ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS ROTH AND BYRD OF VIRGINIA TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders have been recognized tomorrow morning under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, and that he be followed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before moving to adjourn, 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. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1972, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday next.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will meet at 9 o'clock a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Senator ROTH, Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senator WEICKER, and Senator STEVENSON.

At the conclusion of the unanimous-consent orders just referred to, the Chair will lay before the Senate—and under the order previously obtained by the majority leader, the time will be 10 o'clock—H.R. 9526, the naval vessel loan bill. Debate will proceed on that bill, and rollcalls on any amendment or passage of the bill could occur prior to 10:45 a.m., of course.

Under the order, at 10:45 a.m. a rollcall vote will occur on passage of S. 2895, a bill dealing with egg prices.

That will be immediately followed, at 11 a.m., by a rollcall vote on the conference report on Radio Free Europe. Senators are reminded, therefore, that there will be at least two rollcall votes tomorrow, and there may be more.

It is anticipated that the Senate will complete action on the various measures reasonably early tomorrow, so that all rollcall votes should be completed by 1 o'clock p.m. or thereabouts, if not earlier.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:40 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 24, 1972, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23, 1972:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1978, reappointment.

Alfred Towson MacFarland, of Tennessee, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1978, vice John W. Bush, term expired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOOTWEAR PRICES TO RISE NEXT FALL

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks a most interesting article written by Mr. Leonard Sloane in the March 21, 1972, issue of the New York Times entitled "Footwear Prices to Rise Next Fall."

The article clearly shows the justification for licensing and limiting exports of hides from the United States. The Department of Commerce should act now on such a request that is and has been pending.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1972]

FOOTWEAR PRICES TO RISE NEXT FALL

(By Leonard Sloane)

Footwear prices will rise between $1 and $6 a pair next fall as a result of abnormally large buying of American hides by foreign countries, according to domestic manufacturers, retailers and tanners. Speaking at a news conference yesterday at the National Shoe Fair, leaders of the four principal trade associations in the footwear industry said that prices would advance still higher unless temporary hide export quotas were imposed immediately.

"In 1966, the Government did impose an embargo for much less urgent reasons than there are today," Harold Gessner, president of the American Footwear Industries Association, said. "Even if the Administration imposes embargoes on shipments out of the country, it will take three to four months to put this situation in balance."

INCREASES CITED

The industry executives at the conference, in the Statler-Hilton Hotel, attributed the forthcoming footwear increases to the recent price rises in hides and leather.

Irving R. Glass, president of the Tanners' Council of America, asserted that the average price of cattle hides jumped from 12 cents a pound on Aug. 15, 1971, when President Nixon's New Economic Policy was announced, to 26 cents a pound last Friday. During the same period, he added, the average price of leather rose from 56 cents a foot to 68 to 74 cents.

The prices of hides and leather are not controlled under the Administration's economic stabilization program because they are agricultural products. Large shoe manufacturers can apply to the Price Commission for increases based on their higher costs, while retailers are permitted to maintain their normal markups.

DEVALUATION A FACTOR

In tracing the background of the short hide supply in the United States that was said to be responsible for rising prices, Mr. Glass pointed to the decline in cattle slaughter in Argentina as the origin of this crisis. The United States and Argentina normally supply 80 per cent of the world's hide supply, but last year's Argentina supply was reduced by 3.5 million head of cattle.

When the Argentine Government imposed quota restrictions on hide exports last May, foreign demand converged on the United States. The currency devaluation on Dec. 8, 1971, gave many of these foreign buyers from Western Europe and Japan a 10 to 18 per cent price advantage in purchasing American hides, the American shoe men said.

In calling for immediate action by the President under the authority granted to him by the Export Control Act, the shoe men emphasized their belief that farmers are not the beneficiaries of the higher hide prices, since hides are a byproduct of cattle. "The packers are profiteering at the expense of the consumers," said Mark E. Richardson, president of the footwear industries association.

Edward Atkins, executive vice president of the Volume Footwear Retailers of America, observed that "this could be the break of the dike for stabilization" if footwear prices were not brought under control.

"Temporary restraints on export of United States shoe supplies in 1966 within a few months stabilized a similar situation," he said. "Every day of inaction fuels inflation."

OTHER ACTIONS

In other actions, the Olin Corporation said that its Ecusta Paper division will increase prices of six types of lightweight printing papers by $1 per hundredweight, effective April 1.

The Pennwalt Corporation announced that it was advancing the price of 50 per cent liquid caustic soda shipped from its Lemont, Ill., terminal to $77.50 a ton, from $71.50 a ton, effective April 1.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as has been our practice for a number of years and as now required under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, the Committee on Appropriations in late January held an overall hearing on the President's budget for the forthcoming fiscal year 1973. Those hearings have just been printed and released. A copy was sent to each Member with the following letter:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1972.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I enclose a copy of the overall hearings held by the Committee in late January on the FY 1973 budget, which I trust you will find helpful especially in connection with consideration of fiscal measures during the session. The hearings focused on the main features of the budget, its overall policy recommendations and economic and legislative assumptions. A number of subjects were covered.

There was considerable discussion of the so-called *full employment concept* under which spending is geared to *theoretical revenues* that would be received *if* the economy were operating at so-called full employment. Of course, the actual *Federal funds budget is projected heavily in the red*—$36.2 billion for FY 1973 on top of a reestimated $44.7 billion Federal funds deficit in the current FY 1972 budget—$80,898,000,000 for the 2 years, which is on top of a $29,866,000,000 Federal funds deficit last year (in other words, $110,764,000,000 now estimated for the 3 years). The Federal funds deficit closely approximates the increase in the Federal debt.

As you are aware, the budget projects *spending* (budget *outlays*) at $246.3 billion in FY 1973, nearly $10 billion above this year. Congress does *not*, however, act on the spending estimates, but rather on *new budget (obligational) authority* which totals $270,898,000,000 for 1973 in the President's budget (some $20 billion above the 1972 total).

Of this $270.9 billion new budget authority, *about $185.3 billion is subject to Congressional action at this session*—mostly in the appropriation bills. Appropriations for debt interest, for social security and other so-called permanent appropriations do not require annual Congressional action. And the $185.3 billion new authority requested for 1973 in turn involves actual spending (outlays), in 1973, of only about $126.8 billion; the remainder, if granted, would be paid out in future years.

As you know, actual spending (outlays) projected for any given year involves a heavy mix of (1) spending from new budget authority requested, (2) spending from large carryover balances of funds voted in previous years, and (3) spending from the so-called permanent appropriations that do not require annual appropriation action.

