high standard of medical service as a matter of right. In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate here our grateful thanks to you and the Committee members for initiating and following through with the action that led to House passage of legislation in the 92nd Congress to improve the delivery of health services to eligible war veterans.

We are particularly pleased with one of the many excellent features of the Veterans Medical Care Act of 1971. It would provide hospital and medical care to the wife or child of a totally and permanently disabled service-connected veteran and the widow or child of a veteran who has died as a result of service-connected disability.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, the DAV is encouraged by the fact that the VA medical budget for 1973 is the highest ever. Among other things, it calls for an increase of 11,000 new medical employees; for an increase in the number of veterans to be cared for both on an in-patient and out-patient basis; for construction; for prosthetic research and for VA nursing care units.

Despite these promising improvements, there is a growing concern among DAV members about a trend strongly underway to assimilate the VA medical system into a National Health Care Plan under the jurisdiction of HEW or some other social service agency.

The DAV recognizes that the problem of health care for the general population is swelling rapidly and that legislation is needed to deal realistically with all aspects of the health care issue. However, the DAV is inalterably opposed to any scheme which has as its object the absorption of the VA medical and hospital program into a sweeping national health insurance system. Conversely, we firmly advocate that the VA hospital program, as presently constituted, not only be preserved intact but also be expanded and improved for the benefit of America's war disabled.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted here today to bring to notice some of the highlights of our objectives for the year 1972. As expressed earlier, we think our program is a reasonable one, is feasible and supportable, and represents what we believe to be needed improvements in veterans' programs.

Before concluding my Statement, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a brief word about the draft "amnesty" issue which, as you know, is evoking rancorous, bitter debate across the country.

This burning question must, in our opinion, be evaluated with the utmost honesty and frankness. Reports indicate that there are about 70,000 draft dodgers and deserters residing in Canada and Sweden. A large number have said they were obligated by conscience to take flight. We rather think they were motivated more by the basic instinct of self-preservation. In any event, the really astounding aspect of this whole matter is the present attitude of some of the defectors. At a recent press conference in Toronto, a representative group demanded "totally nonpunitive restoration" of their civil rights if and when they return to the United States. They rejected without reservation any alternative service as a condition for amnesty.

We do not think these people will win favor with any veteran groups. It is our considered opinion that amnesty should not now be granted, that the merits of the individual case should be decided separately, and only after the conflict has ended and all who served their nation honorably have returned home.

Mr. Chairman, may I again express our grateful appreciation for giving us the opportunity to appear before you. I cannot think of any better note on which to bring my Statement to a close than to call attention to and publicly thank the dedicated and conscientious members of the Committee staff. The officials of our Organization receive the Staff's splendid cooperation not only when hearings are in progress but all through the year; and for this we are deeply grateful.

ROSES FOR NEW YORK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on today's front page of the Christian Science Monitor, David Winder wrote a colorful article in which he makes all New Yorkers glad they are New Yorkers.

In just a few short paragraphs he has subtlety but firmly captured the charm of living in the city. No one will disagree that we have our problems, but then, again, no city has the theater, culture, or the commercial vigor as does New York.

Often we hear that "New York is a nice place to visit but you wouldn't want to live there." Slowly this is changing. The unmatched theater and entertainment on and off Broadway still makes New York the show capital of the world. The flourish of new stores with new ideas and diversity contribute greatly to the exciting pace of living and working in Manhattan and the surrounding boroughs.

I would like to insert into the RECORD that fine article by Mr. Winder in which he points out why New York is still the place to live:

ROSES FOR NEW YORK

(By David Winder)

New York is coming up roses.

The press is suddenly finding time to put in a good word for the big city. They're almost affectionate about it. This change of mood is not capricious and is sufficiently pervasive to prompt one journalist here to claim that "a backlash of good news seems to be upon us."

The turning of the new leaf began appropriately in the new year. January saw Suzanne Haire, Lady Haire of Whiteabbey, formerly of the BBC, writing a column in the New York Times entitled: "If you are tired of New York, you must be tired of life." It was one of three good public relations jobs on New York City that appeared within one week on the Times's op-ed page.

Then February's Harper's Bazaar rushed to the defense of New York. In the same month New York magazine devised 101 signs that the city wasn't dying—most of them trivial indications, but nevertheless underlining a feeling that there was a lot going for New York and not nearly enough fans going for it.

TWINGE OF CONSCIENCE

Why the sudden turnabout for much maligned New York? There are still muggings, strikes, and petty harassments.

Maybe it is a slight twinge of conscience. A sense of shame perhaps for continually knocking New York. A realization, too, that it has been made the scapegoat for all urban problems.

Charles Gillett, executive vice-president of the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau, thinks there is an element of that.

"It is ironic. This giant has been so beat that it is almost becoming something of an underdog."

With even rural U.S.A. now starting to put locks on its doors, people apparently are coming to the conclusion that New York doesn't have a monopoly on all the unpleasant things in the world. Surprisingly, New York ranks only 16th in the national crime listings, but the concentration of the mass media here gives the city maximum exposure on this front.

Moreover, there is evidence to show that those who live in New York (and very often voice complaints) are miserable when they are away from it.

HISTORY ON DOORSTEP

A colleague with the German news media, questioned on how he enjoyed a vacation back home, nodded approvingly. Then, as if to impress another thought more clearly than he would in passing conversation, he grabbed a paper napkin and wrote on it forcefully: "But the bluebird of happiness is New York."

If that puzzles those who think Manhattan is fun to visit but not to work and stay in, Mr. Gillett, the paid lobbyist for New York, provides an explanation:

"New York means to me one of the most exciting, most up-to-date cities in the world. It means living in a place where history is literally being made every day and you are seeing it on your doorstep."

Michel Bernoville would probably go along with that. Michael is a cultured Frenchman with a good eye for antiques and whose ability to read and write four languages makes him a useful interpreter at the United Nations. But there came a time when Michel wanted to escape from the Manhattan rat race. He packed his bags for Europe. For good, he thought.

MUSIC AT ANY HOUR

Soon he was back again in Manhattan. He had deluded himself into thinking Paris wasn't materialistic. He missed the mobility of ideas here. And the cultural stimulation ("if French artists want to exhibit they come to New York"). And the opportunities for recreation. And "even stupid little things like turning the radio on at any time of night to hear music."

This correspondent, returning after a five-year absence, finds no difficulty in readjusting to New York. Moreover, he is agreeably surprised to find more trees planted out on the sidewalk; that air pollution is not personally as uncomfortable or irritating as it was back in the mid-'60's; and that from a Manhattan apartment the stars on a clear night really do shine.

Certainly there are problems in New York. But there is a moral to that, and Mr. Gillett as New York's most ardent promoter provides it.

In his busy 42nd Street office opposite Grand Central Terminal, he likes to relate a conversation between a native New Yorker and a friend from mythical Podunk, U.S.A.

Says Podunk citizen: "Our restaurants are better. Our air is cleaner. We have less traffic. What do you think of that?"

Replies the New Yorker: "You're so right. But the only difference is that when you wake up in the morning you are still in Podunk."

CRITICS OF SAFE STREETS PROGRAM FEAR RETALIATION

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to Mr. Jerris Leonard, Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, is self-explanatory. I include it in the RECORD for the information of Members of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1972.

Mr. JERRIS LEONARD,
Administrator, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEONARD: As you probably know, I have been in contact with mayors and other public officials in the 56 largest cities, with respect to my Emergency Crime Control Act (HR 11813). I have been seeking their comments on the legislation, in anticipation of the public hearings ordered by the Hon. Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

While the majority of the cities have responded, sending me material which has proved very helpful, I am disturbed to find—and I am certain you will share this feeling—that officials in some cities have not replied because they say—or intimate—that they fear retribution by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and/or the State Planning Agencies.

One official I spoke to yesterday was quite candid about this. He telephoned me to apologize for not having replied to my survey letter. He explained he could not "go on record" because to do so might damage his relationship with your agency and with his state agency as a result of which his city could lose some sorely needed crime-fighting funds. But he urged me to press forward with my legislation, assuring me, as he put it, that it is "100% on target." Then, on a confidential basis he told me about some of the inadequacies of the Safe Streets program, as administered by your agency and state authorities.

I regret that I cannot give details because to do so would unavoidably identify the city in question. However, the information is worth having for purposes of my own elucidation, even though I am, of course, distressed that the city official should feel so inhibited about publicly discussing the situation. I can only say that this city clearly is not getting sufficient funding from the Safe Streets program, and even the funds allocated to it are not reaching the city speedily because of an incredible amount of red tape.

I would like to cite another example. An official in another large city advised my office that he could not answer the survey letter because he feared that this might jeopardize the possibility of his city being selected as one of the eight "Special Impact" grantees. Since that time his city *was* selected, but the official still is dissatisfied with the way the grant was handled. He too will not "go on record" out of fear of retaliation.

As you know, Mr. Leonard, my legislation assures large cities that they will automatically receive Safe Streets funds as *a matter of right*. The amount could not be changed by your agency or state officials. The amount would be based on the city's population and crime rate. This would be clearly stated in the law, and there would be no danger of politics interfering with the program, since your agency would be relieved of a great deal of the discretion it now has—and so would the state capitals.

Whatever you think about the merits of my legislation, I am certain you believe that (1) a free exchange of opinions is healthy, and (2) it is necessary for Congress to have such opinions with facts to back them up.

Therefore I ask you to circulate a letter to program officials in the largest cities (defined in my bill as those having populations of 250,000 or more), assuring them that they will not be penalized if they give information to Congress that is critical of your program. I am certain that is your policy right now, but, as I have indicated, officials in some cities evidently need some assurances to this effect. I request also that you send a letter to the State Planning Agencies, asserting that it is the policy of your office to encourage frank and open discussion of the Safe Streets program.

I do not doubt that perhaps the fears of some officials were not too well-founded. But I am convinced that such feelings with inevitably arise under a program structured in such a way that city officials have to come to Washington begging for a handout. I would hope to have your support for H.R. 11813, which would cure this situation.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. STANTON,
Member of Congress.

VIEWS ON BUSING

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on forced busing of school children continues throughout our Nation, it would be wise for us to hear the experiences of my colleague, the Honorable DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, of Richmond, Va.

It was in Congressman SATTERFIELD'S district that the landmark judicial decision to abolish established school boundaries to achieve racial balance was handed down.

My colleagues recently testified before the Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee in support of the pending constitutional amendment which would provide that no public school student because of race, creed, or color shall be assigned to or required to attend a particular school.

His eloquent testimony, which I am presenting here, clearly outlines the effects of busing on Representative SATTERFIELD'S district, the State of Virgina, and our entire Nation.

One of Mr. SATTERFIELD'S main concerns is the deterioration of quality education for all students as a result of extensive busing. He also expresses his fear that this decision sets a precedent that will have nationwide impact.

I believe it is appropriate that we take a moment to read this pertinent and compelling views on this important and immediate issue.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 29, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: I know no issue of deeper concern to our citizens than court ordered busing of school pupils to alter the racial mixture in public schools. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate this Subcommittee for its decision to conduct public hearings upon a host of proposals before it which would attempt to deal with this issue.

I wish to express also my personal appreciation for this opportunity to appear before you to express my views as well as those of my constituents in the City of Richmond, Virginia, and the two adjacent Counties of Henrico and Chesterfield, who are so vitally affected.

The depth of concern among my constituents was forcefully demonstrated on February 17th. Despite a heavy snowstorm a motorcade of 3261 vehicles journeyed from Richmond to the District of Columbia to demonstrate objection to forced busing and to consolidation of school districts to facilitate forced busing. An additional 2000 vehicles were turned back at the point of origin in order to reduce the impact of this demonstration on the usual heavy afternoon traffic on highways leading south from Washington.

The peaceful, lawful nature of their protest and the demeanor of 120 citizens, who called upon more than 300 offices of Members of the House that day, demonstrates more eloquently than words that these were serious individuals typical of middle-class America.

I want to make it clear that I do not appear here today to argue the question of integration in the public schools of Richmond or any other place. I appear as a spokesman for the people in my District and as a legislator who has become deeply concerned about forced busing of pupils to correct racial imbalance in public schools. I am concerned by what I have seen it do to my City of Richmond, Virginia, and by what I fear it may do to my entire District, my State and my Nation.

I am concerned about the present and future quality of public education and the adverse affect of forced busing upon excellence in education. I have grown concerned also about the possible effect of busing decisions upon the future of this nation and its system of government.

Our Federal system of government is a good one, capable of perfection in its operation. It is my view that the failure to realize its full potential has been due to the frailties of man and not imperfections in the system itself. However, we will never achieve that potential if we abandon the basic premise inherent in the freedoms secured to us all in our Constitution, that to the fullest extent possible, man should control his own destiny and that of his minor children.

In a sense, it is regrettable that the offending judicial edicts have become obscured by the use of the term "busing" and that as a result the real points at issue have been obfuscated. The busing of which I speak, and about which I complain, is the busing of pupils by force, pursuant to judicial order, for the purpose of effecting an artificial racial balance of students in public schools.

I have heard it said, primarily in an effort to mitigate the gravity of the forced busing issue, that busing is historic in America and that through the years thousands of students have ridden school buses to and from school. But there is a serious difference between that kind of busing and the forced busing of which I speak. That difference can be described in one word—compulsion.

The kind of busing to which these individuals refer emerged with the development

of the motor vehicle and was employed to replace the long walk or horseback ride to the nearest school. It developed as a matter of convenience to assist pupils in their efforts to attend the nearest school. It was voluntary.

Court ordered busing plans, on the other hand, transfer students by bus, not as a matter of convenience, but merely to achieve some arbitrarily established level of racial mix among pupils. The court thus replaces the parent in determining what schools his child shall attend and how. It thus seizes all control over a child's education and denies to the parent the right and opportunity to influence an important aspect of his child's education.

I realize that there have been instances in the past where a black child was bused past his nearest school to attend a black school or a white child bused past his neighborhood school to attend a white school. That was wrong.

It is just as wrong today to bus a black or a white child past his neighborhood school in order that he will become a part of an artificial racial balance in a school miles away.

I am not unmindful of the fact that some sociologists and psychiatrists have suggested that proper public education demands a certain degree of racial mix and that parents lack the ability, experience and knowledge to determine what is best for their own children and that these suggestions have been used to defend forced busing. I would observe, however, that neither suggestion has escaped serious challenge and that arguments supporting the principle of free choice must of necessity transcend both in importance.

I am acutely aware of the fact that some individuals who express the view that forced busing is necessary, do so with the mistaken idea that areas now under busing orders have made no effort to integrate their schools or that they have deliberately resorted to subterfuge to prevent integration.

That is not the case in my District. Even if it were, it seems to me there are other solutions, not nearly so harsh, which can at the same time contribute to quality education. We may have been slow to react to the Brown decision but we did take steps to conform to what it said.

In 1966 the school system in the independent City of Richmond inaugurated a freedom of choice system for enrolling pupils in our public schools.

This plan was devoid of any possibility of gerrymandering a school area since it employed no geographic zones at all. It permitted parents to send their children to any school of their choice within the corporate boundaries of the City of Richmond. It conformed to the 1969 court definition of a unitary system as being one within which no person is effectively excluded from any school because of race. That it was achieving integration in the public schools of Richmond is evident. Consider, if you will, the fact that in 1961, prior to implementation of this freedom of choice plan, only 1.8 per cent of 34,956 pupils attended integrated schools. In the 1967–68 school year, the second under this freedom of choice plan, that figure had risen to 44.6 per cent and in the 1969–70 school year to 50.2 per cent. In 1969–70 every white student in the City of Richmond attended an integrated school.

The subsequent decision of the Federal Court at Richmond ordering forced busing of pupils to achieve an arbitrary racial mixture of students in the Richmond Public School and its further order requiring the reassignment of teachers to achieve a racial mixture in each school's faculty as well, produced a profound and undesirable effect upon the Richmond School System and the quality of education provided by that system.

I realize that this is neither the time nor place to discuss in detail the numerous incidents which support this conclusion or to discuss those resulting problems peculiar to Richmond. I feel I would be remiss, however, if I did not invite the attention of this Subcommittee to some of those problems which I believe are inherent in every case where forced busing is ordered and which I believe diminishes the quality of education.

Perhaps the greatest long range damage results from transferring teachers from the school at which they taught prior to a busing order, for the sole purpose of achieving an arbitrary racial mixture of teachers at each school. Some of these teachers were uprooted after years of tenure in one school. An immediate result in Richmond was a termination by many teachers of their voluntary after-hours work with students in various extracurricular activities. Furthermore, many teachers, upon the expiration of existing contracts, feel compelled to leave the school system involved. Some seek employment elsewhere. Others who have reached the age for retirement but who continued to teach out of pure love of their profession, have elected to retire. This exodus, which includes in its ranks many of our most experienced and effective teachers, seriously damages the school systems in which they had worked.