Furthermore, of the $185.3 billion new budget authority subject to action in this session, about $47.5 billion is for ongoing programs which first require authorization bill actions prior to taking them up in the appropriation bills. Another $10 billion involves new legislative proposals such as general revenue sharing.

I trust that you and your staff will find this material helpful and that you will feel free to call us for any further explanation you may wish.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MAHON,
Chairman.

Copies were, of course, also made available to the press and others. Copies are available—as long as the supply lasts—in the committee offices, room H–218 in the Capitol.

The budget is such an important document—touching as it does the lives and welfare of every American in one way or another—that I thought I should call attention to these hearings. The printed hearings contain much helpful information.

LABOR EDITOR DISCUSSES MINIMUM WAGE, BURKE-HARTKE BILL

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial in the Tacoma Labor Advocate, Editor Darlow I. Goertzen has made some interesting comments on minimum wage and the Burke-Hartke trade bill. I believe this editorial is worth reading and commend it to my colleagues:

[From the Tacoma Labor Advocate, Mar. 16, 1972]

DIGGING AROUND

When I see the constant, often undercurrent competition between capital, labor, and management, it reminds me of Uncle Sam and his three legged milking stool as told to me by my Uncle Martin.

As I recall in high school, I was studying American Government and the assignment was to tell which is the most important, management, labor or capital. I went to my Uncle Martin with the problem. He was a smart man, a philosopher in overalls. He was in the midst of milking his cow, Bessie. I said: "Uncle Martin, what's the most important—capital, labor or management?"

He looked up at me from his milking and said: "son take a look at the three-legged milking stool I'm sitting on. If you can tell me which of the three legs is the most important, I'll tell you which is most important—labor, capital or management." He was telling me in his own way that they're all of equal importance.

All we Americans, personified in Uncle Sam, are sitting on a three legged milking stool—one leg, labor—one, capital—the other management.

We're all drawing from our natural resources, represented by Bessie the cow.

Say one leg or two legs are thinned or attacked by termites. The stool becomes weak, imbalanced and "the body politic" or Uncle Sam has a heck of a time milking a cow.

If one would listen to the voice of capital, one would think that its importance warrants it to be one very thick leg on Uncle Sam's milking stool while labor's leg is riddled with "termites."

Because of a "new economic policy" unions have lost wage bargaining power and the President signed a compulsory arbitration bill aimed at West Coast Dock Workers—after the dockers had ratified a new contract and returned to work. "He signed it while in Peking, 'as a symbolic gesture,' according to Labor Secretary James D. Hodgson."

How can a nation survive without profit? It can't. And capital is honorable.

Labor asks for what it needs in minimum wages in many cases and higher wages in others to compete with the inflated cost of living today. Why shouldn't labor have it. Isn't labor as honorable as capital?

Huge management lay-offs, especially in the aero-space industries, are touted as being the result of "workforce reduction" and a natural event in a computerization age. But subcontracts and contracts made abroad by multinational firms lends itself to their lay-off. Shouldn't those who have been laid off in management survive? Aren't they honorable too?

Personally, I feel that a "smoke-screen" of wrongs have been thrown at Americana; but the real culprit is an out-and-out short sighted foreign trade policy.

In the AFL–CIO American Federationist, February 1972, Andrew J. Biemiller, Director of the AFL–CIO Department of Legislation states: "It is ridiculous for the United States to pursue any further a foreign trade policy that has cost her more than 700,000 jobs in the past 10 years."

Unless the three, labor, capital, and management, forgets about greed and works together—the three-legged stool is going to topple, Uncle Sam is going to have a spill and the cow will probably kick the bucket.

The question we must all ask ourself is: "what is to happen now to (the unemployed) the surplus "living?" Think about this when you vote this year. In the meantime, write to your congressmen and ask what are they doing about this "Burke-Hartke Trade Bill—a rational, 20th Century approach to correcting America's trade problems."

SPECIAL ANALYSIS OF OPERATIONS OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT, PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee is presently holding a series of hearings on the administration and effectiveness of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) as part of its overall investigation of U.S. Government Information Policies and Practices.

In preparation for these hearings, the subcommittee queried executive departments and agencies last year on their experience under the act. Responses to our questionnaire have been tabulated and analyzed by Dr. Harold Relyea and Sharon S. Gressle, analysts in American National Government and public administration in the Government and General Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. The subcommittee is grateful for the special research assistance provided by CRS in assisting in this and other projects connected with our hearings. The results of the special analysis follow my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, in 1966 the Congress took the first step toward guaranteeing the people's right to know what their government is planning and doing. The Freedom of Information Act was by no means a failure, nor was it an all-out success, but its shortcomings are due more to resistance on the part of the huge bureaucracy than to compromises which are inherent in the legislative process which created the law.

This is apparent from the analysis of the first 4 years of operation under the Freedom of Information Act. For every

17 times citizens used the law to try to get public records, they were denied the information one time.

On the surface, this looks like the Government is leaning over backward—at the rate of 17 to 1—to honor the Freedom of Information Act. But the executive agencies granted the public access to public information only because they were pushed over backward—only because the Congress passed a law to require the executive branch to honor the people's right to know. This is obvious when the figures show that, in spite of the law, nearly 2,200 requests for access to public records were denied, completely or in part.

Many Government agencies seem to be doing everything possible to ignore the Freedom of Information Act. Some agencies—and the Air Force is the worst offender—try to make their information operations look good by claiming that thousands of requests for routine Government documents are actually demands for access under the Freedom of Information Act. Other agencies—for example, the Civil Service Commission—keep no records and apparently have no interest in implementing the law.

Mr. Speaker, another indication of the attitude that government business is none of the public's business is the long time it takes an agency to act on a request for information. The major Government agencies took an average of 33 days to even respond to a request for public records under the Freedom of Information Act. And when the initial decision to withhold information was appealed by someone seeking the facts, the agencies took an average of 50 days to respond.

I am not surprised by the fact that corporations and lawyers representing private interests appear to be making the most use of the Freedom of Information Act. Those who can afford the expensive and time-consuming process of fighting for their right to know, will do so. I hope that the Congress can find a means to help the average citizen win his battles against the information bureaucracy.