I doubt any educator will challenge the value of participation in extracurricular activities to the quality of a pupil's education. Yet forced busing has seriously interfered with the opportunity to engage in these activities after school. For many, the time formerly employed in these pursuits is now unproductively consumed riding a bus. For those fortunate enough to continue their extracurricular activities, the experience is less rewarding because of the reduced number of participants and the diminished availability of teachers who possess the greatest interest in these activities.

The debilitating effect of forced busing on extracurricular activities is particularly true of after school athletic programs. It is regrettable that participation in sports, so essential to the physical and mental health of our young citizens, is thus curtailed.

But that is only part of the story. In the Richmond system, for example, which has been remarkably free of violence in the past, there occurred, following the inauguration of forced busing, an alarming increase in the incidence of violence, disruption and criminal acts in its public schools and against the persons of pupils and teachers. This regrettable fact forced the City to engage, for the first time ever, a school security force armed with the power of arrest to help maintain order and to protect law-abiding students and teachers. It also forced the termination of nighttime school sports events.

One tragic result of forced busing has been the destruction of the role of the neighborhood public school in its community. As a direct result of forced busing;

Parental contact with and influence in schools attended by their children have been lost.

Parental conferences with teachers, so essential to proper childhood guidance, have been inconvenienced if not lost altogether.

Children, especially those in kindergarten and lower elementary grades, have lost an important sense of security and identity provided by neighborhood schools.

Parents are severely handicapped in their ability to bring a sick child home; and

Children are subjected to additional risks; for example in Richmond alone, school buses were involved in a total of 153 accidents between September 1, 1971, and February 24, 1972.

Last, but by no means least, is the question of educational opportunity. All of us have heard, at one time or another, the statement that in order for a black child to receive a quality education he must attend a school in which white children are enrolled. That is a racist statement which makes no more sense than another racist statement which we have also heard, that a white child cannot receive a quality education in a school also attended by black students. Both statements are erroneous, but they do serve to focus upon a critical question relative to the effects of forced busing.

No doubt, there are instances where one might conclude that a bused pupil will achieve a better education in the school to which he is bused than he received previously. But what about that child who will receive an inferior education as a result of being bused. A classic example, which can be documented, but which is by no means exclusive, has occurred in Richmond.

The Richmond School Board was a pioneer in the concept of providing accelerated courses in math, chemistry and physics through which exceptionally talented students would be afforded an opportunity to expand their knowledge at a more rapid rate than was possible in the standard curriculum. Pilot courses were commenced in one high school and gradually extended to others when and where a need became evident. As a result of the forced busing order, some who were already pursuing the course of study provided in these advanced classes were plucked out of their neighborhood school and bused to schools which do not provide any accelerated courses of study. These unfortunate students were forced to waste the balance of their high school careers repeating classwork they had already completed in their accelerated studies.

Can one really justify forced busing when this is a direct result? Of course, we must exert every effort to provide equal quality education to all pupils, regardless of their race or economic station in life. But I fail to see how anyone can condone a plan which may improve the quality of education of one student at the expense of another or which threatens a decrease in overall quality education.

Do the rights of a student who may improve his educational lot through forced busing outweigh the rights of a student who thereby suffers a diminution in the quality of his education? If this then be a result of forced busing, and it is, on what conceivable constitutional theory can it be supported? I submit there is none.

None of the problems to which I have referred, by any stretch of imagination can be said to contribute to excellence in education. Indeed, the exact opposite is true. These problems are in fact sacrificial offerings upon the altar of forced busing.

The time has come to stop this practice.

In January a new decision was rendered by the U.S. District Court at Richmond, not out of a new cause of action but upon a motion of joinder in the original action which had produced the forced busing order for the City of Richmond. Although this new decision is being appealed, I feel compelled to discuss it, because it provides a chilling insight into how far Federal Courts are prepared to go.

To fully comprehend the impact of this decision it must be remembered that Virginia is unique in that its cities and counties are completely separate political entities, neither being dependent upon the other in the operation of its government.

The City of Richmond is governed by an elected council and the Counties of Henrico and Chesterfield by separate elected Boards of Supervisors who appoint the members of their respective school boards. Each political entity has operated its own separate school system, the boundaries of which are coterminous with the political boundaries.

Funds to operate these systems are appropriated by their respective legislative bodies which also authorize capital investments. Bond issues for school construction are the sole obligation of the political entity offering the issue.

Richmond City has approximately 43,000 pupils, the Counties of Henrico and Chesterfield have approximately 34,000 and 24,000 respectively. Richmond City students are predominantly black and those in the counties predominantly white. The three independent political subdivisions encompass an area of 744 square miles, some of which and, in both Henrico and Chesterfield, is rural.

The decision to which I refer would impose a forced busing plan upon these three jurisdictions, by abolishing the three separate school districts and their respective school boards and by creating in their place and stead a single master school district encompassing the entire area. That new district would be administered by a master school board to which Richmond City would appoint four (4) members, the County of Henrico three (3) members and the County of Chesterfield two (2) members.

I wish to call particular attention to the fact that when this decision was rendered each of the three jurisdictions involved was then operating an approved unitary school system; Richmond's unitary system having been established pursuant to order of the court in question and the Counties of Henrico and Chesterfield having been established pursuant to unitary school plans approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

This decision goes far beyond the ordinary desegregation case involving the reassignment of students and faculty to obtain a unitary school system. It involves the complete restructuring of three independent unitary school systems in three independent political subdivisions in order to bring about something defined as a more "viable racial mix" throughout the area, defined as a "metropolitan area" school community. In mandating this consolidation, the Court, for the first time, has affixed a constitutional right of Negro children attending a judicially approved unitary school system of one political subdivision to be transported to and enrolled in a unitary school system of an adjoining political subdivision. The Court has further affixed to white children attending a unitary school system, the *obligation* of being transported to a predominately black unitary school system, in another political subdivision; the rights and obligations are said to have been invoked to provide for a more desirable racial mix.

It would establish within the new master school district six subdivisions extending like slices of pie from the center of the city and would arbitrarily fix the racial mix in each school at not less than 20 per cent nor more than 40 per cent black. It would provide that selection of pupils to be bused would be by lottery, similar to the Random Selection Method employed in the selection of draftees under the Uniform Selective Service Act.

The implications of this decision are broader by far than any previous school case. Here, for the first time a Federal Court has struck down jurisdictional lines which were established in the first half of the 18th Century and which have been changed only by periodic enlargement of the City through annexation proceedings which no one has ever seriously suggested were designed to perpetuate school segregation.

Should this decision to ignore jurisdictional lines within a State be affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, which certainly is not a complete improbability, then the precedent will have been set to ignore State lines as well. We could then anticipate a host of court ordered interstate mergers, such as a merger between the schools of Washington, D.C., now 97 per cent black, with those of the adjacent areas of Maryland and Virginia, or perhaps a merger involving New York City and New Jersey.

Make no mistake, this decision constitutes a very real threat to the right of a locality to control its own schools. Once begun, interstate mergers could easily lead to a Federal School System controlled absolutely in Washington by appointed officials, who are in no way answerable to the electorate. They would dictate the design of each and every new public school; determine where and when it shall be erected; assign pupils to specific schools; determine the training requirements of teachers and their assignment to specific schools; select the textbooks to be used, formulate and dictate classroom curricula; and control every facet of school administration.

Should this come to pass, it goes without saying that every single community in this country will be affected, even though it does not now have, and may never have, an education problem involving race.

The greatest guarantee we have, for the continuation of freedom in education so essential to a free people, is to continue that diversification of control over public education inherent in the principle of local control. Destroy that and you destroy freedom of education itself.

As disturbing as this aspect of the consolidation decision may be, the collateral questions which it raises are even more disturbing.

For example, if Federal Courts are permitted to strike down local jurisdictional boundaries for an educational purpose, might they not also traverse them for some other public purpose such as welfare and medical care?

Consider if you will those questions collateral to implementation of the Richmond Consolidation Case. The manner in which they may be resolved will have a serious impact upon local government far beyond the questions of education, integration and forced busing.

The court has made no effort in its decision to deal with the number of school administrators which will be required by the new master school district. It makes no reference to the philosophy of the new district or the educational program it will employ nor does it indicate how or by whom either will be determined. It fails to acknowledge the operational costs of this new school system or to suggest how funds to finance those costs will be raised. It fails to address the question of how capital outlays for new schools or additions to existing schools are to be financed or, for that matter, how bonds will be issued. It fails to address the problem of how school property will be conveyed to the new school board or how that board will receive and hold such property; it ignores the vital problem of how the separate outstanding bond obligations of the counties and city involved, will be assumed or repaid. Above all, it leaves unanswered the vexing question as to how three separate legislative bodies can be made to finance their respective portions of the operating expenses of this new common school district, especially when the true tax rate in each political entity is different or how either of these bodies can be made to act when the public interest of county or city is hostile to the public interest of one of the others.

Previously in this case the presiding Judge ordered the Richmond City School Board to purchase buses and Richmond City Council, an elective legislative body, to appropriate the funds required to pay for them. These orders were armed with the threat of contempt citation and punishment if resisted.

Both bodies, the School Board and City Council complied with these orders. Regardless of any question as to whether they should or should not have resisted, I think it is self-evident that little or no imagination is required to raise the fear that all these collateral questions will be determined either by court edict or by judicial coercion upon the elected representatives involved. Such a possibility should be repugnant to every individual who believes in our Constitution.

The potential for mischief inherent in this decision is, I think, self-evident. It constitutes a serious threat to the autonomy of local and state governments as integral parts of our Federal system and it constitutes a serious danger to the continued right of the people of this nation to freely govern themselves at the state and local levels of government.

If the Federal Courts are prohibited from demanding forced busing as a tool to achieve a unitary school system—whatever that may be—then the reasons which have produced the Richmond consolidation case and all like it, will have been removed. Court ordered busing is a fact. Extension of the doctrine upon which forced busing is predicated is now more than a fear or a theory.

The time has come for Congress to act to prohibit forced busing either by legislative act, as some suggest, or by amendment to the Constitution, which I believe to be the only practical course now open to us.

There was a time when I believed that Congress could enact legislation which the Supreme Court would sustain to prohibit forced busing to achieve an artificial racial balance or to eliminate a racial imbalance in public schools. I confess, however, that my optimism in this regard was destroyed by the Supreme Court's opinion in *Swann, et al. v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, et al.*

That opinion left no doubt that the Supreme Court has concluded there shall be a reordering of the ratio between the races among pupils in the public schools in areas where *de jure* segregation is said to exist. Moreover, it makes quite clear that busing is an acceptable tool, and, therefore, a Constitutional tool, which may be utilized to effect the necessary involuntary transfers.

When I consider that determination, when I consider the facility with which the Supreme Court swept aside pertinent language in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as well as Congressional expressions in subsequent enactments, and when I consider the distances pupils must be moved from one school to another to implement that decision, I find it impossible to conceive that the Supreme Court, of its own volition, will embrace and approve any legislative act having the effect of prohibiting such forced busing or eliminating forced busing already in progress as a result of its decision.

I know that some Members of Congress sincerely believe we can prohibit forced busing simply by enacting legislation. I respect their right to this view, of course, but I disagree with their conclusion. We are dealing with a basic decision which is predicated upon the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution. I fail to see how we can alter such a decision by mere legislation. The groundwork is already laid upon which the Supreme Court can render a decision which would declare such legislation unconstitutional and I believe that is precisely what it would do.

It is important at this point for each of us to contemplate a perplexing aspect of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg decision. I refer to the Court's failure to make that decision applicable to public schools located in areas where *de facto* segregation is said to exist. What may be of greater signficance, however, is the Court's refusal to hold that these areas are exempt from its application at some future date.

I find it difficult to justify the apparent conclusion of the Supreme Court, on the one hand, that the civil rights of a black child in North Carolina are so violated by a condition of segregation as to demand redress, whereas, on the other hand the civil rights

of a black child in another area who experiences the same condition of segregation are not violated simply because the former condition is determined to be *de jure* segregation and the latter *de facto* segregation. I deem it self-evident that the rights of both children are the same and that if the rights of one are violated, then the rights of both are violated regardless of the circumstances which contributed to establishing the offending condition. There can be no serious doubt, absent effective action by Congress, that the time must come when the Supreme Court will conclude that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg decision applies to *de facto* and *de jure* segregation with equal force.

It is high time for all of us to recognize, for what it is, the distinction which has been created between *de facto* and *de jure* segregation;—that it is a deliberate effort to divide into two camps the potential objectors to forced busing and to keep the two camps divided by holding out to one the hope that it will not suffer the same indignity of forced busing visited upon the other. I suggest that the long range result, if we fail to act, is that both camps will suffer the same fate, separately.

Those who feel secure today because they reside in areas identified as having *de facto* segregation will be well advised to heed the arguments of those of us who are currently under the gun. Where we stand today, they will surely stand tomorrow.

Some of those who now advocate action by legislation, and who argue that it would be upheld in Court, do not seek to prohibit forced busing, but rather to implement existing busing orders by attempting to impose some limitation upon the extent to which such orders would apply. Some advocates of this approach with whom I have talked seem to be saying that a certain amount of forced busing is acceptable, so long as it occurs somewhere else.

I hold that if busing is wrong in one place then it is wrong every place. I cannot, therefore, understand or accept such an approach as a method for dealing with this issue.

Forced busing under Court order, solely to achieve an artificial racial mix of pupils in public schools is a fact. In Richmond, for example, it has existed for a full year and a half. To date every determination to impose forced busing upon separate school systems have been made by the Judicial Branch of the Federal Government, in which democracy as we know it simply does not exist.

We should not make the mistake of failing to recognize that citizens across this land, especially those in jurisdictions already subject to Court ordered busing are growing restive, not simply because of their objection to forced busing but because this practice, so vital to them and their children, has become a reality without any opportunity to express themselves on the issue either by direct vote or through their duly elected representatives.

This fact alone offers a compelling argument against reliance now upon so questionable a remedy as a legislative act, for the validity of such an act will remain undetermined for a long period of time, perhaps several years. Meanwhile, existing court ordered busing would continue unabated and consolidation orders, such as the one in Richmond, even if stayed throughout appeal, will have been decided long before such legislation can be tested in the Supreme Court.

I am here today, therefore, to support, and to urge your sympathetic consideration of, an amendment to the Federal Constitution which will establish the Constitutional foundation for valid legislative action to properly and effectively deal with this issue and hopefully with the related arbitrary assignment of teachers to achieve artificial racial balances of the teachers in each public school.

The essential language to which I refer provides that no public school student because of race, creed or color shall be assigned to or required to attend a particular school. This language is appealing because it is brief and explicit and because it properly extends to its ultimate conclusion the existing principle that the Constitution is color-blind.

Proponents of forced busing have charged that such an amendment would roll back progress in school integration which began with the Brown decision in 1954. This is an invalid argument.

First of all, the charge appears to be predicated upon a conviction, which no amount of fact seems to dispel, that every opponent of forced busing is an unrelenting segregationist whose sole objection to it is his unswerving aversion to mixing black and white children in public schools. That simply is not a fact. Opposition to forced busing is not related to race, for the principle that public schools shall be racially integrated is well established and accepted. In the past year and a half, for example, I have received approximately 15,000 communications from constituents, some of whom are black, expressing their opposition to forced busing. Except for a handful of letters, these citizens made affirmative statements demonstrating that they do not object to integration in public schools. That this reflects a genuine conviction is attested by the fact that immediately prior to the forced busing order in Richmond, public school integration was progressing—peacefully and without incident.

Second, I find it difficult to understand how these opponents of the Constitutional amendment which I support can embrace, on one hand, the proposition that our Constitution says that a public school pupil may not be prevented from attending a particular public school on account of his race, creed or color, yet reject on the other, this proposed amendment which complements that proposition by stating that henceforth the Constitution will also forbid the assignment of that pupil to a particular school because of his race, creed or color.

Their position supports the patently unequal proposition, that for some purposes the Constitution is color-blind but for others, it is not.

The language I support, as set out in my resolution, H.J. Res. 597, H.J. Res. 620, and other pending proposals, would make it clear beyond doubt that the Constitution is indeed color-blind—in every respect.

Should there be a feeling on the part of this Subcommittee that the suggested amendment should reflect both propositions then, I submit, it might consider inserting immediately after that portion of the proposed amendment which reads "No public school pupil shall because of race, creed or color" the words "be prevented from attending or" so that Section 1 will read "Section 1. No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be prevented from attending or be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

An important facet of the approach I recommend, which should allay the fears of its detractors is that even though this Constitutional amendment is passed and ratified, subsequent legislation will be required to implement it. The question as to what school plans will result and whether the neighborhood school concept, freedom of choice, or some other plan will be permissible will, no doubt, be determined by subsequent Congressional legislation.

I am aware of the argument that this amendment might produce a result contrary to the one I seek. Perhaps that is possible; however, its adoption and ratification will provide Congress with an opportunity to make the decisions involved rather than to continue to leave them to the Federal Courts. I, for one, feel far better about relying upon the will of Congress than I do about having to rely upon the discretion of Federal judges who are not accountable to the people for their actions. I have an abiding faith in the citizens of this Nation, when important issues are involved, to be fair and objective and to reach a correct decision. Those of us who have joined together in our anti-busing effort are perfectly willing to place our case before the body politic who will speak through their elected representatives. I think it is fair, then, to ask those who oppose us why they are unwilling to do the same.

In conclusion, let me reiterate; our effort here is not one to perpetuate segregation, it is simply an effort to prohibit the utilization of compulsory busing of pupils to achieve an arbitrary racial mixture in public schools.

It is an effort to redirect national focus upon the proposition that public schools exist for the purpose of providing quality education, not for experimentation in sociological projects.

It is an effort to provide the framework upon which permssible legislation can be formulated.

It is an effort to afford to the people an opportunity to act.

I intend to support legislation, if it is developed, which has as its objective a prohibition upon forced busing. However, to support such an effort to the exclusion of all else would, in my view, be a serious mistake and I will, therefore, continue to work for their Constitutional Amendment.

Because of the questionable validity of a legislative act, I believe, we should all join hands, now, in support of this Constitutional Amendment, regardless of whether our action is in conjunction with separate legislation or not.

Should we do that and should we also enact anti-busing legislation which is sustained by the Court before this amendment can be ratified, then no damage will have been done. On the other hand, should such legislative enactment be declared unconstitutional at some future date then the immediate availability of an amendment for ratification will be a significant and welcome circumstance in what must be the common goal of us all, to effect resolution of this vexing problem at the earliest possible time.

Thank you.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS SIGNS NEW CONTRACT WITH HEW

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a communication that I have recently received from Dr. George K. Degnon, director, Department of Government Liaison, American Academy of Pediatrics, together with an article in the American Academy's newsletter dated March 1, 1972.

Without elaboration at this point the communication and the article in the newsletter inform us that the Academy has signed a new contract wtih the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expanding headstart medical consultation services to 1973.

The letter and article follows:

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
Evanston, Ill., March 8, 1972.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: You know of the long-standing interest and support of the

American Academy of Pediatrics for programs to improve the health and welfare of young children, particularly Project Head Start. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Academy's recent newsletter discussing the new medical consultation contract.

This contract which will result in expanded participation by the pediatric community in Project Head Start represents a major step forward by the Academy to insure that health services provided the Head Start children throughout the country will adequately meet the health needs of these children, their families, and their communities.

We will be pleased if you see fit to submit the enclosed article to the Congressional Record so that other members of the Congress and the public might be apprised of the Academy's continued commitment to the health and welfare of young children.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE K. DEGNON,
Director, Department of Government Liaison.

[From Newsletter, American Academy of Pediatrics, Mar. 1, 1972]

ACADEMY SIGNS NEW CONTRACT WITH HEW EXPANDING HEAD START MEDICAL CONSULTATION SERVICES TO 1973

The American Academy of Pediatrics has signed a $1,134,600 contract with the Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare renewing and expanding the AAP Head Start medical consultation program originally initiated in 1967. The contract will extend the program through July, 1973.

The new Head Start contract was initiated and developed by the Academy's Department of Community Services and represents a major step forward by the Academy to insure that health services provided Head Start children throughout the country adequately meet the health needs of these children, their families and their communities.

The Head Start contract features two new provisions which were not included in the original program.

REGIONAL HEALTH SPECIALISTS

One provision will enable the Academy to hire and train twelve regional health specialists to develop and coordinate health services training and technical assistance systems to serve the needs of local program personnel. The regional health specialists will participate in general policy making and program development with the regional Head Start consultant and the regional Office of Child Development.

They will assist local program personnel in obtaining and using medical assistance funds; train personnel in the use of planning and budgeting guides, and train program staff in self-evaluation techniques, program budgeting and planning of training and technical assistance needs. Besides training Head Start program personnel, the regional health specialist will monitor local Head Start programs to ensure their smooth and effective operation.

SELF-EVALUATION

The other new provision calls for individual self-evaluation of Head Start programs at the community level. Through this mechanism, Head Start medical consultants and program staff will review and critically assess the program's operation in detail. This procedure will enable Head Start consultants, regional health specialists and program staff to effectively develop and implement new techniques as needed to ensure better quality child health care.

These two new provisions in the Head Start contract will further enable consultants to pinpoint and resolve administrative and other types of problems more quickly and efficiently. Thus the consultant will have additional time to provide extensive medical services to Head Start children through a more economic and efficient overall program.

CONSULTANTS' DUTIES

Under the provisions of the renewed contract, the Head Start medical consultant will be able to more effectively: assist in the development of applications submitted by the community; meet with local planning committees to map out Head Start programs; maintain contact with program medical directors; follow-up and evaluate programs, and maintain liaison with OCD regional and national offices.

Consultants will work with the Office of Child Development representatives responsible for funding and evaluating Head Start health programs, helping them interpret the needs of the children, the resources of the community, and the success of Head Start programs. The consultant will supplement rather than replace the medical and administrative skills available in each community.

FURTHER INFORMATION AVAILIBLE

Anyone wishing further information about the Head Start medical consultation service program or desiring to serve as a consultant should contact: Mr. Edmund N. Epstein, administrative director, Head Start Medical Consultation Service, American Academy of Pediatrics, P.O. Box 1034, Evanston, Ill. 60204.

CHINA: WHAT DID WE GIVE AND WHAT DID WE GET?

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a penetrating and outspoken statement summarizing the real results of the President's recent visit to Peking, made by a man who has become probably the best known, mostly widely watched television commentator in southern California: George Putnam. I only wish our national broadcast media, whose spokesmen react with such a pious pretense of horror when they are accused of allowing a single point of view to dominate their newscasts and comment almost completely, would give this man the nationwide audience he clearly deserves. Then the American people would have the opportunity to hear a good many more of the truths not pleasing to Chairman Mao.

Mr. Putnam's broadcast, entitled "What Did We Give and What Did We Get?" and broadcast over KTLA, Channel Five, Los Angeles, at 5 and 10 p.m., February 28, follows:

WHAT DID WE GIVE, AND WHAT DID WE GET?

(By George Putnam)

When it was first announced that the President would fly to Red China to meet with Mao Tse Tung and Chou En Lai, this reporter voiced disapproval unless such a meeting be held at a neutral location with predetermined ground rules, agenda, and objectives fully expressed.

Shortly thereafter, I was summoned to the Western White House and a briefing by Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger. I came away with some of the following conclusions—that the meeting would consist only of discussions—that we would give nothing away—that we would carry forth our commitments to Taiwan and to the Nationalist Chinese—that the administration needed maneuvering room—that's the way the doctor put it—that a wedge might be driven between Russia and Red China—that a giant international chess game was in progress—and that we were, in fact, playing one Communist power against the other.

Well, it all sounded quite reasonable. But now, my original fears have been borne out. It is this reporter's conclusion that Mr. Nixon came away from his meeting with Chou En Lai giving much more than he received. And there is question that we received anything at all.

Mr. Nixon promises withdrawal of our ten thousand troops from Taiwan—not immediately—but over a period of time. He agrees there is only one China and that Taiwan is a part of mainland China. He endorsed entirely the five principles of so-called peaceful coexistence as espoused by the Red Chinese since back in 1955.

And the President comes very close to warning Russia not to attack China when he states, "Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states—non-aggression against other states—noninterference with the internal affairs of other states."

It must be noted that these would be violated by any Soviet strike against Red China.

Well now, what did we get in return? It is this reporter's opinion we got nothing, or next to nothing. There are thirty thousand Red Chinese troops in Laos. There are American prisoners held in Red China. There are three U.S. civilians held by the Chinese Communists at this moment.

The Red Chinese continue to supply our enemies with the weapons of a war that are killing Americans and our allies, and that is happening right now. The Red Chinese continue to use drugs as an instrument of policy and as a weapon. Now, are these not *negotiable* items?

Red China is committed to the destruction of the United States and all western values, as enunciated by Chairman Mao himself. Yet, the Nixons sat down and broke bread with the Red Chinese, who emasculated Tibet—killed at least fifty million of their own—directed the Red Guard massacre as recently as four years ago, in 1968.

And yet, in high flown language, our President, in his post-communique toast said, and I quote, "The Chinese and American peoples are dedicated to the principle that never again shall foreign domination, or foreign occupation, be visited upon any part of China or any independent country of this world."

But what is to become of Taiwan? It would appear that the President has pulled the rug out from under the Nationalist Chinese and Chiang Kai Shek, our steadfast allies through three wars. It will be denied—but putting Washington acceptance of Taiwan as a part of China, together with U.S. acceptance of the principle of non-interference, in the internal affairs of other states, adds up to a "hands off" attitude toward Taiwan.

Conspicuous by its absence is any pledge of Nixon support for Nationalist China if Taiwan is invaded by the Communist Chinese. What is to become of the mutual security treaty that we signed with the Nationalist Chinese in 1954? What is to become of the confidence some Asian allies previously held for the United States? Does our word mean anything at all? Are we, ourselves, to be trusted?

July fifteenth, 1971, President Nixon pledged, and I quote, "Our action, in seeking a new relationship with the People's Republic of China, will not be at the expense of our old friends." End quote.

Now, it is this reporter's opinion that Mr. Nixon has acted contrary to those high flown words—that he has gained nothing in return for his commitments to the Red Chinese and that he has now substituted expediency for principle.

Does Mr. Nixon, by his new concessions to the Red Chinese, prove true the statement carried on the North Korean radio that he, Nixon, was going to China with the white flag of surrender in one hand and the beggar's bowl in the other?

Because, if so, he will rank in history with Neville Chamberlain, and this will prove to be just another Munich.

COAST GUARD SERVICES ON LAKE MICHIGAN

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, about a month ago the Coast Guard cutter *Woodbine*, which had been stationed at Grand Haven, Mich., for many years, was decommissioned due to budget curbs imposed upon the agency.

Since the time when I was first notified of this impending action, I have been working to secure assurance that the vital Coast Guard services provided to the boating public and commercial shippers of western Michigan will be maintained. The decommissioning of the *Woodbine* left the shoreline of Lake Michigan from Chicago to Charlevoix without the services of a cutter. This decision is a serious concern to the thousands of citizens who depend upon the protection of the Coast Guard in the southeastern portion of Lake Michigan.

Over 75,000 boats are registered in nearby counties, the overwhelming majority of which are used by people fishing or boating on Lake Michigan. Many other boaters come from other areas of Michigan or outside the State to fish in these waters. In addition, increasing utilization of the St. Lawrence Seaway at all times of the year suggests that the icebreaking operations, navigational aid systems, and search-and-rescue programs of the Coast Guard will become steadily more important in the years ahead.

The Coast Guard is presently analyzing its requirements and vessels assignments for Lake Michigan, to assure that its larger vessels are distributed throughout the area in the most effective manner. The citizens of Grand Haven and neighboring counties, who have enjoyed many decades of close association with the Coast Guard and who have demonstrated their interest and support of the agency in the annual Grand Haven Coast Guard Festival, are very hopeful that the Coast Guard will be able to respond to the needs of their area. Several weeks ago, while visiting in Michigan, I heard the following editorial on WOOD–TV of Grand Rapids, Mich. The editorial effectively summarizes these needs and the fine cooperation which Grand Haven has traditionally extended to the Coast Guard:

WOOD–TV EDITORIAL, FEBRUARY 18, 1972

The Coast Guard Cutter *Woodbine*, a fixture in Grand Haven for 25 years, is now mothballed in Detroit for economy reasons. Aside from small boats operated by Coast Guard stations along Lake Michigan, buoy tending, search and rescue missions, and assistance to commercial shipping will be shared by two ice-breakers—the *Sundew* stationed at Charlevoix and the *Mesquite* stationed at Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin.

Now, the Coast Guard is wrestling with a division of Lake Michigan . . . either to split the Lake down the middle, or to establish an East-West dividing line with each ship taking half the Lake.

The *Woodbine* was expensive to maintain. With helicopters and faster small boats, search and rescue teams can cover more ground. But Sturgeon Bay and Charlevoix are both in the northern half of the Lake, almost opposite and a little over 100 miles apart. Both these stations are between 250 and 300 miles from the concentration of boats and shipping around Chicago and lower Lake Michigan.

Requiring two ships to patrol all of Lake Michigan is lean. And, certainly, their present locations are not strategically sound. . . . The interests of commercial and pleasure craft in the lower lake—and there are thousands of them—ought to be carefully considered. If, as we've heard, the shipping season on Lake Michigan will be extended, an ice-breaker on the lower east shore would be handy when prevailing winds clog east shore shipping lanes.

One other consideration: Grand Haven people have worked hard to make theirs the Coast Guard City—Coast Guard Week is an example. That kind of publicity has immeasurably helped the Coast Guard and Grand Haven deserves serious consideration as a base for another Coast Guard ship.

VOTER INFORMATION DAY IN MANHASSET, N.Y., STORE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 11, Lord & Taylor Department Store, in cooperation with the League of Women Voters, held a Voter Information Day at their Manhasset and Garden City branches. Volunteers from the League of Women Voters spent the day at the two stores at voter information centers answering questions and distributing voter information kits to shoppers. In their announcement of the event, Lord & Taylor emphasized the importance of vote power to young people, the group at which this day's events was aimed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend both Lord & Taylor and the League of Women Voters for their efforts not only to inform the public, but to emphasize the responsibility we all have to take part in our country's election process. Of course, the time to establish regular voting habits is when we are young, and therefore Lord & Taylor has performed a double service by directing its appeal to those 18, 19, and 20 years old.

By acquainting the newly enfranchised youth with the procedures and responsibilities of voting, Lord & Taylor and the league have hopefully laid a solid groundwork of conscientious citizenship with the many young people I am told took part in the day's activities.

I hope that others will follow the fine example Lord & Taylor has set.

DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, April 1 marks the 10th anniversary of the Defense Industrial Supply Center and its mission of supply support to the Nation's Armed Forces.

Established as a field activity of the Defense Supply Agency on April 1, 1962, DISC has for a decade, combined professional personnel talent with modern management techniques to provide its military customers throughout the world with responsive logistic support. DISC items are used by all the services in support of their multimillion-dollar weapon systems such as the Polaris, Hawk, Hercules, Thunderchief, and F–111 aircraft, Minuteman, Chinook, Vigilante, Chinook helicopter and Sheridan tank, as well as the repair and overhaul of other military and space program equipment.

Commanded by Brig. Gen. Paul E. Smith, USA, DISC averages over 14,000 individual sales each calendar day of the year, with a catalog of approximately 578,600 industrial items. The DISC inventory totals $307 million, with sales of over $181 million per year.

From its 9-acre headquarters in Northeast Philadelphia, within my district, DISC personnel maintain a constant flow of critical items 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to satisfy the supply needs of the military services.

Over 2,000 career civil servants and 36 officer logisticians representing each of the services, are responsible for the realization of DISC's mission. Because of the primary functions relating to procurement, supply, distribution, and technical analysis, the majority of employees are in the inventory manager, purchasing agent, and equipment specialist categories.

DISC, during its 10 years of service, has been responsible for the wholesale support of the military services with industrial type items. These include bearings, block and tackle, rigging and slings, rope, cable, hardware, metal bars, sheets and shapes, and electrical wire and cable.

DISC catalogs about 30 percent of the total DSA number of items with many items enjoying repetitive demand and high dollar sales characteristics. The center processes over 5½ million requisitions yearly and renders bills to about 2,000 customers.

DISC has met the challenges of its first decade squarely and surely. Its personnel now look forward to the future by continuing its role as a vital link in DSA's logistic chain from American industry to the U.S. Armed Forces through improved support at reduced costs.

As DISC marks its decade of service, I personally extend my praise and appreciation to Brig. Gen. Paul E. Smith, USA, his officers and civilian personnel who have given so much to the successful accomplishment of their military

mission but have also pioneered numerous and innovative domestic action programs in the community.

The people of Philadelphia and the Nation can take justifiable pride in a fine job well done and to look forward to the continuation of DISC's vital role in the defense efforts of our country.

RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI'S DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the positions taken by the Department of Mississippi, Disabled American Veterans, who support President Nixon's policies in Vietnam whereby he has offered to set a deadline for withdrawal of troops in exchange for American prisoners and an accounting of those missing in action. The Mississippi Department of the DAV also deplores the inhumane treatment of American prisoners.

These positions were taken in a resolution adopted at the State executive committee meeting held in Jackson last month.