I am surprised, however, that the reporters, editors, and broadcasters whose job it is to inform the American people have made so little use of the Freedom of Information Act. They were the major supporters of those in Congress who created the law. The free and responsible press is the keystone of an informed, democratic society and it should be the major user of the law designed to guarantee the people's right to know.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the Freedom of Information analysis as prepared by the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress follows:

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

On July Fourth, 1966, the Federal Government's first Freedom of Information Act was signed into law. It became effective one year later, giving the departments and agencies of the Executive branch time to adopt rules explaining the procedures to be followed by any person requesting access to public records.

The Freedom of Information Act became section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code. It was the result of 11 years of investigation by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations (formerly the Special Subcommittee on Government Information). It was also based on studies and investigation during most of the 11 years by Subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The new act repealed the so-called Public Information Section of the Administrative Procedure Act (Section 3) which had permitted Executive branch agencies to withhold government records "for good cause found" and "in the public interest." If no good cause could be found for withholding information, Section 3 permitted the government to release information selectively to persons "legitimately and properly concerned."

To explain the proper procedures for granting access to public records under the new Freedom of Information Act, the Department of Justice prepared a 47 page memorandum for all agencies of the Executive branch. The Attorney General's Memorandum issued in June, 1967 said that the key concerns of the law are—

that disclosure be the general rule, not the exception;

that all individuals have equal rights of access;

that the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it;

that individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts;

that there be a change in Government policy and attitude.

After the Freedom of Information Act had been in operation four years, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee began a series of studies and investigations to find out whether the new law was living up to the hopes of those who had worked for its creation and enactment for 11 years—and whether the Executive branch was administering the law in the spirit in which it was enacted, a spirit highlighted by the Attorney General's comments on the key concerns for the people's right to know the facts of government. The Subcommittee was mainly interested in the following sections of the Freedom of Information Law (5 U.S.C. 552) which spell out the right of access to public records.

"(3) Except with respect to the records made available under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, each agency, on request for identifiable records made in accordance with published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized by statute, and procedure to be followed, shall make the records promptly available to any person. On complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such a case the court shall determine the matter de novo and the burden is on the agency to sustain its action. In the event of noncompliance with the order of the court, the district court may punish for contempt the responsible employee, and in the case of a uniformed service, the responsible member. Except as to causes the court considers of greater importance, proceedings before the district court, as authorized by this paragraph, take precedence on the docket over all other causes and shall be assigned for hearing and trial at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way.

"(b) This section does not apply to matters that are—

"(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy;

"(2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;

"(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute;

"(4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential;

"(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;

"(6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

"(7) investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency;

"(8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; or

"(9) geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.

"(c) This section does not authorize withholding of information or limit the availability of records to the public, except as specifically stated in this section. This section is not authority to withhold information from Congress."

One step in the study and investigation was a series of questionnaires sent to all agencies of the Executive branch of the Federal Government by Congressman William S. Moorhead, chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. The Freedom of Information Act, by its terms, does not apply to the Legislative or Judicial branches. The basic questionnaire covered the first four years of the Act's operations, from July 4, 1967 through July 4, 1971. The following are the questions:

1. How many formal requests for access to records under 5 U.S.C. 552 has your agency received between July 4, 1967, and July 4, 1971?

a. In how many cases was access granted?

b. In how many cases was access refused?

c. In how many cases was access granted in part and refused in part?

d. How many cases are pending?

2. For each of the cases in which access was *refused*, please provide the following information:

a. The name and address of the individual or organization presenting the request for access and the date upon which it was presented;

b. The date upon which access was initially refused;

c. The section of 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (1) through (9) which was the basis for the refusal;

d. Whether an administrative appeal was filed against the initial refusal and, if so, the date of the appeal;

e. The date of the agency action upon the appeal and the title of the individual who took the action;

f. Whether, before the final refusal, the agency consulted the Department of Justice as requested by the Department's memorandum of December 8, 1969, to General Counsels of all agencies.

3. For each of the requests for access to records which has resulted in court action under 5 U.S.C. 552, please provide the following information:

a. The case citation and the date court action was initiated;

b. A *brief* description of the agency records requested;

c. A citation of the section of 5 U.S.C. 552 upon which the agency relied to refuse access;

d. A *brief* explanation of the current status of the court action.

4. What legend is used by your agency to identify records which are *not* classifiable under Executive Order 10501 but which are not to be made available outside the government?

Please list each term and explain its application.

5. How many officials of your agency are authorized to classify material Top Secret under the terms of Executive Order 10501?

Please identify, by name and title, each individual so authorized.

6. How many officials of your agency are authorized to classify material Secret under the terms of Executive Order 10501?

7. How many officials of your agency are authorized to classify material confidential under the terms of Executive Order 10501?

Before the questionnaire was sent formally to all departments and agencies of the Executive branch of the Federal Government, it was pre-tested by discussing possible questions with a number of government officials who would have the eventual responsibility of answering the final questionnaire. Included were some who had participated in hearings while the law was being considered by Congress and others who had participated in drafting the Attorney General's Memorandum.

To analyze the questionnaire answers and assist in the research work necessary to help prepare the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee members for a series of hearings on United States Government information policies and practices, a special task force was set up by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. It included legal experts from the American Law Division and government experts from the Government and General Research Division, with the activities coordinated by Samuel J. Archibald of the University of Missouri Freedom of Information Center, serving as a consultant to the Congressional Research Service.

The analysis of the questionnaire answers was conducted by Dr. Harold Relyea and Sharon S. Gressle, analysts in America national government and public administration in the Government and General Research Division.

DATA ANALYSIS

Nature of the data

The nature of the data obtained by means of the Subcommittee's questionnaire must be qualified as to its validity. While the aggregate data provided by the Executive agencies on the number of information requests and their action upon the requests suffers no quality limitation, the sample of individual-requestor cases listed in answers to the questionnaire was biased. Agencies were asked to identify only those requestors who had been denied, either in whole or in part, the material they had sought. The usual characterization of a valid measurement is one which "measures what it purports to measure" or obtains the information being sought. The identification of those denied information under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), was a major purpose of the questionnaire. On the level of measurement or accomplishment, the questionnaire and the data obtained are valid. Yet data consisting only of denial cases may have a bias. This bias becomes important when certain sociological generalizations are made within the analysis, such as the proportion of one type of requestor vis-a-vis another or averages of time lapses in acting upon requests. It is not, therefore, valid to generalize from the sample analyzed to the total number of requestors seeking information under the Freedom of Information Act. Those denied requests constitute approximately one percent of the total number of requestors. While this figure is skewed by the large number of requests reported by the Department of the Air Force, the total number of denials reaches only five percent of the total number of requestors when the Air Force figures are removed from the computations.