I include the text of the resolution at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Disabled American Veterans is an association of wartime disabled veterans federally chartered by Congress to work in the interest and welfare of the health, education, rehabilitation, and employment opportunities for all disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents. Its total membership is around 400,000, and

Whereas, at its last national convention held in Detroit, Michigan, in August, 1971, the Disabled American Veterans passed a resolution placing the organization solidly behind the President in support of his policy in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, the Department of Mississippi, through its several chapters geographically situated throughout the State, serves as the spokesman for all the disabled veterans, their widows and orphans living within the State of Mississippi, and

Whereas, a large percentage of our members are former Prisoners of War from previous wars, and

Whereas, we deplore and consider the current handling of the present Prisoners of War very inhumane and inconsistent with international policy adopted by the Geneva Convention and supported by the United States of America and *all* civilized nations. The suffering and suspense presently imposed upon the families of those missing-in-action and formally declared Prisoners is intolerable, from our point of view.

Now therefore be it resolved: That during its regularly scheduled semiannual Executive Committee meeting held in Jackson, Mississippi, on February 12 and 13, 1972, the Executive Committee, in executive session, does hereby reaffirm its support of the President of the United States in his offer to set a deadline for withdrawal of all troops in that area in exchange for Americans who are presently held as Prisoners of War and in his efforts to bring about cessation of all war activities in Indochina. It appears to us that the President of the United States has put the responsibility for the continuing of this war squarely upon the shoulders of the North Vietnamese, and

Be it further resolved: That copies of this resolution be forwarded to every Senator and Congressman, from the State of Mississippi, in Washington, D.C., urging his support of the President's Vietnam policy, and

Be it further resolved: That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all news media asking their support in this effort to attempt to secure the release of all Americans presently held in enemy prisoner of war camps in Southeast Asia.

ALEX J. SIMON,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Passed this 13 day of February, 1972, at 9 o'clock a.m.

Attest:

GADDIS M. WILLIAMS,
Department Adjutant.
ROBERT E. GRANT,
Department Commander.

STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a thesis on the subject of sea-based and land-based missile systems. The article forwarded by Richard M. Flaherty of the University of Michigan is thought provoking and deals with one of the most complex and absorbing subjects of our time. I believe the Members will benefit from reading it.

The article follows:

STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS

Thesis statement: Sea launched ballistic missiles should aid or replace land-based intercontinental missiles.

I. Reason for offensive sea missiles:
A. Mobility.
B. Detection.
C. Civilian factor.
D. Defense perimeter.
E. Accuracy and power.
F. Time factor.
II. Reasons for defensive sea missiles:
A. Adaptability.
B. MIRV's.
C. Misses reported to Safeguard.
D. Defense of allies.
E. Accidental launches.
III. Affect on Strategic Arms Limitation Talks:
A. Plan for United States and Russia.
B. Advantages of the plan.

There is now some question as to whether the United States still has an edge over the United Soviet Socialist Republic in nuclear power. As each day progresses, the Soviet Union's production of nuclear weapons increases rapidly. If the Soviets achieved nuclear supremacy, our country could well be threatened by a possible "first strike" by the unpredictable Russians.

Leaders in the United States' government feel that we should prevent this gap in power and find a way to give the Soviets less reason to present an attack. The United States now has approximately one thousand and fifty-four intercontinental ballistic missiles to the Soviet's thirteen hundred and fifty; four hundred and thirty-five heavy bombers to the Soviet's one hundred and fifty; fifty medium bombers to the Soviet's seven hundred; and six hundred and fifty-six sea launched missiles to the Soviet's two hundred and ninety.

Many Congressmen, as well as the leaders in our armed forces, have presented plans which they think might tip the nuclear balance in our favor. An antiballistic system was brought to the attention of Congress and was approved. It is now under construction. This action is just one step this country has taken to gain nuclear advantage over Russia. An underwater long range missile system also has been proposed and is being developed on the drawing board.

A number of statesmen, along with our Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt, feel that we should return to the sea with our nuclear power. They have managed to sway Congress into letting the Navy replace four hundred and ninety-six of the six hundred and fifty-six Polaris missiles with the up-dated Poseidon, which is more accurate and can carry ten to fourteen separate warheads, commonly called MIRV's. (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles)

But the United States should not stop at this point in building up its sea power. Uncle Sam can easily decrease the chance of nuclear war by aiding or even completely replacing our land based intercontinental missile system with emphasis on sea launched missiles.

At the present, our nuclear sea power consists of forty-one nuclear submarines, carrying sixteen nuclear missiles each. Each missile, which may be MIRVed, carries a single megaton. These missiles can be aimed towards targets as far away as twenty-eight hundred miles.

If this sea force were doubled and supported by a nuclear surface ship fleet, the United States would have a great advantage over Russia, which would last far into the future.

There are many reasons which support a sea based nuclear force over a stabilized land base. The Soviets have developed a new missile which is capable of dispersing several bombs of twenty megatons each. Just one of these bombs can deliver a blow one thousand times as powerful as the Hiroshima bomb of World War Two.

Every U.S. intercontinental ballistic missile silo's location is known by the Soviets. Our immobile missile system grows more vulnerable day by day. The silos are not deep enough, strong enough, or placed far enough apart to withstand these new Russian SS–9's or "Scarp" missiles. The mobility of a nuclear sea force is quite obvious. The waters of the world cover close to three-fourths of the globe's surface. Nuclear submarines, as well as other nuclear equipped surface vessels, are capable of cruising almost four hundred miles a day. A missile could be shot by a foreign power at a certain submarine or surface ship and the same vessel could be ten miles away before the missile reached its target. Hostile missiles would have to be shot within a twenty mile diameter in order to get a *single* nuclear vessel. As a result, it would take a large segment of the Soviet's missile force to attempt to destroy a very small portion of our nuclear fleet!

Polaris submarines are also able to remain submerged for ninety days without surfacing. These nuclear submarines are almost impossible to detect while submerged in the silent depths, for scientists have not made a surface device which is capable of finding submarines at cruising depths. In the near future "there is no sign of a breakthrough that could let man 'see' through the dense curtain of the ocean the way radar can spot different objects in the sky." It is possible for a hunter submarine to track down another, but very unlikely.

Because underwater acoustics are tricky, getting an accurate fix on a fast moving submerged target can be as much an art as a science. The temperature of the water, for instance, affects the behavior of sound waves. Thermal layers can bend and scatter sonar signals and throw a big error into calculations.

Electromagnetic radiation, used in sonar, fades in water.

And the more sensitive the hydrophone array (which is used by the hunter submarines) the more difficult it becomes to dis-

tinguish the "signature" of a submarine from the jumble of sound and echoes produced by the abundant natural life in the ocean. Many a sonar operator has reporter (sic) a sub contact that turned out to be a whale!

Consequently, it seems very practicable to use a nuclear sea force not only for its mobility, but also for its undetectability.

However, ther is still more reason to support the changing of the United States' present land based system to sea based missiles. If the United States were to put its nuclear power to sea, the civilians of this country would not be *directly* threatened in case of a nuclear war. "Russia's prime targets in the United States are our ICBM (Intercontinental Ballistic Missile) sites, which the Kremlin planners know they must destroy if they are to mount a successful attack." Since most of the United States' ballistic missiles are located on the continent, its cities are vulnerable to direct hits in the event of a Soviet attack. If we removed our nuclear power from our soil and placed it at sea, the Soviets would have no reason to bomb our cities and would be less likely to hit them through error. Their main objective would be our retaliatory force at sea.

The Navy agrees that if the United States were to place seventy-five percent of its nuclear power out to sea, the United Soviet Socialist Republic would have no feasible reason for even mounting a strike on this country.

The most searching analysis shows that a global missile ship force could not be put out of action in less than eight to ten hours. In fact, significant numbers of ships would survive for days, weeks, or even months. Facing such a prospect an aggressor would have to conclude that a first strike on his part would lead to national suicide.

Presently, all our continental nuclear power directed against the Soviet Union is aimed in a single direction. All our missiles upon reaching Russia would have to pass through a small area known as the "threat tube." "The tube is 33 degrees wide or about nine percent of the Soviet defense perimeter." As a result, the Russians now only need to direct their defenses on one small area. With an accurate Soviet antiballistic system now being built, a retaliatory attack from the United States could possibly be thwarted. On the other hand, if America were to take advantage of a major nuclear sea force, the Soviets would have to present a three hundred and sixty degree defense. Our ships could be based in all the waters surrounding Russia, enabling our missiles to be fired from all directions.

The accuracy and power of the missiles found on the United States' submarines is unquestionable. Each missile, regardless of the evasive maneuvers of the submarine, ". . . is always trained on its assigned target." A former chief of Pentagon research said that although Poseidon's lone megaton is quite small as compared to the Soviet's SS–9, he feels that the Poseidon could become accurate enough to make up the difference.

A sea force would also allow the President more time to make a decision if a major crisis were to arise. On the average, it takes a missile about twenty minutes to reach the United States after it has been detected. Due to the shorter flight time needed for the missiles on a submarine or surface vessel which are nearer to their targets, the President may have a few more vital minutes in deciding his course of action.

A nuclear force would not necessarily consist of only offensive missiles. The United States could greatly aid its present Safeguard system with a sea based antiballistic missile force. There would be a number of advantages in such a novel plan. The Navy claims that the present Polaris boosters could be easily adapted to handle the Safeguard defensive missile. By this method, a surface ship could easily carry sixty interceptors. The mobility of such a defensive force is very evident. It would be similar to that of the proposed offensive nuclear system. A sea borne antiballistic missile system would also be able to intercept MIRVed missiles before their warheads separated, and the radar deceptive flack released. Accordingly, we would be able to keep a larger number of missiles from entering the country. If the defensive sea force were to miss a Russian missile, it could radio the miss to the continental Safeguard which could possibly have another chance at the missile. This mobile force would also more easily be able to defend our allies from the threat of an attack. Finally, if we were to accidentally launch a missile from the continent or from our offensive nuclear sea force, the sea based antiballistic missiles, because of their location, would be more capable of intercepting it before it reached foreign boundaries.

Government officials in Vienna at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) feel that if we do not obtain supremacy over the communists, we should at least attempt to place ourselves in a permanent nuclear deadlock, halting the build up of any more nuclear arms. This deadlock could be obtained by a nuclear sea force of equal proportion on each side.

If both sides had an agreed level of nuclear submarines—and also of hunter killer subs, the most effective antisubmarine weapons—neither side would have to fear that the other was developing a first strike capability. Both sides would MIRV their submarine-borne missiles, but since there would be no land-based ICBM's to serve as targets for the MIRV's, the effect would not be destabilizing.

The agreed level would provide the two nuclear giants with crushing nuclear superiority over the Chinese or any other nuclear power. . . . At the same time the agreement would ensure that neither nuclear giant, except in an act of insanity, would attack the other. (39)

Therefore, there are many reasons supporting a sea based nuclear force. Ships are more mobile than land-locked silos. Thus, sea vessels would be harder to pinpoint and destroy. A sea based force would minimize the immediate civilian hazard in the event of a nuclear war. Ships would enable us to retaliate from any side of the Soviet Union if the need should arrive. Our present sea missile, Poseidon, is accurate enough to compensate for the destructive power of the Russian SS–9. The nuclear fleet would allow the President more time in making decisions. Finally, antiballistic missiles, along with the other offensive missiles on the sea vessels, would have all the same advantages as well as being able to intercept the MIRVed missiles and our own missiles if they ever were accidentally fired.

If we are unable to obtain a nuclear supremacy with a nuclear fleet of our own, it would be possible to form a deadlock with the Soviets in a limited but equal amount of nuclear sea force, as proposed at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

For these reasons, a sea launched missile system, whether of the offensive or defensive type, definitely would be superior, should supplement, and could easily replace our present land based missiles.

RADIOACTIVE ASHES IN THE KANSAS SALT CELLAR

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission plans to construct a nuclear generating station on Newbold Island, 11 miles from the city of Philadelphia.

I am concerned by such a prospect and will vigorously oppose any such construction.

Besides the safety of 2 million people in Philadelphia and an additional 400,000 in an adjoining county, I have strong reservations about the siting trend the AEC is trying to establish by placing this facility in the heart of a major metropolitan area instead of in safer and more sparsely populated areas. Such planning is indeed dangerous to our people and has been overlooked by persons who should recognize this very real danger.

Newbold Island is in the middle of the Delaware River which is Philadelphia's source of drinking water. In December 1966, the Public Service Electric & Gas Co. of New Jersey applied for a construction permit from the AEC for a nuclear powerplant to be located on the river in Burlington County, N.J. This site is 5 miles from the northern Philadelphia border and the congressional area I represent. That application was withdrawn after I filed a protest with the Commission.

Now once again the same utility has put forward another construction application equally as dangerous. This one is 11 miles from the same section of Philadelphia—on Newbold Island, in the Delaware River, upstream from the previous location.

Title 10, CFR Part 100 in AEC Document TID–14844 for Calculation of Distance Factors for Power and Test Reactor Sites issued on March 23, 1962, provides that—

> Where large cities are involved a greater distance may be necessary . . .

It further provides for three concentric circles to surround a reactor to isolate it from population centers such as Philadelphia.

In the case of an accident, distance would be the only safeguard.

Philadelphia has more than 2 million people and is the fourth largest city in the United States. The thermal capacity for the Newbold reactors would be 6.6 billion watts. A pipe rupture with consequent loss of coolant would cause a nuclear core meltdown which would release a significant amount of radioactive material.

One feels that reasonable men with knowledge of nuclear power and its consequence to people in event of an accident would respect such power and therefore plan accordingly.

Yet the AEC does not heed these possibilities. Indeed, in appraising the Newbold site, the AEC admitted to deliberately ignoring Philadelphia. If the above-cited recommendations were followed, the site would have been planned about 48 miles away from Philadelphia in accordance with the three suggested concentric circles.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the Commission would be ignoring a great many safeguards and would be playing with our lives if it approves this application giving authorization to construct the nuclear powersite 11 miles from the fourth largest city in the United States.

The AEC claims that improved tech-

nology will lessen the danger. Incredibly, while the Commission admits that a hazard does exist, they refuse to do anything to protect the people of Philadelphia from a nuclear accident.

I cannot accept, I cannot allow 2 million-plus lives to depend on, the argument that this new technology will prevent an accident. This is especially true when the AEC will not follow its own recommendations which assert that a great enough distance between the reactor and major population centers is the best protection in case of an accident.

The AEC is willing to take a chance on catastrophe. It will experiment and test its new equipment at the cost of people's health and lives. This cannot be tolerated.

The list of AEC failures to comply with its promises for safety is long. One example is the bitter struggle in Lyons, Kans., where its 5,000 residents fought the AEC over the dumping of radioactive substances near the town.

John Lear, writing in the February 19 issue of Saturday Review, tells of the fight and subsequent victory of the people of Lyons.

Because I feel I must call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the AEC's dangerous gambling with the lives of our citizens, I now submit Mr. Lear's account in the RECORD:

RADIOACTIVE ASHES IN THE KANSAS SALT CELLAR

(By John Lear)

The town of Lyons, Kansas (pop.: under 5,000), sits over two salt mines, one beneath the north end of town, the other under the south end. The main tunnels of the mines head directly toward each other and come within 1,800 feet of meeting, 1,000 feet below the streets of Lyons. The north-end mine has been abandoned for some time, and the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission wants to buy it and turn it into a dump for disposal of the radioactive ashes of all the atomic furnaces in the country. The south-end mine is in daily operation. Its owners oppose the opening of the radioactive dump because they fear it would harm their business—people might think their salt was contaminated by radioactivity.

The south-end mine owners are not alone in their fears of radioactivity's contaminating effects. These fears have spread all over Kansas and have reached Washington, D.C., where Kansas Congressman Joe Skubitz talks of changing the wording of billboards that stand alongside every main highway leading into Kansas. Now the billboards flaunt this legend over Governor Robert Docking's name: "Welcome to Kansas. Home of beautiful women. Please drive carefully."

Skubitz says that if the north-end mine at Lyons is finally taken over by the AEC the billboards will have to read: "Welcome to Kansas. Home of beautiful women and the national nuclear waste dump. Please be careful."

The fears arise, of course, from the peculiar nature of splitting atoms as displayed in the fissionable isotopes of uranium and plutonium. In one respect, these radioactive fuels are the same as fossil fuels: wood, coal, oil, and natural gas. They all burn in a relatively steady process. Oil and gas are not good illustrative analogues, however, because their burning leaves little residue. Let us take coal instead. When coal burns, both the flame and the source of the flame can be seen clearly. When part of the coal is exhausted of its energy, that part dies; if the ash does not crumble away, it can at least be discerned and knocked away. It is finished burning. Not so with radioactive fuels. They burn internally. The combustion can be neither seen nor felt. The ashes are all mixed up with the still energetic fractions of the fissioning isotopes. At any time the potent fractions are a large proportion of the fuel in the furnace (which scientists confusingly call a "reactor") for nuclear combustion is more efficient if exhaustion of the available energy does not pass a certain point. Hence, any batch of fuel removed from the furnace is still dangerously hot.