While the percentage of denials appears to be relatively small such statistics mask the fact that (minus Department of Air Force totals) for approximately every seventeen requests for information under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, one request is denied. And even this consideration ignores the quality of information requested, the public interest which might have been served by granting the request, and the basis upon which the public record was denied. Further, certain agencies have higher ratios of refusal than others—some, as will be indicated, denying more requests than they grant. In brief, such statistics demonstrate problems in the administration of an act which was designed to make disclosure the general rule and not the exception and to promote equal rights of access for all requestors.

Nature of the analysis

The focus of the analysis was chiefly upon agencies of the Federal Government which generally affect the public welfare or which, in the preliminary examination of returned questionnaires, indicated areas of special interest. While the overall survey covered some ninety executive departments and agencies, this analysis considers selected respondents.

Certain statistical findings in this analysis utilized available data rather than a total or randomized sample. Averages of lapsed time for action on initial requests or appeals were occasionally computed on less than the total number of reported cases due to incomplete details on each case. It should, therefore, be noted that certain totals of individual or category items listed in the major analytical chart do not coincide with the appropriate number of reported cases.

Quality of data

Responses to the Subcommittee's questionnaire were generally complete and detailed for most agencies, but in certain cases the agencies seemed to misunderstand the questions or they provided otherwise unusable information. The Department of Defense for example, acknowledged incomplete records to answer some questions. The Civil Aeronautics Board supplied aggregate information for fiscal year 1968 only. The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration reported they kept no records on Freedom of Information Act requests.

In a number of instances details were omitted from agency responses. The number of requests for public records was not provided, for example, by the Department of the Army, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Coast Guard, the Federal Maritime Administration, and the Civil Service Commission, though those agencies did provide information on individual denials. Often no initial request dates were supplied for individual cases or no dates on appeals were given, thus making the computation of time intervals impossible or limited to a few cases. In many responses the titles and citations of relevant court cases were garbled or missing. The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of State, and the Securities and Exchange Commission failed to cite appropriate sections of the Freedom of Information Act as a basis for refusing information.

Frequently, the responding agencies cited court cases which resulted from their refusals to provide materials but they failed to provide details on the administrative procedure which preceded judicial action. While the Air Force was way out of line in claiming to grant 202,714 requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act and to deny only 118 requests, some other agencies also appeared to inflate the figures on requests for information. The Agriculture Department claimed it granted 10,769 requests for information while denying only 137 requests; the Department of Transportation claimed 13,295 grants and 445 denials and the Civil Aeronautics Board claimed that 18,261 requests for information were received and only 33 requests were denied. The grant/denial record of other agencies seemed to be in line with their size and activity.

Those agencies which were out of line might have overstated the number of requests which were granted—counting a request for a routine government publication, for instance, as a demand for public records under the Freedom of Information Act—or the variations in numbers of requests cited may be one more indication that the Freedom of Information Act is held in minimum high regard by the agencies responsible for protecting the people's right to know in a democratic society.

The possibility was considered that agencies might cite many sections of the Freedom of Information Act as authority to refuse requests for information initially, but cite fewer and more defensible sections if challenged in court. The analysis indicates only nine instances where initial citations of authority for refusal differed from citations in court. Nor was the trend within these cases unidirectional; in some instances more sections of the Act were cited at the court stage than at the initial refusal stage.

Computations were made for the average number of days required for each agency to respond to initial requests for information and for the average number of days to respond to appeals of the initial denials. These time spans ranged from an average of 8 days (Small Business Administration) to 69 days (Federal Trade Commission) for responses to initial requests and from 13 days (Department of the Air Force) to 127 days (Department of Labor) for responses to appeals. For those agencies listed in the analytical chart, the average number of days taken to respond to initial requests was 33 (for 27 agencies); the average number of days to respond to appeals was 50 (for 20 agencies). In terms of the average time lapse on initial requests for agencies listed in the analytical chart, 11 agencies exceeded this average; 9 agencies exceeded this average for time on acting on appeals. The Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Justice and the Renegotiation Board exceeded the total average for both stages of the administrative process. Statistically, four agencies seem to be in no hurry to expedite requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act.

Only two agencies reported that they denied more requests than they granted. These are the Department of Justice and the Federal Power Commission, but in the latter case the outcome resulted from a total of only 8 requests. Other agencies indicated high refusal rates in their responses. These refusals are usually not overturned to any general extent when appealed within the agencies or when pressed in court. Of 296 requests which were appealed, 37 were granted and 196 were denied. Those remaining were granted in part, were pending, or results were unknown. Of 99 court cases which were initiated to obtain information denied by the executive agencies, 16 resulted in grants of the material sought and the remaining cases were either denied or appealed to higher courts.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ANALYTICAL CHART [FOR PERIOD: JULY 4, 1967–JULY 4, 1971,

Agency [1]	Formal requests	Access granted [2]	Access refused	Access granted in part [2]	Pending initial decision [2]	Refusals administratively appealed	Refusals sustained by administrative appeal	Refusals reversed by administrative appeal	Refusals reversed in part through appeal	Court action initiated [3]	Refusal sustained in court action	Refusal reversed in court action	Refusal reversed in part in court action	Average time for action on initial request [4] (in days)	Average time for action on appeal [4] (in days)	Types of requestors [5]									Bases for refusal [6] [Title 5 U.S.C.]								
																Corporation	Private law firm	Public interest group	Researcher	Non-Federal Government Agency	Labor union	Media	Congress	Other	552(b)(1)	552(b)(2)	552(b)(3)	552(b)(4)	552(b)(5)	552(b)(6)	552(b)(7)	552(b)(8)	552(b)(9)
Atomic Energy Commission	392	376	8	6	2	0				0				28		4	2		1					1		1		1	5	2			
Percent		(96)	(2)	(1.5)	(.5)									(4)																			
Civil Aeronautics Board [7]	18,261	(8)	33	3	0	5	1	2	2	2	0	2	0	[9] 10	[9] 30	16	10	1		4		1		4		2	25	5	1	9		
Percent														(31)	(5)																	
Civil Service Commission [10]	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	1	1			0				26	7			2	2		1	1	2	15		2		8	5			
Percent														(23)	(1)																	
Department of Agriculture [11]	11,093	10,769	137	79	9	17	11	1	5	2			2	20	52	40	18	22	7	9	15	12	21		2	13	71	17	14	37		9
Percent		(97)	(1.2)	(.7)	(.08)									(124)	(17)																	
Department of Commerce [12]	182	109	50	9	4	11	11			[13] 8	1	1		18	64	13	18	1		1	6		10			8	37	21	10	1		
Percent		(60)	(27)	(5)	(2)									48	(11)																	
Department of Defense [13] (Other than Air Force, Army and Navy)	2,732	2,638	64	29	1	4	3		1	[13] 2				15	23	21	7		6	1		1	1	9	8	16	14	23	27	1	2		
Percent		(96.5)	(2.3)	(1)	(.03)									(44)	(4)																	
Department of Air Force	202,957	202,714	118	30	95	[13] 28	8	11	2	[13] 5		2	2	43	13	54	9	3	3	4	2	1	1	72	8	19	4	40	62	17	12	2	
Percent		(99.8)	(.05)	(.01)	(.04)									(134)	(25)																	
Department of Army	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	14	8	4	2	[13] 1	1			(8)	([8], [15])	3	1		2		1	1	2	4	4			2	5	2	1		
Department of Navy	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	[9] 9				[13] 9	3		3	28	88	2	12		1	1			1	4			1	2	3	1	1		
Percent														(6)	(8)																	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	368	258	77	16	17	[14] 8	5			[17] 5	1	2	1	54	71	6	10	6	4		9	1	22		1	8	10	15	7			
Percent		(70)	(21)	(4)	(5)									(55)	(5)																	
Department of Housing and Urban Development	736	660	48	23	5	[18] 7	3	1	2	3		3		21	36	5	25	14		5		12	1	9		1	22	38	22	1	13		
Percent		(90)	(6.5)	(3.1)	(.6)									(71)	(5)																	
Department of the Interior [16]	15	6	5	1	3	5	5			[16] 1				36	76	1	1	3						1			1		2			
Percent		(40)	(33)	(7)	(20)									(2)	(4)																	
Department of Justice	535	215	311	9	0	[17] 14	6	(17)	(17)	[17] 9	6			60	65	106	15	5	1	2	1	8	2	169	1	1	4	3	28	244	38		
Percent		(40)	(58)	(2)										(50)	(10)																	
Department of Labor [18]	(8)	(8)	33	(8)	(8)	7	2	4	1	1		1		28	127		18	1		1				13			9	8		29		
Percent														(31)	(6)																	
Department of State [19]	195	171	12	9	3	([19])				[19] 2	1			48	([19])	2	3		2			3	1	13	([19])							
Percent		(87.6)	(6.1)	(4.6)	(1.5)									(24)																		
Department of Transportation [20]	13,764	13,295	445	13	11	[20] 55	44	5	3	[20] 8	4	1	2	27	40	29	9	3				3		54	1	5	37	15	28	7	23		
Percent		(96.5)	(3.2)	(.09)	(.08)									(77)	(48)																	
Department of the Treasury [21]	1,625	1,175	338	79	33	46	45	0	1	[21] 8	3			41	43	20	59	7	1	21	1	11	6	74	4	49	56	59	52	21	33	3	1
Percent		(72)	(21)	(5)	(2)									(196)	(47)																	
Environmental Protection Agency	1	1	0	0	0																											
Percent		(100)																														
Federal Communications Commission	98	63	26	7	2	[22] 5	4			[22] 1				27	30	13		6		1		6	3	6			18	10		7		
Percent		(64)	(27)	(7)	(2)									(35)	(7)																	
Federal Power Commission	8	2	6	0	0	3	3			[23] 2				31	27	6													5			
Percent		(25)	(75)											(6)	(3)																	
Federal Trade Commission	432	388	36	7	1	0				[24] 7		2	2	69		11	7	3	3	1		3		14			3	20	13	1	23	1	1
Percent		(89.8)	(8.3)	(1.6)	(.23)									(46)																		
General Services Administration	37	21	13	2	1	0				[25] 5			1	48		5	2			1				8	2	1		1	3	3	4		
Percent		(57)	(35)	(5)	(3)									(3)																		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	1,019	984	5	10	20	0				1	1			41		6	4			1	2	1		1			7	6	2			
Percent		(96.5)	(.49)	(.98)	(1.9)									(10)																		
Office of Economic Opportunity [26]	1	1								[26] 1							1															
Percent		(100)																														
Office of Emergency Preparedness	3	3																														
Percent		(100)																														

Footnotes at end of table.

FREEDOM of INFORMATION ANALYTICAL CHART [FOR PERIOD: JULY 4, 1971]—Continued

Agency [1]	Formal requests	Access granted [2]	Access refused [2]	Access granted in part [2]	Pending initial decision [2]	Refusals administratively appealed	Refusals sustained by administrative appeal	Refusals reversed by administrative appeal	Refusals reversed in part through appeal	Court action initiated [3]	Refusal sustained in court action	Refusal reversed in court action	Refusal reversed in part in court action	Average time for action on initial request [4] (in days)	Average time for action on appeal [4] (in days)	Types of requestors [5]									Bases for refusal [6] [Title 5 U.S.C.]								
																Corporation	Private law firm	Public interest group	Researcher	Non-Federal Government Agency	Labor union	Media	Congress	Other	552(b)(1)	552(b)(2)	552(b)(3)	552(b)(4)	552(b)(5)	552(b)(6)	552(b)(7)	552(b)(8)	552(b)(9)
Office of Management and Budget	60	52	5	3	0	0				0				25		1	1		3	1				2	1				7			
Percent		(87)	(8)	(5)										(8)																		
Renegotiation Board	40	11	10	15	4	13	11		2	[27] 9	1		3	52	53	20	3	1	1					1		2	20	20	21		9		
Percent		(27.5)	(25)	(37.5)	(10)									(26)	(13)																	
Securities and Exchange Commission [28]	(9)	(9)	26	14	(9)	[28] 40	14	9	15	[28] 3	1			(8)	55	2	15	2	4			5	12									
Percent															(33)																	
Selective Service System	20	13	5	2	0	0				[29] 0				29		1		1						3			4			1		
Percent		(65)	(25)	(10)										(5)																		
Small-Business Administration	10	4	1	5	0	[30] 1				[30] 1				8	(9)			1		1		2	1	2			6	3	2		1	1	
Percent		(40)	(10)	(50)										(4)																		
U.S. Information Agency	7	5	1	1	0	0				0				(9)		1									1							
Percent		(71)	(14)	(14)																												
Veterans Administration	46	35	9	1	1	3	3			[31] 3		2		36	44	2		3		2	1			3			3	1		4	1	
Percent		(76)	(20)	(2)	(2)									(9)	(3)																	
Totals [32]	254,637	233,969	1,822	373	212	296	196	37	42	99	23	16	16			390	250	85	41	53	13	90	34	547	30	100	206	403	375	344	244	7	11
Percent																																

[1] The chart is not inclusive of all agencies responding to the questionnaire. The agencies listed were chosen because they generally affect the public welfare or because, in the preliminary examination of returned questionnaires, they indicated areas of special interest for analysis.