In fact, the radioactivity contained in atomic furnace ashes is so intense that the ashes must be handled at a considerable distance from the human keepers of the furnace. Remotely controlled mechanical slaves, often of enormous size, do the sifting behind thick walls of concrete, lead, or steel and at the bottoms of deep pools of water. The ashes themselves boil spontaneously, and some will continue to boil for half a million years. The AEC allows private atomic furnace operators to keep these seething brews on private premises under proper safeguards for ten years. Then the ashes must be taken to a reprocessing facility. Only one such facility is operating in the country today. It is near Buffalo, New York. Another is under construction in Illinois. A third is planned for South Carolina. In the reprocessing, acids chemically separate the isotopes, which continue to change identity as they lose energy. The ones that are still useful as fuel are shipped back to the atomic furnace. Regulations recently put into effect require the residual mixture to be dried to a solid state and bundled in glass or ceramic before being capsuled in metal for permanent burial in some such place as the abandoned salt mine at Lyons.

Why a salt mine? Why Lyons? Why Kansas? Kansas has no atomic furnaces. Why should America's breadbasket, its fabled wheat fields rippling golden in the sun, become an inglorious cover for the radioactive ashes of everyone else's atomic furnaces? Because seventeen years ago, when atom-splitting was still a federal government monopoly (inherited from the military makers of atom bombs conceived as a last-ditch defense against Adolf Hitler and finally used to erase two Japanese cities from the earth), a panel of specialists chosen by the National Academy of Sciences looked into the future and saw only one possible containment for the furious energy of radioactivity during the thousands of years it would remain perilous to man. That containment was in geological structures lying deep within regions of the earth's crust that have long established records of stability, few visitations from earthquakes, and no access to flowing water. Thickly bedded salt looked safest of all. Salt resists corrosion, and flows slowly under the influence of heat, like a tallow candle. At a certain distance from the heat source, the flowing stops and the salt hardens again, sealing up whatever space has been opened by the flowing.

Five hundred thousand square miles of the continental United States is underlain with sailt, but only three patches of it meet the minimum requirements of a radioactive disposal site: salt at least 200 feet thick in order to absorb the most extreme radioactive effects with space to spare; salt buried at least 500 feet below the surface of the ground so that even glacial erosion could not wear away the rocky overburden and expose the salt to the rain; salt within a 2,000-foot depth to avoid prohibitively expensive access. One deposit of such dimensions is in western New York State, another lies under the city of Detroit, and the third stretches tens of thousands of square miles from central Kansas west and southwest through the panhandles of Texas and Oklahoma into New Mexico.

Millions of years before there was a state of Kansas, the breadbasket of today was occupied by a shallow sea intermittently connected to the Gulf of Mexico. Salt, evaporated from the sea water by the sun, accumulated to depths of between 200 and 300 feet all along the shore. During subsequent geological ages, successive layers of sedimentary rocks formed above the salt, and water gathered within these layers to feed the soil from which the wheat, the alfalfa, the sorghum, the soybeans, and the tall corn grow.

Perhaps because the salt around the city of Hutchinson, Kansas, had been easily mined since the 1800's, the AEC chose it as the first site for radioactive ash disposal. In 1959, Congress was asked to finance the underground carving of a giant Atomic Age replica of an old-fashioned moonshiner's still. It was proposed that, deep within the Kansas salt bed, a great cavern be cut in the shape of a laboratory flask. Into this chamber radioactive liquids from atomic furnaces throughout the country were to be poured and allowed to ferment into impotence. Congressman Skubitz, then administrative assistant to the late U.S. Senator from Kansas Andrew S. Shoeppel, recalls that piping was to run upward from the cavern to the ground and back to carry hot gases, cool them, and return them to the cavern. Senator Shoeppel considered this a "harebrained idea. Congressman Skubitz still thinks it was and calls it characteristic of the superficiality of the AEC's attention of the need for atomic furnace ash disposal while billions of tax dollars are lavished on the AEC's "client relationship with private companies operating power plants" that will steadily produce more radioactive ashes.

Two years after abandoning the idea of the moonshiners still, the AEC asked the American Association of Petroleum Geologists to select some saline aquifers (underground reservoirs of salt water) into which the radioactive liquids might be put. When the AAPG study committee recommended an aquifer under Lincoln County, Kansas, the designation was deleted from the committee report at the AEC's request.

Two years after that, in 1963, having accepted a National Academy of Sciences suggestion that radioactive ashes be solidified before their permanent disposal was attempted, the AEC returned to the salt cavern concept. An existing cavern was available in a worked-out segment of a mining property of the Carey Salt Company at Hutchinson. Hutchinson, the state's old salt marketing center, has excellent transcontinental rail connections that would facilitate transport of atomic furnace ashes from all directions. But the AEC soon shifted its attention twenty miles away to the entirely abandoned Carey salt mine under the north end of Lyons.

In 1965, a crew of scientific observers from the AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory moved into Lyons and lived there for the next year and a half, conducting Project Salt Vault. They drilled holes in the floors of five empty mine caverns, filled the holes with encapsuled radioactive ashes from the AEC's atomic test furnaces in Idaho, and measured the effects of the capsules' heat and radiation on the surrounding salt. The ashes from Idaho were old and not nearly as hot as ashes from a reprocessing plant of today; so electric heaters were brought in to approximate reality. The only unexpected observation was that a few drops of water moved through the salt toward the ash-filled capsules. Calculating the total effect of their findings, the AEC crewmen estimated that if twenty capsules containing radioactive ashes in glass blobs eight to ten feet long and six to ten inches in diameter were spaced out in a cavern 300 feet long and 30 feet wide, and if the caverns then were refilled with salt, the ceilings would sink two feet, the floors would rise two feet, each wall would move one foot in-

ward, and each capsule of ashes would move two feet up and six inches sidewise during the following ninety years.

After the Oak Ridge crew left Lyons, nothing further was heard of the need for a radioactive dump until the General Accounting Office of Congress reported, in May 1968, that its men had been scrutinizing the AEC's management of the radioactive waste problem. They learned that ninety-three billion gallons of very hot furnace ashes had been stored in supposedly leakproof tanks in the states of Washington, Idaho, and South Carolina, where the AEC's own facilities are concentrated. The GAO reported that several hundred thousand gallons of these dangerous liquids had leaked out of their containers and had escaped into the ground.

Silence fell again for eighteen months. Then, late in January 1970, AEC geologist Tom Lomenick appeared without notice in the offices of the Kansas State Geological Survey on the University of Kansas campus at Lawrence. Lomenick asked for help in determining how to predict geological change in central Kansas during the next million years.

The next silence was shorter. On March 24, two AEC representatives arrived unexpectedly in the offices of Kansas Governor Robert Docking in Topeka and requested an immediate interview. They told the Governor that the Carey mine at Lyons had been chosen for use as an atomic furnace ash dump and that it would be advisable to prepare the people of Kansas to accept the proximity of radioactivity.

When news of this interview reached the university campus at Lawrence, it set geology professor William Hambleton to growling. After many years of service in the State Geological Survey, he was preparing to assume its directorship at the beginning of the new fiscal year, only three months off. He did not agree that people should accept the proximity of radioactivity unless they were confident that they would be safe. He mulled this dissent for three weeks and then put it into a letter to the Governor.

The letter pointed out that once the AEC took title to the Lyons mine the state of Kansas ever after would be helpless to protect its citizens against mistakes. Lacking detailed geological information about the mine himself, Hambleton pleaded with the Governor to demand thoroughly documented scientific data establishing the safety of the mine for the designated purpose.

Hambleton's advice seemed sound to the Governor, who immediately authorized the State Geological Survey to undertake as much study of the Lyons site as the state budget would allow. The Governor also suggested to the Kansas legislature that it summon a symposium to corral all views of the controversy. State Attorney General Vern Miller was ordered to take whatever legal steps were necessary to protect the rights of the citizens of Kansas from abuse by any AEC action at Lyons. At the same time, the Governor's position was transmitted to the AEC and to the Kansas Congressional delegation, which includes U.S. Senator Robert Dole, national chairman of the Republican Party.

Reaction in Washington was prompt. The National Academy of Sciences Committee on Radioactive Waste Management invited Hambleton to join the committee's Panel on Disposal in Salt and to participate in its next meeting at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. He joined the panel and, after hearing the AEC's case in favor of Lyons, refused to sign the original draft of the panel report, insisting on the insertion of a number of precautionary provisos.

The scientific community is notoriously allergic to public exposure of its internal politics. The AEC had to go through the motions of placating someone it continued to underrate as a hick surveyor from the Bible Belt. Hambleton was asked to play host to a scientific group discussion of the recommendations the academy panel had asked him to make. After a full day of talking at Lawrence, on June 16, the conferees went into executive session on the 17th. While they were still debating, AEC Assistant Manager John Ehrlwine summoned news reporters in Topeka and announced the "tentative selection" of the Lyons mine. Even Oak Ridge employees of the AEC at the Lawrence meeting were embarrassed by this *fait accompli*.

Hambleton expected some signal of disapproval from the academy panel. When none came, he compiled his own "interim report" of events. "Unquestionably," he wrote, "the AEC would now proceed to buy the Lyons mine and prepare for operation of the radioactive dump by 1974. He said that it was now more crucial than ever that Kansas protect its citizens by carrying through adequate investigation of the Lyons site and by exploring the possible selection of more appropriate sites, either in Kansas or elsewhere."

On December 2, Hambleton wrote a further report. He distributed copies of it to interested scientists, the Governor's office, and the press. In it he disclosed that, pursuing one of the recommendations he had made to the academy panel, the AEC had added $100,000 to State Geological Survey funds already assigned to make a detailed study during the month of August of the surface geology, groundwater hydrology, and subsurface geology of a nine-square-mile area centered on Lyons.

Hambleton said he had proposed the drilling of four holes from the surface of the site through the salt to a depth of approximately 1,300 feet. Two holes had actually been drilled. A core had been drawn from the full length of one while core samples had been taken from the other. The corings would make it possible for the first time for the AEC to do what he said should have been done earlier on its own initiative: analyze the order and respective thicknesses of the layers of rock and salt at the mine and locate possible fractures along which fluid movement possibly could occur.

To date, he revealed, the AEC had based all its calculations on the supposition that there was a single layer of pure shale underlain by a single layer of pure salt. The cores, however, contained many alternating layers of salt and shale. Hambleton then explained that discrepancies between the AEC's assumptions and the geological realities "could be responsible for breaking the seal" of rocks overlying the salt and for permitting entry of surface or subsurface waters into the salt bed to create erosional problems and to invite dangerous convection effects.

Hambleton's December 1971 report also discussed the energy to be buried. "As long as the waste containers maintain their integrity, only very small quantities of salt would be subject to high-energy, heavy-particle radiation," he agreed. "However, release might occur once or twice a year for about three years, and melting or erosion might cause containers to migrate to lower depths, possibly the shale areas, and faults could develop in overlying rocks because of explosions. In addition, the metal containers are expected to deteriorate within six months, and the ceramic material [binding the radioactive ashes] is expected to deteriorate within several years. Accordingly, radioactive particles could migrate through the salt. . . . Water is available in the salt, and the waste particles could be suspended by turbulent boiling." The released radioactivity could also cause chemical breakdown of the salt itself. The salt molecule is constituted of chlorine and sodium atoms, and sodium burns intensely in the presence of water.

The AEC was hard pinched. The disproportionately low priority it had assigned to atomic furnace ash disposal over the years had left it vulnerable now that the private industrialists it had subsidized were reaching for the market they had been promised. Twenty-one atomic furnaces were in operation, fifty-five were under construction, and thirty-six more were under contract. Some time had been bought for solution of the ash problem by allowing the furnace owners and reprocessors to hold the ashes on their own properties for a decade, and the space necessary to accommodate the ashes had been reduced by the order to solidify the liquids. Nevertheless, the ash pile estimated for 1980 would make a cube thirty-three feet on a side; by the year 2000 the cube would be 180 feet on a side. It would be necessary to move only three capsules of ashes into the Lyons mine in 1976, but by 2000 there would be 500 intensely radioactive capsules ready for disposal every year, plus 700 capsules of less virulent stuff. The AEC could not afford any further delay, but it could not escape circulating a statement of environmental effects before going to Congress for funds with which to buy the Lyons salt mine.

Governor Docking got his copy of the environmental impact statement in December 1970. Almost everyone in Kansas who read the copies Hambleton distributed was enraged by the AEC's continuing failure to answer his questions. There was an even more hostile reaction to the AEC's insistence on preparing to put radioactive stuff into the mine and experimenting with it on the assumption that whatever difficulties might arise could safely be "engineered out." Moreover, Kansas hooted at the AEC's vague promise to remove the radioactive capsules from caverns refilled with salt should removal become necessary. What fantastic excavation instrument would be used? It had not been invented yet and would not be until need for it arose. This would happen in Kansas?

Both houses of the Kansas legislature and the whole Kansas delegation in Congress had joined the uproar by the time the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy called a public hearing last March on the AEC's request for $25-million to buy 180 acres of the Lyons mine property and 900 additional acres of salt plus subsurface mineral rights to a 1,700-foot-wide buffer zone surrounding those two adjoining properties. Activation of the appropriation would take out of production, for twenty-five to thirty years, 1,000 acres of Kansas farm land now planted in wheat, sorghum, or soybeans, or devoted to pasture.

Governor Docking authorized Hambleton to testify in the name of the state of Kansas. Among the other hearing witnesses was a functionary of the National Academy of Sciences who admitted that the AEC had not told the academy whether or not the salt panel's provisos had been satisfied. Another witness disclosed that the AEC had managed to make one computer calculation based on the multilayered rock and salt core provided by Hambleton. A third witness explained that the scientist responsible for the heat-transfer studies repeatedly requested by Hambleton had died and was only now being replaced. Hambleton's own remarks occupied about six of the 279 pages of the Lyons appropriation hearing transcript. Almost all the rest of the space was taken up in defense of the AEC, enunciated not only by AEC officials but also by members of the joint committee, only two of whom—Senator John Pastore of Rhode Island, the committee chairman, and Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., of Tennessee—expressed sympathy with Kansans' fears. A prediction that Senator Pastore made, however, turned out to be right: Congress was not willing to act against the unanimous opposition of the elected representatives of Kansas. Instead, it approved an appropriation bill amendment submitted by Senator Dole, prohibiting the AEC from purchasing the Lyons mine within the following three years unless the acquisition

was first approved by a special committee to be appointed by the President.

The AEC did not confess any change of attitude after the Congressional rebuff. But it did completely reorganize its machinery for administering the radioactive waste disposal system. Closer to Hambleton's home grounds in Lawrence, the members of the Lyons Chamber of Commerce—who at first had enthusiastically favored the abandoned Carey mine purchase—experienced a modification of opinion. They had originally looked upon Hambleton as a crank, but last June they invited him to Lyons to address interested townspeople at their high school. They met his University of Kansas plane at the Lyons airport in a playful mood, displaying a hangman's noose and asking whether the plane could fly home if it were tarred and feathered. Half a hundred Lyons residents went to the schoolhouse to hear what Hambleton had to say. One of them was J. B. Allen, superintendent of the mine that the American Salt Corporation operates at the south end of Lyons. After the meeting, Allen asked whether or not Hambleton had seen a letter the corporation president and general manager, Otto Rueschhoff, had written to the AEC from the corporation headquarters at Kansas City, Missouri.

At Allen's suggestion, Rueschhoff sent a copy of the letter to Hambleton. The original, dated May 4, had been dispatched in reply to one that F. M. Empson, an AEC health physics specialist at Oak Ridge, had written to Rueschhoff on April 14. Empson nad been in the crew that lived at Lyons during the Salt Vault experiment. As the only AEC employee known to have met Rueschhoff personally, Empson was picked to ask the salt mine company executive for proprietary information that probably would not be forthcoming—such as how much salt the south-end mine at Lyons produced each year. Rueschhoff did not give this information, but his letter to Empson did list some interesting reasons why the abandoned Carey mine at the north end of Lyons might not be a safe place for a radioactive dump.

Although the American Salt Corporation and the Carey Salt Company were competitors in a business notoriously reluctant to share information, Rueschhoff was familiar with the Carey property because each of the Lyons mines has only one entry-and-exit shaft. In the 1930s, the rival mine owners considered connecting their main tunnels in order to provide each other with a back door in case of accident. These plans were abandoned when the Carey salt mine was closed, but the negotiations lasted long enough for Rueschhoff to learn that the Carey mine shaft drillers had passed through forty feet of water in the rock overlying the salt; a caisson had to be installed to complete the operation.

The shaft of American's own mine at the south end of Lyons, as Rueschhoff reported in mining parlance, is "wet." Water regularly collects in a receiving ring at the shaft bottom and has to be pumped to the surface.

Only five days after Empson's letter to Rueschhoff was written, drillers and blasters in the dry-mining segment of the American mine bored seven feet into what they thought was solid salt and hit a hole from which mud and water poured until the hole was closed with concrete. No one knew how the hole got there. Mine records gave no clue. The owner of the land above the mine was equally nonplused. An unrecorded well was suspected, but no opening could be found in the ground above, even after a bulldozer dug up the soil to a depth of four feet in a 200-foot radius from where the entrance to such a well should have been.

An equally puzzling episode of 1965 was recalled by Rueschhoff. It occurred in that part of the American mine where hydraulic methods are used to remove the salt. In the way customary to such operations, three vertical holes were drilled 600 feet apart in a triangular configuration. Fresh water was pumped into one hole with the expectation that it would break through the salt below, find the other two holes, and wash the dissolved salt back up to the surface in them. In this instance however, the brine did not come up. The downpouring water—170,000 gallons of it—simply disappeared.

After Hambleton went to see Rueschhoff and reported their conversation to the AEC, enthusiasm for a dump anywhere in the Lyons neighborhood waned perceptibly. In a subsequent talk to the Kansas Engineering Society, the new director of the AEC's waste disposal system, Dr. Frank Pittman, referred to unresolved "problems" that had arisen. AEC Chairman Dr. James R. Schlesinger wrote a letter to Tammy Lee Estes, an anxious Fort Scott, Kansas, schoolgirl, and promised her that the Lyons mine would not be used unless its safety could be guaranteed. However, he reiterated the scientific preference for disposal in salt beds.

Hambleton had never questioned the desirability of using the salt beds under adequate safeguards, and a recent report of his to the AEC identifies seven other places in Kansas that might be suitable as atomic furnace ash disposal sites. The question now is whether the AEC's tactics at Lyons have stigmatized the radioactive dump concept too starkly to restore it to respectability in the public's mind.

If a dump is not established somewhere, the American people will have to relinquish the benefits of the Atomic Age until scientists learn to effectively control the fusion of atomic nuclei and thereby open a new era of almost clean power.

SOLVING THE POWER CRISIS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, America's power needs have doubled in the last decade; current demands will triple by the year 2000. The inability of existing technology to close the widening gap between demand and supply means that this summer there will be more blackouts, brownouts, voltage reductions, and power shortages than ever before.

One answer to the power crisis is that the insatiable American consumer may well have to settle for fewer electrical gadgets in the kitchen and garage. Another is that traditional attitudes toward population growth need to be changed and the goal of population stabilization—two children per family—achieved by voluntary means. Still another is a new technology which can meet the energy requirements of a prosperous economy without the belching smoke of conventional powerplants or the radiation and thermal pollution dangers associated with the current state of nuclear power.

Along these lines, Dr. Aden Meinel of the University of Arizona, and his wife Marjorie, have gained national attention with their study of solar energy. The Meinels have suggested that the sun's energy can be harnessed by the optical concentration of sunshine in ground collectors spread over desert regions—sunshine converted to produce steam and ultimately electricity. The Meinels' fascinating proposal, which has received all too little attention, is examined in articles recently appearing in the magazine Aware and the Scottsdale Daily Progress.

They follow:

SOLAR ENGERY—THE POSSIBLE DREAM?

(In this new approach the primary technology is optical thin film coatings that can absorb sunlight but prevent remissions of infrared light)

(By Aden Baker Meinel)

People are becoming aware that solar energy may be a neglected option in the growing energy crisis and they ask the question "Is solar energy practical, and if so, when could it become available?" Since our name is now being associated with a new concept for thermal conversion of solar energy for power production we would like to tell you of our exploration into the subject, how the concept developed and the long road ahead—the road from concept to reality.

Solar energy from time to time has been hailed as something important to mankind, but these hopes were not realized. What might be different this time? We began researching the solar energy literature last year solely to answer our own curiosity of why solar energy, hailed widely in the 50's, had not achieved its promise. We also wondered why solar energy had been dismissed as of no importance by a prestigious committee of the National Academy of Sciences as recently as 1969.

Solar energy recently is having a new birth of interest and some spectacular but impractical proposals have been made—such as giant orbiting power stations. So often the unspectacular gets overlooked in flights of imagination. The result of our study has been a new avenue, but one that could hardly be called "spectacular"—but it might work!

Solar power is familiar to most of us through its service in the form of direct conversion silicon solar cells on spacecraft. These devices work fine if you can afford to pay a few hundred times as much for power as is regularly produced by nuclear and fossil commercial power plants.

Few fully appreciate what inexpensive power means to civilization and in freeing mankind from harsh labor. We travel to the Asian subcontinent rather frequently in connection with science projects and have opportunities to get into the back country and see how much of mankind has lived since the dawn of antiquity. When we hear some people say that we need less energy and want to return to the "good old days", we want none of it. We feel it urgent that energy be kept inexpensive and our studies have been guided by this need.

ECONOMICS BASIC SOLAR BARRIER

Economics is the biggest barrier to solar power. There are many scientific ways to convert sunlight into power—direct conversion, thermal conversion, biological conversion (such as a crop-to-methane process) and many variants. Quite a few of these effects are once more being proposed but the hard facts of economics will keep many in the category of museum curiosities.

Our study led us to thermal conversion as an area needing a new look when we noted that the low conversion efficiencies of 2 to 3 percent in olden attempts could be vastly improved by devising a system that would operate at high temperatures. We asked the question "Why not make a system that could operate at the high temperatures of modern steam turbine power plants?" In this case one could neatly interface the new solar technology with existing central power station equipment types. Let us look at the key technologies that combine to meet this goal.

The primary technology is optical thin film coatings that can absorb sunlight but prevent re-emission of infrared light, the dominant way heat escapes from a heated surface

when the surface is inside a vacuum envelope. These coatings are very thin. They can be applied to steel substrates by various techniques such as vacuum (HVD) or chemical (CVD) deposition, and withstand the high temperature we require when refractory metals and oxides are used. Modern "continuous processors" like the Libby-Owens-Ford unit for coating architectural glass have lowered the cost of multilayer coatings to a point where they are cheap enough to be seriously considered for solar power uses.

In our design we use simple Fresnel (microstepped) lenses or mirrors to concentrate sunlight 10 to 15 times normal brightness on the selective coatings. One can then extract on the order of 80% of the incident sunlight at a temperature of 1000°F.

The second key technology is liquid metal heat transfer fluids, such as liquid sodium, developed by the AEC for a nuclear reactor coolant. Sodium is cheap and abundant and appears to be the ideal way to bring heat into a central power station from a farm of solar collectors.

The third key technology is low temperature salt eutectics, also developed by the AEC. The role this type of material plays in our concept is as a cheap way to store solar energy heat for overnight and cloudy day operation of the steam power plant.

The fourth key technology is the art of U.S. industry to develop and manage integrated manufacturing facilities. Such a facility is vital for economic success in the solar energy field because of the stringency of economics constraints. This facility might be located in a city in the middle of a suitable arid region and serve a cluster of solar power farms in a radius of 20 to 30 miles.

WHAT IS ALLOWABLE CONSTRUCTION COST?

"The magnitude of the economic constraint can be seen when you ask what the allowable construction budget is in terms of the anticipated power cost. For example, if we wish power at 5.3 mills/kwh (energy cost) (which is about that using natural gas as a fuel, but more expensive than nuclear or coal) and must pay 10% interest on the large capital investment inherent in solar power farms, then if the capital is paid off in 15 years, the operating lifetime of the plant is 40 years, and the efficiency of conversion (via our concept) is 25–30%, it means that one can expend no more than 60 dollars per square yard of collecting area. While this constraint is tight we feel that it can be met.

The basic plan of our concept is shown in the accompanying chart. The solar collecting farm is connected to the thermal storage tanks via the liquid metal loop. The power plant draws energy from storage as the demand of the power plant requires, the cooled thermal storage material being stored for reheating the next day. This diagram is obviously much simplified over what a real system becomes. For example, one does not wish to leave hot sodium in the solar collectors at night or it will cool and probably freeze. When the frozen system is reheated the next morning considerable time would be lost in getting it up to operating temperature, hence we purge the hot sodium out with compressed nitrogen and store the hot fluid overnight. The empty collectors heat rapidly the next day, whereupon the sodium is pumped back into the collectors and the system begins to collect a new load of energy.

WON'T UPSET CLIMATE OF THE DESERTS

Solar power farms require large land areas and raise a number of environmental questions. We have given many talks to student and professional groups and certain questions are always raised. The main one is "Won't they upset the climate of the deserts?" The answer is definitely no! It happens that a balance occurs since the energy being collected and delivered to the distant cities is balanced because the solar collectors are blacker than normal terrain and absorb enough adidtional energy to balance the export. In other words, if you looked at a solar farm from an Apollo spacecraft you would see a darker spot since the radiation that would have been reflected out into space by the terrain is now absorbed.

"WASTE HEAT" BECOMES "RETURN HEAT"

There is a subtle point hidden in the achievement of local thermal balance at the solar power farms—we must return the unused portion of the turbine thermodynamic-cycle heat to the local environment. We call it "waste heat" when the power plant is nuclear or fossil since it *adds* something to the environment. In the case of solar power it is more appropriate to call it "return heat" since we need it to keep the local climate in balance. Yet one must be careful how this is done in order to avoid damage to the immediate spot, a point that the power industry now fully appreciates.

There have been expressions of concern over the amount of land area required by solar power farms. The total amount to produce 1,000,000 MWe of power, a significant fraction of what the entire U.S. will need in the year 2000, is about 5000 square miles (a square 70 miles on a side). This land would not be in one solid cluster, but spread over 8 or 10 of the Southwestern states and Florida. This area is only *one* percent of the agricultural farm land in the U.S., yet food constitutes only about 1% of our total energy needs. It would seem therefore that solar power farms would be a bargain in comparison, in terms of energy output per acre.

A second important comparison was brought to our attention by Arizona Public Service Company, operators of the Four Corners Power Plant, also a company that is backing our concept. They noted that their plant would require strip mining a considerably larger area of land in the next 35 years than would be needed if it could be operated with solar energy—and the Navajo's sheep could safely graze under and between the rows of collectors. Unfortunately we are perhaps 20 years of intensive development removed from this intriguing possibility.

CAN CONTRIBUTE WITHIN TWO DECADES

We feel that solar power farms can be developed to a point where they are contributing power to the U.S. needs within two decades. We base this optimism on the fact that our concept combines currently available technology with existing power plant hardware. In fact one could, and perhaps would, in the early years, make a power plant to operate interchangeably with solar power and a backup supply of fossil fuel.

Solar energy does have two practical problems. The first is that the arid regions are far from the major power using areas, the Eastern Seaboard and the upper Midwest. This means that new methods of long-distance power transmission must be developed. Already study is in progress on how to do this with underground cryogenically-cooled AC or superconducting DC power lines. In the meantime the growth of power demand even in the arid regions is so great that all the solar power farms that one could imagine being built in the next 30 years would scarcely handle the demand in the states reachable by present technology.

The second practical problem of solar energy available changes with the seasons and any "national" system built to meet the December-January power demand would have excess power for 8 months of the year. This surplus, however, is good since many domestic need for liquid fuels will continue well beyond the foreseeable end of abundant petroleum resources. To synthesize these fuels will require energy and one could use this surplus power for this process.

CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM

Solar energy is no instant answer to our growing power needs, but by the year 2000 it could well be important—and it cetrainly has tne potential of supplying not a minor fraction of national needs, but the entire burden if necessary. We are anxious to see our concept tested in the near future. The initial skepticism that any solar energy proposal seems to get is beginning to be replaced by cautious optimism that the idea may have merit. We are especially pleased to see several of the utilities in the Southwest and Pacific area providing some vital technical and financial assistance to our work. It seems that some far-sighted members of the power industry may already sense the possibility that some day in the future we may consider the deserts of the earth as one of its greatest natural energy resources!

SOLAR ENERGY WORTH STUDY

For several years we have been hearing dire predictions of an energy crisis in the United States. Fossil fuels eventually will give out and they are polluting the environment. Hydroelectric potentials are limited. The answer is nuclear energy, or so we are told. But is it the best answer?

For the past 20 years 85 per cent of federal research dollars for energy has gone to nuclear electricity. It has cost taxpayers some $3 billion, and in return we have developed 9,000 megawatts of nuclear electric capacity, and many scientists question the safety of the plants producing it.

In the meantime relatively little research has been done in the field of solar energy. Despite this, most government officials have dismissed solar energy as a solution to our needs.

The October 1971 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists contains two provocative proposals for solar energy which indicate that such power cannot be dismissed as an answer.

Dr. Norman Ford and Dr. Joseph Kane of the University of Massachusetts propose using solar heat to produce non-polluting hydrogen gas from water. This could be stored and transported like natural and synthetic gas, and it would have the advantage of being clean.

The second proposal comes from two Tucson scientists, Dr. Aden and Marjorie Meinel of the Optical Sciences Center at the University of Arizona The Meinels propose building what they call solar farms. They estimate that an area of 5,500 square miles could produce almost three times as much electricity as is now being produced by all processes in this country.

The Meinel's system is based on conversion by optical concentration of sunshine in ground collectors spread over desert regions. According to the article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists it has the advantage that energy could be stored in the form of heat until used.

These concepts are new and different. They may not be the ultimate answer, but it seems incredible that our government has not given solar energy research significant attention. It offers a potential which boggles the mind, and if it works it would be both safe and pollution free.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—III

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am presently circulating for cosponsorship the Telephone Privacy Act, which would

allow individuals to place a "no solicitors" sign on their telephones.

This bill would give to individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option to require the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the names of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercal solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates and organizations and opinion poll takers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individuals or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

As I noted in a statement last Thursday, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today I am placing a second sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

COLUMBUS, GA., *February 24, 1972.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: Although the article about the "phone privacy bill" might have been allotted a small space in our local newspaper, the thought of such a possibility was a very thrilling one, indeed.

The fact that you have investigated such a bill will greatly be appreciated by many private citizens who have been harassed by these calls. The most infuriating aspect of these calls usually turns out, when you have informed the caller that you neither want nor need his product (to save him time and effort and in a polite way) that he hangs up very rudely before you can even finish speaking.

Mainly, however, I wanted to take this time to thank you for your effort and your good idea, and wish you much luck and hope that the bill will pass. You can be sure, also, that I speak for many Americans.

Let's hope we will soon be reading about the new "phone privacy bill" that passed unanimously.

Thank you again.

——— ———.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO,
February 23, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I read with great interest an editorial placed in *The Plain Dealer*, Cleveland, Ohio, on February 23, 1972, pertaining to a Bill which you have introduced in Congress, called the *Telephone Privacy Act*. It is the wish of a multitude of citizens that your Bill will have the support that is needed for passing.

For many years I could have stood on a "soap box" in favor of such a Bill to prevent the use of what I consider my private property, just as much as my electricity, gas or water that I pay for.

May I have the number of your Bill because I would like to contact our State Representatives for their support, and pass the word along to many people I come in contact with daily that favor such a Bill. Thank you—thank you.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

PAPILLION, NEBR.,
February 28, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I read an article in the Omaha World Herald a few days ago. This article concerned the bill you planned to introduce this past Monday to give persons the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not want to be solicited over the phone. I would like to congratulate you, sir, and let you know there are many of us who are behind you. I live in a suburb of Omaha and my neighbors and I are plagued with everything from awning specials to having your dog photographed! We all resent this and have communicated with the phone company getting courteous service but no results. Their solution is to have an unlisted number or be unlisted in the book but allowing your number to be given out through information. I have chosen the latter for the next book to be published soon.

I consider such phone calls to be an invasion of my privacy and that the solicitors should pay me for my wasted time—having to answer the phone and then hang up on them.

I would like to see your bill passed along with all my friends, relatives and neighbors.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

INDEPENDENCE, MO.,
February 21, 1972.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPIN: I support your proposed bill to be called the "Telephone Privacy Act," as reported in the Kansas City *Times* for February 19, 1972. It seems to me that the telephone is a private convenience. I pay for it on that basis! By subscribing to the phone company's service I do not feel that implicit authorization has been given all other subscribers permitting them to bother me without my permission.

Junk mail can be disposed of at my pleasure, but there is no way of identifying a junk phone call until after the inconvenience has taken place.

Please push for passage of the "Telephone Privacy Act."

Sincerely,

——— ———.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
Februray 22, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: As a harassed consumer I want to express my enthusiastic support for the bill referred to in the enclosed clipping from the Omaha World-Herald.

Since moving to this city less than two months ago we have been bombarded by companies soliciting our business. It was especially annoying during a 10-day period when I was ill and in need of rest. It was not possible to take the phone off the hook because of the loud beeping noise which begins shortly after the phone is taken off. So I was at the mercy of these irritating callers.

We feel it is a definite invasion of privacy for businesses to take advantage of the telephone which we have had installed for our own private use and for which we are paying. Since it is undesirable for most people to have an unlisted number it would seem quite desirable to have provision made for those who do not want to be imposed upon by telephone solicitors.

We will be interested in learning the fate of this bill.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

P.S.—We were *sure* we heard coyotes while camping in northern Wisconsin last summer. Did our ears deceive us?