[2] Figures in parentheses are percentages of the total number of formal requests to the agency. Due to rounding the percentages may not equal 100 percent.

[3] Incidences of court action do not necessarily reflect the number of appeals lost and brought to court. Many agencies cited court cases and provided no previous administrative action data.

[4] The figures shown in parentheses are the number of cases on which the average is based.

[5] Identity of requestor (in cases of refusal only) was provided by the agencies. Judgments were made in instances where types were not explicitly stated. Therefore the categories may not be fully illustrative.

[6] Sections cited are the exemptions written into the Freedom of Information Act. The number of exemptions will not always justify with the number of denials due to multiple citations or lack of citation altogether.

[7] CAB provided total number of requests for fiscal 1968 only. Kept no records of requests granted. Those refused cover the 4-year period.

[8] Unknown.

[9] CAB. Of the 31 cases (initial refusal) computed, 22 received action within 24 hours. On appeal, 3 cases received action in less than 15 days.

[10] CSC has not made it a practice to keep centralized records of requests; therefore no figures were provided. Were able to identify 23 denials through reference to the General Counsel's office. It is possible that other formal requests have been denied.

[11] Department of Agriculture response was decentralized. Each constituent agency replied independently. The replies indicated no unified recordkeeping policy.

[12] Department of Commerce cited 10 cases, action on which do not fall into chart categories: 7 were withdrawn before acted upon; 1 was for records at another agency; 1 was for nonexistent records; and 1 is unrecorded as to action taken. Of 8 court cases, only 3 were cited as requested. 2 were pending July 4, 1971; the other found for the agency. Of the remaining cases, 1 ordered release of documents (411 F. 2d 696) and 4 were reported as "Suit dropped. Resolved by access." Citations to the Code of Federal Regulations accompanied 5 U.S.C. 552(b) as basis for refusal.

[13] Department of Defense was decentralized in its replies. The constituent agencies, except Army, Navy, and Air Force, have been combined on the chart. Some question arises as to method of recordkeeping; i.e., Air Force reports over 200,000 formal requests for information; Army could give no statistics other than appeals (and no dates for appeal initiation); and Navy estimating that the number of cases would total millions, provided both initial denial and appeal information where possible. Navy provided an estimate for Marine Corps Headquarters: granted 16,804 access requests; denied 960 access requests; and granted in part 50 requests. No departmentwide statistics were charted due to the imbalance created by Air Force figures. Court action: The 2 DOD (combined) cases are pending as are 3 from Navy and 1 from Air Force. Administrative appeal action: Air Force, no record for 7; Navy reported 1 appeal pending

[14] Department of HEW: Of 8 appeals, action was unknown on 2 and 1 is pending. Of 5 court cases, 1 is pending. HEW was irregular in its reporting of basis of refusal. In some instances it referred to only 5 U.S.C. 552(b), not citing specific exemptions and in some instances it relied solely on HEW public information regulations or combined those with code citations.

[15] Department of HUD: Of 7 appeals, 1 is pending.

[16] Department of the Interior interpreted formal requests to be those which were appealed or otherwise considered by the Solicitor. The sole court case was not a result of refusal for information, but rather a refusal to gather, from all field offices, the information together in Washington for plaintiff's perusal. No final action was reported.

[17] Department of Justice: Of 9 court cases, 3 are pending. Appeal action: 6 modified (granted whole or in part): 1 pending and 1 record nonexistent.

[18] Department of Labor keeps no record of requests granted; when requests are initially denied copies of relevant correspondence are filed. The Code of Federal Regulations was also cited as a basis for refusal.

[19] Department of State has no formal appeals process. Of 2 court cases, 1 is pending. 5 U.S.C. 552(b) was general basis of refusal with no specific exemptions cited.

[20] Department of Transportation estimated the number of requests received as being over 14,000. Figures shown are those aggregated from the constituent agencies providing data. Of 55 appeals, 1 is pending and 2 have no record of action.

[21] Department of Treasury: Internal Revenue Service reported denial of access (whole or partial) in 306 instances; information was provided for 130 of those, the remainder being unidentifiable or granted on appeal. Of 8 court cases, 5 are pending.

[22] FCC reported 1 court case for which an appeal is pending. Action is unknown on 1 appeal.

[23] FPC reported 2 court cases, both of which are pending.

[24] FTC reported 7 court cases, 3 of which are pending.

[25] GSA: Of 5 court cases, 4 are pending.

[26] OEO reported 1 request which was not refused per se. The Director responded within 4 days stating that the document would be studied for possible release. Suit was filed the day the letter was dated. Before hearing the document was released.

[27] Renegotiation Board reported 9 court cases, 5 of which are pending

[28] SEC provided information only on Commission action which constitutes appeal action. No initial refusal or basis for refusal data was provided. Time for appeal was computed from time of initial request. Of 40 appeals, 2 had no action recorded. Of 3 court cases, 2 are pending

[29] Selective Service System reported 7 instances in which requests for information resulted in court action: refusal was sustained in 6 and reversed in 1. No previous administrative data was provided for these cases.

[30] SBA reported 1 appeal with action unknown and 1 court case which was declared moot.

[31] VA: Of 3 court cases, 1 is pending.

[32] Individual units may not equal apparent totals due to variations among agencies.

WALLACE MARTIN ON RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct 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.

I am honored and pleased that the winning speech from Louisiana was delivered by a resident of my district, Wallace T. Martin, 210 LSU Avenue, Baton Rouge, La. Wallace is the son of the Honorable Wade O. Martin, Jr., long time secretary of State of Louisiana.

I insert the text of the winning speech, as follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Wallace Martin)

"Do Your Thing!" Haven't you heard this statement before? You see this slogan on pins, shirts, pants, flags, banners, bathroom walls, posters, and you hear it on records. The reason this slogan has become so popular today is because it refers to a person's individual freedom. However, this phrase is frequently misused and hypocritical; it is a deluder, too often promoting conformity instead of individuality. Perhaps a more honest slogan should read, "Do the Same Thing," or "Down With Individuality and Up With Conformity." Individuality is the most important and outstanding characteristic a person may possess. Individuality and freedom are synonymous. If a person is to be free, he must have the capacity to express himself in an individualistic manner.

In its true sense, "Do Your Thing" can exemplify America by reminding us that we are free to express our freedoms and our opportunities more than the people of any other country in the history of our world. The only word of caution here is that doing your own thing should be tempered with common sense and a sense of responsibility.

The differentiating factor between a democratic and a communistic form of government is freedom. Freedom allows a person many individual rights. It gives a person the right to assemble, to worship as he pleases, to secure private property, and to make his personal views public. These freedoms not only affect the country as a whole, but me as an individual. Without the freedom of speech, open public criticism would be an impossibility without fear of arrest, and even the mere idea of a peaceful protest would result in total failure due to governmental intervention. Without the freedom to secure private property, we could not own a car, a plot of land, or even a house in which to live. Since these freedoms affect me as an individual, it is my duty to take a personal interest in their preservation. The young generation of today will be the established generation of tomorrow, and if we do not exert an unending effort toward the continuation of freedom, tomorrow's generation will fall miserably.

In the past few years the younger generation has taken great steps toward student involvement in government and national problems, such as the war in Viet Nam, poverty, etc. This great interest was recognized recently by the nation, and a decision was made to allow eighteen year olds the right to vote. This new law now gives me the freedom to express my feelings in such a way that they will directly affect the nation. As a young voter, I must accept the responsibility to carefully select the candidates and to wholeheartedly support them. By exercising my voting right in a mature manner, I am fulfilling a small part of my responsibility to freedom. Also by becoming involved in these issues, I am setting a good example for others to follow. Involvement is the key to understanding and by becoming involved one gains experience which is the key to learning.

Since the importance of freedom is finally being recognized to such a great degree today, many new groups have been organized to protest the "establishment" and thereby promote freedom. These groups often greatly abuse their rights to freedom by considering these rights to be more of a license than a responsibility. They feel that this license gives them the right to continually protest, to allow their hair to grow until their appearance greatly resembles that of prehistoric man, the right to dress as if they had not the money to support a family of rats, the right to speak harshly and cruelly against all forms of establishment and the right to desecrate our parks with rebellious protest marches and sit-ins. This is not freedom; it is the lazy way out for people who did not try hard enough to have their ideas executed, their principles understood and their mores accepted. Now it is too late to ask for respect. They have been given the freedoms which are justly due them, but they have misused them and acted irresponsibly. Therefore, as long as they continued to abuse their rights and freedoms, they shall not be deserving of the public's admiration, trust or respect.

The United States of America has given me many freedoms; however, it is my duty as a citizen to prove myself worthy of them. As a youth, I can prove myself worthy by going to the polls on election day and voting as an individual, only influenced by my own conscience. I can become involved in today's issues and thus increase my understandings of life, and I can act as an individual—one who stands up and fights for what he believes is right and one who stands behind his ideas all the way, no matter how different they may be from others. I am a free individual, and I am extremely proud to be one. Won't you join me!

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM BY MARY ELLEN CARPENTER

HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and include in the RECORD the essay written by the Vermont State winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest. A half-million young men and women competed this year for five national scholarships. All students submitted essays entitled "My Responsibility to Freedom" to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and VFW auxiliary who sponsor the contest.

Mary Ellen Carpenter is the Vermont State winner for 1972 and is the daughter of Russell and Mary-Elaine Carpenter of Bennington who are fine examples of our best American traditions. Mary Ellen is a senior at Mount Anthony Union High School in Bennington where she has not only been an excellent student, but has found time for a wide variety of outside activities. She has been editor of her high school yearbook, member of Model Congress for the past 3 years, high school band, Model U.N., Steering Committee, student representative to the Bennington Park and Recreation Commission, member of the National Honor Society, French Club, and was channel 8–TV program director. Mary Ellen has received many awards for her studies in Latin. She is presently the Vermont State Secretary for the Children of the American Revolution. Mary Ellen plans to pursue a career in law.

I am pleased to present the excellent winning essay by Mary Ellen who is worthy of this honor and in her essay she has displayed her dedication to the betterment of life for her fellow man:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

"Only free people can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end, and prefer the interests of mankind to any interests of their own." Woodrow Wilson made this statement in an address to Congress in 1917. I feel that these principles still hold true today. This is the result of the hard work and labor of many Americans from the birth of our country to present day to keep our nation and people free. The youth of America from Revolutionary times have shouldered a responsibility to this ideal of freedom.

I look to the past for ideas and ways that I can help preserve the high ideals put forth in the Constitution.

During the Revolutionary War the youth of our country played a quiet, but none the less important, role in our fight for independence. They carried many messages, helped feed and clothe our soldiers, cared for the wounded and, in some cases, even fought on the battlefields. They carried on the spirit of the Revolution with vigor.

Young people continued to be an influencing factor in the Civil War. Our country was torn apart by strife and dissension. The young citizens stood up for their beliefs in the War-Between-the States. The Northern youths smuggled slaves to freedom, and fought for the ideal of freedom for all. The Southern youths should not be overlooked. They spoke up bravely for what they felt was right and this is one of our greatest freedoms. Northerners may not have agreed with them, but the Southerners were allowed to say what they felt without fear of imprisonment.

World Wars I and II found our world in a state of turmoil. The youth of America kept up the morale of our men in uniform by their support and concern over the men. The young people also supported the policies of Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt to the extent that many were willing to risk their lives defending the freedoms that we enjoy.

During the fifties we were again involved in a conflict. Our troops were sent to a far area of the world to again act as the guardians of freedom. Many Americans lost their lives in the belief that they were helping the people of Korea.

The sixties found our country going through a great deal of internal strife. The poor were demanding more welfare money and blacks and women felt the pressure of job discrimination. Riots tore our cities apart. Three national figures were assassinated. Many citizens spoke out in open

opposition tothe Vietnam War. Yet throughout this our country has endured. I feel it is because of our many freedoms granted by the Constitution and all the people that care about preserving these freedoms.

I believe that there are many lessons to be learned from my study of the past. My responsibilities to the freedom of this country are many and complex. I feel that as an American one of my greatest responsibilities is voting. Now that the 18 year old vote is a reality I must consider all of the qualifications of each candidate and make an intelligent choice. Involvement in politics on the local, state and, national level is also important. Letters to our representatives in Washington is one of the best ways to inform them how their constituency feels on vital issues.

Obeying the laws of our country is important to me. The laws were made for the majority of citizens and I do not believe that one individual has the right to interfere with the welfare of others.