RESPONSE NOT RHETORIC

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Members on this floor have often pointed an accusing finger at those who are long on words and short on action. I hope that we here are not going to be guilty ourselves of giving 57 million workers a great deal of rhetoric and very little response to funding the Occupational Safety and Health Act in fiscal 1973.

Recently, the AFL–CIO Executive Council made an incisive statement on the need to carry out what we promised more than a year ago when the law passed this body. We pledged:

To assure so far as possible every working man and woman in the Nation safe and healthful working conditions and to preserve our human resources. . . .

Are we about to abdicate that responsibility?

Will we shortchange our workers by not providing the OSH Administration with enough personnel to develop effective standards and enough inspectors to assure compliance with them?

When the Department of Labor appropriations come up for consideration, I ask my colleagues to join me in increasing and strengthening the allocation of funds by giving priority to the act's most vital activities: standards-setting and compliance.

The AFL–CIO resolution follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

More than a year has passed since President Nixon signed the Occupational Safety and Health Act into law. At that time, he termed it one of the most important and far-reaching laws of recent decades, and promised highest priority to its vigorous and effective administration.

We have weighed the President's words against his deeds and found them wanting. The record is one of foot-dragging, flabby enforcement and adulteration of the special provisions of the Act setting forth specific rights and protections for employees.

Organized labor had hailed the act, pledged its full cooperation to the federal agencies responsible for administration, and established programs designed to shoulder organized labor's responsibilities in helping make it work.

But the Administration regards implementation of the act as a matter to be worked out among the federal government, business management and the governments of the various states. Organized labor is regarded as an interloper. Its proposals and sugges-

tions are disregarded or opposed. Major policy decisions are discussed with labor only at our insistence or after decisions have already been reached.

Thus the goals of this law have been debased, and their achievement needlessly delayed. We further note that there is a similar lack of enforcement and implementation of the Railroad Safety Act.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration's own summary report on its enforcement actions between July and November 1971 tell the story.

This report shows that 77.4% of all establishments inspected were in violation, a commentary on the abject failure of the states to protect the lives and health of workers during the years when there was no federal law.

According to the report, $512,000 in fines were assessed against 8,257 employers for violations—an average fine of $62. That is too cheap a price tag to be placed on the lives and health of workers. More stringent fines are necessary to prevent employers from deciding that it is cheaper to violate the law than to correct the hazard.

On the basis of the present enforcement staff of over 300 plus, with 9,800 establishments inspected in five months, the 4.1 million workplaces covered by the Act would all be finally inspected once in the next 170 years.

In response to an urgent appeal from the AFL–CIO, the OSHA adopted an emergency asbestos standard, but has not undertaken on its own initiative a single inspection of any workplace where asbestos may be a hazard.

The fiscal year 1973 budget authorizes $67.5 million for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the Labor Department, or an increase of 85 percent over fiscal 1972. But of that amount, nearly half is earmarked for assisting the states to regain jurisdiction over occupational safety and health. That $30 million figure is one-third greater than the budget authorization for federal enforcement programs.

Up to now, few states show inclination to submit plans that will provide programs affording protections to workers equal to those provided by the federal program.

Organized labor in every state must watch with care the development of such plans. Any which do not fully embody the employee protections of the federal law must be opposed.

We urge the Congress to drastically overhaul the Administration's budget for occupational safety and health porgrams as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

There still are not enough inspectors to provide an effective enforcement program. The AFL–CIO requested 1,000 inspectors in the field by the end of fiscal year 1972. There are only 315.

The AFL–CIO last year urged that there be more than 2,000 compliance personnel. The 1973 budget calls for only 800.

1. The amount for enforcement should be more than doubled in order to provide for 2500 or more compliance officers, and industrial hygienists.

2. The Congress should remove $20 million from the state program item and transfer it to enforcement.

3. Budget authorizations for developing occupational safety and health standards, training and education and statistical reporting of injuries and illnesses should be at least doubled.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health must be rescued by the Congress from the callous indifference of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Its effective functioning is indispensable to carrying out the intent of the Act.

The budget does not provide authorization for training needed occupational health personnel as required under the Act.

We urge that the Congress more than double the $28.3 million authorized for the vitally important program of NIOSH. This will enable more rapid development of criteria and recommended occupational health standards, expanded hazards evaluation, and plant surveillance, and accelerated training of critically needed occupational health personnel.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND COMMISSION

The Review Commission, which is responsible for adjudicating contested citations for violations of the Act, is both short-handed, and faced with a weekly rate of new cases greater than contested decisions by the National Labor Relations Board. This creates a constantly increasing backlog of unprocessed cases—a bottleneck to the entire occupational safety and health program.

The budget request of $1.3 million for the Review Commission is only $220,000 over that of the previous year. That is completely inadequate. We urge the Congress to increase it substantially.

We urge the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds and provide for the necessary staff to enforce the Railroad Safety Act and carry out the intent of that law.

Much progress has been made in the past year by all of our affiliates in meeting the responsibilities of organized labor under the Act. Much is yet to be done—in the plant, in the state legislatures and before the Congress.

All affiliates are urged to let their governors and legislators know that they will accept no substitutes for strong, effective, well-founded state laws and plans. All affiliates should let their Congressional delegations know that they are vitally concerned in adequate appropriations this year to make the act work toward achievement of its great humanitarian aims.

PHILADELPHIA PROCLAMATION OF 1972 OF THE AFRICAN COMMISSION

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, a recent proclamation issued by the African Commission of the National Committee of Black Churchmen focuses attention on the problems of black Africans.

The grim reality in 1972 for black people in America is to be seen in the continuing policy of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa and its relationship to the muffling of the drums of freedom on that continent.

The proclamation calls for definitive steps which our Government can and should take in putting an end to the policies of colonialism and apartheid which pervade these African nations. Many of the steps which the African Commission advocates can be accomplished through legislation.

The Congressional Black Caucus has addressed itself to these problems. We have introduced a bill which would terminate the exploitative activities of U.S. business concerns in the Republic of South Africa, South-West Africa, Rhodesia, or any African territory under Portuguese control and to end certain violations of the United Nations universal declaration of human rights by such businesses. I urge this Congress to act on these measures.

I commend the Philadelphia proclamation to the attention of my colleagues:

PHILADELPHIA PROCLAMATION OF 1972 OF THE AFRICA COMMISSION—NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF BLACK CHURCHMEN

The Africa Commission of the National Committee of Black Churchmen calls upon all concerned people to understand, challenge and struggle against the *Administration of Benign Neglect* in the ghettos, suburban as well as urban, of America. The responses must be made from every level and segment of the population including the church. The Africa Commission of the National Committee of Black Churchmen recognizes that if a religion lays stress on human values, upon honesty in commercial relations, love, freedom, and the equality of opportunity, it will be helpful to growth of a people. If it is hostile to these values it is hostile to human life and unworthy of the name "religion."

In an era which finds the church on the wane, especially among young people; in a time when the church is supporting apartheid in South Africa; in a time when the church is a willing partner of government in the suppression of millions of people around the world; N.C.B.C. calls upon the churches of America to close ranks and to declare their allegiance and support for the crowning achievements of humanity, love, freedom, peace, happiness and abundant life which Christ came to bring.

We are now witnessing the waning of the church. Can religion admit the existence of a sharp antithesis between personal morality and the practices which are permissible in business? Does the idea of a Christian church involve the acceptance of a particular standard of social ethics? Should not the church enforce such an ethic among the obligations incumbent upon its members? These questions present the most pressing problems of our time.

The Book of Revelations speaks of Armageddon or the apocalyptic struggle between good and evil. The forces of both sides are busy positioning themselves for the battle. The evil forces will be known by several names, among them are the Haves, Rich, Oppressors, and Racists. The battle will be the scene of terrible retribution upon a faithless church as well as a sinful world.

It is possible that the ultimate tragedy may be delayed, speeded up, altered, or transformed by new programs of church involvement. It is clear that the belly comes before the soul, not in the scale of values, but in point of time. Churchmen of America: "We are part of the problem or part of the solution". The decision rests with us. Groups and individuals denying the human rights of others can claim none themselves. Once the oppressed have set themselves to liberation goals, nothing, not even the church can stop them.

The grim reality in 1972 for Black people in America is to be seen in the continuing policy of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa and its relationship to the muffling of the drums of freedom on that continent. It involves an understanding of the indivisibility of African people around the world. It involves the understanding that Attica and Sharpsville are caused by the same forces. It involves and understanding that Marks, Mississippi and Namibia are exploited by the same forces. It involves and understanding that the forces that murdered El Haj Malik and Lumumba are the same. It involves the understanding that the backbone of the American dollar is the bloodstained, downtrodden shoulders of the people of Harlem, Selma, Latin America, South America, Asia,

and Africa. It is because of this duality that the African Commission of the National Committee of Black Churchmen calls upon all concerned people to raise the cry of African Liberation and to support the movements against colonialism, apartheid and neo-colonialism.

Therefore we call upon all people of good will in America to demand that the American Government implement the vaunted humanism of its Declaration of Independence, its Constitution and the United Nations Charter on Human Rights by:

1. Calling for an end to the sugar quota for South Africa and other forms of economic support for that apartheid government.
2. Taking the initiative in calling for a United Nations Task Force to drive South Africa out of Namibia.
3. Repealing of the Chromium Ore Agreement with Rhodesia.
4. Denouncing and rejection of the Home-Smith Agreement.
5. Cancelling the proposed $437 million loan to Portugal.
6. Extending the minimum wage and other domestic worker benefits to foreigners who work for American corporations abroad.
7. Beginning now to pay reparations for the slavery of African people into a general fund for the liberation and development of the colonial possessions presently being fought for by the African movements.
8. Withdrawing immediately all its military personnel and armaments from Vietnam, Southeast Asia and Africa.

The echos of history and the drift of domestic and international politics of the United States Government compel African people in America to make a profound decision about the destiny of our people and to challenge this nation to redress the grievances of oppressed peoples throughout the world who have been directly and indirectly victimized by American racism and imperialism. Close Ranks in 72. We *are* an African People.

THE TAXPAYER'S LAMENT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in a few short weeks, the average American is going to have to read the grim news his tax return gives him, reach down very deep and pay what to him or her will be an exorbitant sum in Federal income taxes.

I know many critics will come forth with the usual excuses, damning those who are perpetually complaining over the rate of taxation and what we get for it.

But it is a sad fact that the average lower- and middle-income taxpayer in the country is being exploited as badly or worse than ever before. This situation is due plainly and simply to the fact that our tax system is unjust, unfair, and stacked in favor of special interests, large corporations, and the wealthy. Last year approximately 200 individuals in the United States earned vast sums of money, yet paid no taxes.

Meanwhile, the average wage earner in this country is confronted with a merciless Federal Government with its hand stretched forth menacingly. And heaven help him or her who dares to hold out a cent.

Computerization in the Internal Revenue Service now insures he or she will be tracked down wherever they seek refuge, yanked forth and be made to disgorge whatever extra sums they owe Government.

These people are being shredded by inflation. The vaunted economic policy of this administration is as bankrupt as Penn Central Railroad. But no Federal Government is present or ready to bail out any individual taxpayer if he is in difficulty.

Price controls have become a national joke, hitting at wages of the average worker while major industries run price hikes at will through the so-called governing board. Any glance at the recent jump in wholesale prices and what meat costs in markets will reveal the hollowness of the administration claims that all is well on that front.

But it is our tax system that is the worst aspect of the entire nasty picture confronting an average wage earner. Beset by inflation, fixed wages, and a depressed economy, he and she still have to make ends meet. No law has repealed mortgages, utility bills, grocery lists, and clothing needs for children. The income tax hits these average citizens like a pile-driver, especially when they least can afford it. For these reasons tax breaks offered major industries are most outrageous and deserve to be pointed out to the public at large.

No industry gets away with more Federal tax privileges than the oil industry. Over the years, this group of massive corporate giants has carved out a series of tax privileges that lend themselves well to clever activities of corporate accountants. As a result, these conglomerations of capital are able to evade most Federal taxes, a situation the average American would find impossible to enjoy. Here is some of the latest available evidence on this situation.

In 1970, Standard Oil of New Jersey earned $2,474,748,000 in net income before Federal tax. It paid only 10.8 percent of that sum in such taxes.

Texaco earned $1,137,666,000 in 1970 in net income before Federal tax. That company paid 6.4 percent of that sum in Federal taxes.

Gulf Oil set some sort of record for greed. In 1970, it earned $990,197,000 before Federal taxes in net income, yet paid out a staggering sum of 1.2 percent in taxes to the Government. Where did all the rest of the cash go? Why, into pockets of fat cats, who do not take subways to work in the morning. Into pockets of people who have few worries about necessities for families or education for children.

I am including a chart at this point in my remarks showing how much money each of the major oil companies earned in 1970, net income before Federal taxes. After that are figures for percentage of that income they paid to the Federal Government in the form of taxes.

	Amount	Percent
Standard (New Jersey)	$2,474,748,000	10.8
Texaco	1,137,666,000	6.4
Gulf	990,197,000	1.2
Mobil	873,744,000	10.9
Standard (California)	589,637,000	5.0
Standard (Indiana)	394,539,000	14.2
Shell	274,681,000	12.4
Atlantic	257,121,000	4.13
Phillips	198,241,000	10.0
Conoco	301,115,000	6.4
Tenneco	182,082,000	13.3
Sun	223,086,000	12.1
Cities Service	151,562,000	17.9
Union (California)	161,825,000	4.6
Amerada Hess	183,905,000	3.6
Getty	159,144,000	21.9
Marathon	153,783,000	5.3
Standard (Ohio)	66,351,000	10.4
Ashland	84,326,000	32.3
Total	8,857,753,000	8.7

Average taxes paid by such companies is 8.7 percent of total earnings in Federal taxes. This was out of a total of $8,857,753,000 in total income before taxes. How many average American wage earners are able to support families and pay 8.7 percent in Federal income tax? Most Americans pay two and three times that percentage of their income annually in Federal levies. How, then, can we excuse such an outrage upon the public?

These are the same companies which have been polluting off our coasts with a firm disregard for a clean environment. Plenty of slick public relations brochures promise all is well. Innumerable well-produced and expensive television ads in prime time assure the public the oil industry is all but killing itself to protect us while giving America all the energy we require. To believe all this, one only needs a petrified brain and the gullibility of a moron.

This is the same industry that has been granted price hikes at public expense. It is the same industry that inflicts promotion gimmicks, games, and trading stamps upon the public and its captives, service station operators.

It is the same industry that perpetrated the Santa Barbara Channel spill and mammoth oil drilling platform fires in the Gulf of Mexico.

It is the same industry that enjoys a 22-percent oil depletion allowance.

And who pays for all this? Merely the consumer, stretched out on the altar of oil industry profit like any human fiscal sacrifice. We all pay for their tax privileges, because what one has must come at the expense of another. We are paying for it at the gas pump, in home heating of oil bills, and for natural gas fuels.

Cheap oil imports available practically everywhere in the world but here could easily be allowed into America. Energy prices could drop like plummets if they were allowed to enter.

But they will not, and many among us know why. Oil import quotas set up by Executive order under Eisenhower insure that a barrel of crude oil doubles in price when brought into this country from abroad. Why? Because our Government wills it so.

Just as Government wills that the oil industry pays minimal taxes at public

expense. And this appalling state of affairs will endure until enough people find out about and change it.

Certainly none of this will transpire under this administration. But at least a few more taxpayers will know a little more of the why of it, as they write out those checks next month.

For sure, the heads of oil companies will not be doing much sweating over their returns.

A SHOWCASE FOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Port Newark is one of the few, yet highly significant, examples of economic growth in an otherwise depressed Newark economy.

The phenomenal growth of my home port has been largely due to its easy access to all forms of inland transportation. Recently, Business Week highlighted the Port Newark-Elizabeth story and I am pleased to share it with my colleagues:

A SHOWCASE FOR INTEGRATED TRANSPORT

A garden spot it is not. But a small strip of the Garden State near Newark has been a fertile element in making the growth of metropolitan New York possible. Here, in 20-odd sq. mi. of land, partly reclaimed from Newark Bay, is located a rich grab bag of facilities that makes the area a billion-dollar showcase of today's transportation.

"I specify the Newark-Elizabeth port for my shipments," says Clifford Robertson, an importer of Scandinavian wood products, "because my truck can go directly from the pier to the turnpike and I don't have to pay to wait in a traffic jam." Ship operators find the port efficient, too. "It's one of the best in the world," says L. A. Renehan of Prudential-Grace Lines. "And it has certainly got more diverse elements." Within the region's informal boundaries is a great variety of traffic—containerships and tractor trailers, Volkswagens and Metroliners, helicopters and jets—all moving to the frantic rhythms of New York's hurry. Not the city's only transport hub, Newark-Elizabeth is easily its most diverse.

The busiest containerport in the world, handling almost 10-million long tons of container and other general cargo, straddles the eastern boundary. A 2,300-acre jetport that serves 6.5 million passengers and moves 160,000 tons of air freight a year sprawls in the middle. High-speed intercity and local rapid transit lines provide rail links with New York and other cities in the "Northeast Corridor" megalopolis, which stretches from Boston to Washington. Four large rail systems crisscross the area with a maze of freight yards and terminal tracks. And splitting the area down the middle is its lifeline, the 12 lanes of the New Jersey Turnpike, the world's busiest superhighway, providing the essential link for freight and passengers alike to move the final miles between ports and terminals and their ultimate destinations.

CLASS BY ITSELF

There is nothing quite like this concentration of transportation anywhere else in the world. Rotterdam has fine harbor facilities but lacks the highway network. Nor does it have an airport as part of the mix. The Tokyo Bay ports of Yokohama and Tokyo have good water access but have little room to grow and are plagued by congested land transport. London's port is spread out along both banks of a crowded river and is also troubled by ground congestion. Smaller ports such as San Francisco do not handle anything like the volume of traffic that passes through New York.

Transportation theorists have long envisioned an integrated commercial hub where all forms of transportation could meet and mesh smoothly. The Jersey complex is not quite that, in large part because there is no present need for an all-purpose interface for all kinds of transportation. Although both seaports and airports, for example, need connecting highway and rail service, there is at present little need for an interchange between sea and air carriers. But if tomorrow's transportation develops such a need, the elements will be there for further integration. Right now, shippers and carriers alike are getting the benefit of smooth coordination of land and sea operations.

Ironically, it wasn't planned that way. The complex developed largely because Newark Bay provided both deep water for ocean ships and wetlands that could be reclaimed to provide acreage for new projects. The reclaimed land made possible both airport expansion and the vast shore-based facilities that containerships in particular require. But there has been no over-all plan for developing the area as an integrated transportation complex. Even now, there is no all-encompassing plan to direct future growth.

But as the port area and the turnpike have grown to match and eventually surpass the area's rail yards in economic importance, a kind of de facto master plan has taken shape. It can be seen in the decisions of the coordinating interagency committees responsible for building parts of the whole: the Port of New York Authority, the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, the New Jersey Transportation Dept., the Tri-State Transportation Commission, and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. All of these, along with local agencies, have some jurisdiction in the area.

RAIL TO HIGHWAYS

The railroads were the first to arrive. The Penn Central and three smaller roads all have major freight yards in the area. The city of Newark established the port in 1915 and the airport in 1928. But the big change to the region's present status as an interchange for all transportation modes began when the Port Authority leased the airport and seaport from Newark in 1948 and began a massive improvement program that so far has cost $217-million for the airport and $241-million for the Newark and Elizabeth seaports. A redevelopment program that will triple the capacity of the airport by 1975 is costing another $200-million. Improvements now under way at the seaports will bring the total investment in those facilities to $360-million, also by 1975.

The other big change in the region came when the 118-mi. New Jersey Turnpike was opened early in 1952. Originally six lanes wide through the Newark-Elizabeth area, the turnpike was widened to 12 lanes in 1970, bringing the total investment to $449-million. Just north of the airport, the turnpike divides into two separate six-lane routes, one connecting with the Lincoln Tunnel and midtown Manhattan, the other with the uptown George Washington Bridge. A six-lane extension leads to the Holland Tunnel. The bridge and tunnels, like much else in the area, are Port Authority facilities.

VITAL ARTERIES

Probably the most important single element in the whole complex is the highway network—the turnpike, U.S. highways 1 and 9, state route 22, and the new interstate 78 under construction. Without the highways and to a lesser extent the rail connections, there would not be the easy movement of people and freight that makes Newark-Elizabeth one of the world's most efficient way stations for international commerce.

But if the enormous concrete acreage of the highways dominates the physical scene, it is the far-flung activities of the Port Authority—the oldest, largest, and richest superagency in the country—that will shape Newark-Elizabeth's future. And as a northbound turnpike traveler reaches the airport-marine terminal interchange, his attention is inevitably caught, "industrial haze" permitting, by the Manhattan skyline 15 mi. away. Significantly, the first landmarks he will notice are the twin 110-story towers of the PA's World Trade Center.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. K. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you the speech that won the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsored Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Utah.

The winner was 17-year-old Jeanne Grow of Provo, Utah, and a senior at Provo High School. Miss Grow, in discussing our responsibility to freedom said that "Freedom" is an important and unique trait of America. She then added:

America has not arrived, but she is in the process of being created.

I would like to commend Miss Grow for her speech and also the VFW for the Voice of Democracy Contest that provides an opportunity for our young citizens to think about and discuss freedom and democracy.

The speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Jeanne Grow)

The ceremony was simple, but it was meaningful to the girls that were participating. As the Flag was raised in the surroundings of American University, Washington, D.C., where girls were gathered from all over the nation—many stood by and laughed. One of the observers shouted, "How can you salute a country that is allowing people to starve within its own bounds, that has such great economic chaos, and that is killing thousands in Vietnam?" The girls felt a form of pity for those who could not realize, because they simply would not realize, what that symbol of freedom actually offers.

America is unique because of its one important trait—freedom. It is being used by some to dissent and destroy, but by others to improve and progress. The responsibility each American citizen has to this freedom is to maintain and preserve it within the intent in which it is given. Hamilton Wright Mabie expressed what the intent of freedom is when he said, "Real freedom comes from the mastery, through knowledge, of historic conditions and race character which makes possible a free and intelligent use of experience for the purpose of progress."

In other words, preservation of true freedom is based on a foundation of knowledge of the historic conditions of America, such as the strivings and accomplishments of our ancestors, and the workings of present-day patriots who are now creating a history that our posterity will be proud of. Such a history can be created only with the knowledge of the processes of democracy and its vital ideals—for a government by the people can-

not stand without the competent rule of those people.

With such knowledge, we can master ourselves and our environment, and progress without allowing the problems of present-day America to impede improvement. We may wish to forget the tragedy of the Manson murders, the Chicago riots, the Vietnam war. We could let such experiences of America lend to its total destruction, or we could use what we learned from them. The scars left by occurrences of the past can be partially healed by future decisions.

These are frightening times. We have seen growing prosperity. We have seen medicine progress greatly. We have seen a very old dream turned into reality—there are footprints on the moon. But we have seen poverty. However, an ancient problem still plagues our modern society. The answer to world peace has been war. The answer to increasing crime has been continued apathy. Times are not the same as our fathers lived through, but the basic principle of freedom, as they set it forth, is the same. If we work for a progressive change, preserving that trait as it was originally initiated, the future of this land will be brighter. Then the past accomplishments of America will go toward even better ones, to solve the great problems we now face.

If we can only build on that foundation of knowledge, as Mabie expressed, of our history, the processes of democracy, of the characteristics of all people, and of the history we are now creating, we can intelligently use our experiences, whether good or bad, to initiate progress. It is this that will enable America to fulfill her dream to gain freedom for all people. It is that this will supply the courage to stand up with the voice of democracy against those who look on, laughing. Only then can freedom be maintained as it was intended to be, not as a license to destroy, but as a tool of progress.

"How can you salute a country that is allowing starvation, economic chaos, and death in Vietnam?" You can't. You support a nation that has often provided the hope of millions of people by sharing its wealth, that has the widest prosperity known in the world—a trillion dollar economy, that is saving the lives of thousands, and sacrificing to share its freedom. And as America preserves its one important trait, she can lead all people toward the same goal.

We will see the wall that separates man from man destroyed. We will see America, not divided by differing groups of individuals, but united by tolerance and understanding for progress, for freedom. For as it has been said, "Tis not too late to seek a better world." America has not arrived but she is in the process of being created.

JOB PLACEMENTS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have a report on the National Alliance of Businessmen which was presented to President Nixon by Mr. John D. Harper, chairman of the alliance.

He and his members are to be complimented on a highly successful effort. As you know, Mr. Harper is chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America and working with him have been thousands of business executives.

I specifically want to call attention to the part of the report that involves the placement of veterans in jobs.

The report follows:

ALUMINUM CO. OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 16, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to give you an interim report on the progress of the National Alliance of Businessmen toward its June 30 goals of job placements for the disadvantaged and Vietnam-era veterans.

As you will recall, in a meeting at the White House last June 23, you requested that the Alliance, as part of your six-point program for veterans, take on the important task of finding jobs for 100,000 Vietnam-era veterans, in addition to our continuing program of job placements for the disadvantaged.

As of January 31, our NAB participating companies and metro organizations report that more than 45,200 Vietnam-era veterans had been hired through our Veteran/JOBS program. The accelerating pace of hiring, supported by the follow-up efforts now underway throughout our organization, make clear that we will meet, and probable exceed, our goal of 100,000 veteran hires by June 30.

In addition, hires of disadvantaged Americans under the JOBS program have continued at a strong level. For the first six months of the fiscal year, NAB companies report 102,000 disadvantaged hires. The majority of these hires continue to be under the "voluntary," non-contract NAB program, at no cost to the government.

These results are to the credit of several thousand loaned executives who have worked on our campaigns across the country this fall. Without the assistance of these men and women, and the cooperation of our partners in the Department of Labor, these accomplishments would not have been possible.

Knowing your continued personal interest in the National Alliance of Businessmen and your support of the principles of voluntary action which it embodies, as well as your desire that every Vietnam-era veteran and every American citizen should find the opportunity for work and advancement, I am pleased to make this report to you personally.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN D. HARPER, *Chairman,*
National Alliance of Businessmen.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th Anniversary of the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Few activities could be called more patriotic than instilling in American youth an appreciation of their Democratic freedoms and the responsibility to safeguard those freedoms. Few activities do this more than the Voice of Democracy contest.

This year about 500,000 young men and women from over 7,000 of the Nation's secondary schools competed in the contest. Each contestant was required to write and deliver an original manuscript on the subject "My Responsibility to Freedom."

I am extremely proud that one of my constituents, Mr. Mark Harmon, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Cecil W. Harmon of Olympia, Wash., was the third place winner in the 1971 Voice of America contest.

Mark Harmon is an 18-year-old student at North Thurston High School in Lacey, Wash. After graduation he plans to attend the Northwest Nazarene College at Nampa, Idaho, to study for the ministry or a career in the educational field.

The following is the award winning essay of Mark Harmon:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

A man died, of an illness that was curable, if the correct medicine would have been applied. He died, clutching in his cold fist a small bottle of tiny green pills, that correct medicine. But that tiny pill bottle had never been opened, the cap never removed. Those small pills had never been put to use—never been put to work.

I, as an American today, am symbolically clutching a small bottle of tiny pills. These pills are often labeled freedom. I am a very lucky person, I hold freedom in my hands. I hold freedom of religion, I hold freedom of choice. I hold freedom of press, assemb'y and petition. I hold the right to vote.

I can turn on the radio and listen to the music of my choice. From Brahms, Bach, and Beethoven to Johnny Cash or the Rolling Stones. I may go to the public library and read any selection I wish, from Einstein's Theory of Relativity to Fairy Tales by the Brothers Grimm. I have the choice of electing whom I want to represent me, from my class officers, school cheerleaders to the President of the United States. And I, as everyone, hold the right to pursue happiness, as long as I do not infringe on the rights of others. For after all, freedom is a give and take proposition. It is a way of giving, as well as receiving. You see, I hold a bottle of duties in my hands as well as a bottle of rights. It is momentous to find that President Abraham Lincoln, the epitome of freedom, used the word responsibility nearly as often as he used the word freedom. And it is my duty to recognize my responsibility, which is I must use what I hold in my hand. I must put freedom to work. For freedom never put to work is like medicine never applied. No benefits are ever obtained from either of them.

Freedom is not something given to me only to sit back and enjoy. It is something I must use, and *I* must be the *one* to use it. Me, as an individual—a committee of one. For this is where my freedom and responsibility begins. With I. A wonderful pronoun, but a singular pronoun. It is personal. It means I, and no one else. I must put freedom to work. And if ever I believe that I am not able to do this, I should remember that great works of the world always begin with one person As one author says:

I am only one,
But I am one.
I can't do everything
But I can do something.
What I can do, I ought to do,
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God I will do.

As the author points out, I am able to do something. I can put freedom to work. In several ways;

I can seek the facts . . . in everything I do. But more important than this, I can seek the truth.

I can fulfill the duties that are mine in home, school and community. It is my job to take an active part—it is my responsibility.

I can educate myself to the geography, economics, history and culture of other peoples. And I can free myself of the prejudices and misconceptions about those people.

I can learn and exercise the qualities of leadership . . . I can be patient, impartial and humble. And with taking the qualities of a leader, I can also take the responsibility and privilege of being a follower.

I can study human relations . . . in order to live compatibly with my friends, family and neighbors. I must learn what the term humanitarian truly means.

And lastly, I can practice the Golden Rule. I can love others as myself. For by loving others, I will help, instruct and educate others to the democratic processes. I can exercise my responsibility to freedom. I must exercise my responsibility. I must not die with an unopen pill bottle full of freedom. I must uncap that bottle of freedom and understand it, use it and preach it, but most important of all, I must put it to work, it is my responsibility.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 16, 1972*

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Let us hold fast to the profession of our faith without wavering.—Hebrews 10: 23.

Eternal God and Father of us all, as the quiet splendor of a new day dawns upon us we stand before Thee opening our hearts to the light that never fades, the love that never falters, and the strength that never fails.

Quicken within us a vivid sense of Thy presence and endow our souls with a power which makes us strong and keeps us steady when we would waver by the way.

Give to us and to our people the spirit to see that Thou alone canst lead us safely through these troubled times and empower us to live and to labor faithfully for the good of all.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3353. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the first U.S. International Transportation Exposition.

SUCCESS IN THE ARMY GAME

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to announce to the Members of the House that at 5 o'clock last night I received the documents which I have been after.

EXTENDING LIFE OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10390) to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and consider the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 23 of the Act entitled "An Act to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055), as amended (75 Stat. 92; 25 U.S.C. 70v), is hereby amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION AND DISPOSITION OF PENDING CLAIMS

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of fifteen years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records and files of the Commission in all cases in which a final determination has been entered shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States. The records and files in all other pending cases, if any, including those on appeal shall be transferred to the United States Court of Claims, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to adjudicate all such cases under the provisions of section 2 of the Indian Claims Commission Act; *Provided*, That section 2 of said Act shall not apply to any case filed originally in the Court of Claims under section 1505 of title 28, United States Code."

SEC. 2. Section 27(a) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70w), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TRIAL CALENDAR

"SEC. 27. (a) The Commission from time to time shall prepare a trial calendar which shall set a date for the trial of the next phase of each claim as soon as practical after a decision of the Commission or the United States Court of Claims or the Supreme Court of the United States makes such setting possible, but such date shall not be later than one year from the date of such decision except on a clear showing by a party that irreparable harm would result unless longer preparation were allowed."

SEC. 3. Section 27(b) of such Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (25 U.S.C. 70w), is amended by striking said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 27. (b) If a claimant fails to proceed with the trial of its claim on the date set for that purpose, the Commission may enter an order dismissing the claim with prejudice or it may reset such trial at the end of the calendar."

SEC. 4. The Act of August 13, 1946, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 28. The Commission shall, on the first day of each session of Congress, submit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, a report showing the progress made and the work remaining to be completed by the Commission, as well as the status of each remaining case, along with a projected date for its completion."

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, to say that he wishes to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill?

Mr. HALEY. We will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. HALL. May we ask, under the right of reservation, what the other body did to the House-passed legislation and thus I will give the gentleman an opportunity to explain his proposed amendment at this point.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida for that purpose.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, after H.R. 10390 was passed by the House, it was amended in the Senate by striking everything after the enacting clause and inserting new text which differed from the text of the House bill in three particulars:

First, the House bill extended the life of the Indian Claims Commission for 4 years, and the Senate amendment extended it for 5 years.

Second, the House bill required an annual authorization for the appropriation of funds to meet the administrative expenses of the Commission. The Senate amendment omitted this provision.

Third, both the House bill and the Senate amendment required the Commission to make annual reports, and although the substance of the requirement is the same the language used is slightly different.

The amendment to the Senate amendment which I propose accepts the Senate provision for a 5-year extension of the life of the Commission, instead of the 4-year extension originally passed by the House, and it adds the annual appropriation authorization provision of the original House bill. The Senate language for the reporting requirement, which is the same in substance as the House language, is also accepted.

I believe that if this amendment is passed by the House it will be acceptable to the Senate and a conference will be unnecessary.

I believe, if I may say to the gentleman from Missouri, that really there is not very much change. In other words, the House wanted 4 years, and the Senate wanted 5 years in their extension. We want this commission to come through the proper committees of Congress and justify their expenditures and their request to operate, and also we request a report on what they are doing from year to year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's clear and concise statement and his personal belief and comment. May I ask further if there is an increase in funding in connection with the additional year of life that has been given to this commission?