Protecting the freedoms set forth by the Constitution is perhaps my greatest responsibility to freedom. Looking back on our country's history this is the one point I most often recognize as being important. In utilizing these freedoms I must not deny anyone the same freedoms. Each of us, as Americans, are entitled to the same rights regardless of age, race, sex, national origin or creed.

STATEMENT BY PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA BEFORE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, the president of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, addressed the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate on Tuesday, March 14, 1972.

Mr. Rodriguez presented a six-point medical care program and 22-point veterans benefits program endorsed by the Paralyzed Veterans of America as their legislative goal for 1972. In addition, he outlined the various activities and services fostered by his organization to alleviate problems faced by our paralyzed veterans.

These veterans are the ones who have borne the direct burden of armed conflict—physical disabilities such as crippled spines and other paralyzing deformities. Their burdens are living examples of the terrible suffering and price that must be paid if our Nation is to remain inviolate and free.

Mr. President, I feel that the proposals of the Paralyzed Veterans of America contain many worthwhile ideas which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF CARLOS RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Members of the Committee: On behalf of the nearly 8,000 members, 26 chapters, and members of the Board of Directors of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, I wish to thank you for the opportunity of appearing here today to present our legislative recommendations. It is our first opportunity to address this Committee since its formation and, coincidentally, our first annual presentation since the granting of a Federal Charter to the PVA during the last session of this Congress.

Accompanying me today are members of the National Office Staff—our Executive Director, Mr. Michael W. Burns, and the National Service Director, Mr. Alan S. Langer—who will be happy to answer any questions you might have regarding our suggested programs. I would like to add that the PVA is proud of the fact that these two top administrative positions are filled by Vietnam combat veterans deeply committed to the needs of our organization's members of all ages and from all wars. Also present are our National Vice President, Mr. James E. Smith of California, and Mr. Harry A. Schweikert, who is the Administrative Assistant to the Executive Director.

The recommendations we wish to make are, we feel, constructive goals for consideration by Congress in the areas of health care, compensation, pension, survivor benefits and spinal cord research. Because of their number and complexity, I respectfully request that we be allowed to submit them for the record and this afternoon I will only speak to the major principles and philosophy contained in them.

I would like to congratulate the Committee for its action in the first session of this Congress which enabled passage of a number of measures which we have long favored. Mortgage Protection Life Insurance, the reestablishment of the Direct Home Loan Program, the increase in the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC), and the timely passage of the Pension increase are but a few of the achievements worth noting. Continued exploration of the health care needs by this Committee's Subcommittee on Health and Hospitals is another accomplishment which must be noted and applauded.

We are well aware that the Congress, like any deliberative body, never can fully complete the work placed before it. We know you are aware that much is left to be done if we are to provide excellent medical care and suitable benefits for our nation's deserving veterans. We truly hope the dynamic initiative of the past can continue at an increased level in the future. Only thus will we all successfully discharge our collective responsibility to veterans everywhere.

Throughout its 25 year history, the PVA has always concerned itself with the medical care received by all veterans, while giving our special attention to those with spinal cord injury and disease. We continue in our belief that nothing will ever replace a dynamic program of rehabilitation for these veterans. This is absolutely necessary if we are to expect these severely disabled veterans to become once again productive taxpaying members of society. Such a program requires skilled professionals of all medical, paramedical and psycho-socio disciplines. It requires that these professionals be highly motivated and dedicated to this effort. Within the Veterans Administration today there are such people, but there are not enough of them. There must be more if these men are to be returned to society, accepted by society, and if they are to be prepared, medically and psychologically, to face the largely hostile and indifferent attitude they will meet when they leave the hospital.

Assistance in vocational and avocational guidance and counseling are also imperative. The need for increased education and training assistance for all veterans has never been greater. PVA supports H.R. 12828, recently reported by the Veterans Affairs Committee of the other body, as being a very large step in the right direction and we support it fully. We hope the Senate will see fit to accept the basic elements of this bill and speed its passage.

The advances made in the immediate medical aid to the combat casualty have presented America with a paradox. Fewer deaths, thankfully, have resulted; but more men have survived incredible wounds, only to face long arduous periods of rehabilitation which, while teaching them to live with their handicaps, will never erase them. Some of these handicaps are so disabling that work in the usual sense of the word becomes impossible. These men must rely heavily on compensation payments. These payments need to be raised, now, in order to provide them with an adequate income to meet rising living costs. We understand that the Subcommittee on Compensations and Pensions of this Committee will soon consider a raise in service-connected compensation. We ask that at that time they also consider the removal of the distinction between "wartime" and "peacetime" rates. We have never supported this distinction. The Veterans Administration has, for a number of years, favorably endorsed its removal, viewing it as discriminatory. Indeed, the date of the Tonkin Gulf incident is used to compute the so-called "Vietnam Era" for veterans' benefits purposes. Yet the Tonkin Gulf Resolution has been repealed by Congress, so we question what significance this date now has. The most recent Selected Service Law contains language in one section to indicate "hostile fire" was occurring in 1957. We ask for enabling legislation which would remove these arbitrary dates and consider "hostile fire" a possibility and, thus, "peacetime" an impossibility, since February 1, 1955.

The non service-connected veteran has always been presented with unique problems, but the spinal cord injured veteran of this type faces near disaster. He must live in the same world that we all live in, yet at an income expectancy far below his service-connected brothers. We have maintained for many years that the present pension system is not the appropriate answer for the severely physically disabled. More than ever before this type of veteran is not an older man in need of constant hospitalization, he is a veteran of this very long war, very often not yet 21 years old, who served honorably only to suffer disability after discharge. Is it fair to confine the hopes of a young and vital mind, capable of wondrous things even with his limited physical mobility, to a nursing home or to a poverty level income? We think not, and hope we may be allowed to work with you to develop a suitable pension system for these men. Even under the present system there are many measures which could be taken which would help to ease their burden. We have outlined them for you in our submitted document.

The Veterans Administration has accomplished a number of milestones in the field of medical research. Its research has had much to do with the development of pacemakers and other lifesaving procedures. We would deem it appropriate if that agency, which pioneered the care of paraplegia, would be the one which discovered the cure for spinal trauma and its resultant paralysis. But to do it, the Veterans Administration needs money and an ongoing program of cure/research. A minimum of $1 million annually should be allocated for this purpose. Hope of doing something about paraplegia should never be lost. Future generations should be free from it. We ask that a start be made so that someday groups such as ours may not even need to exist. A cure for the paralysis resultant from spinal trauma will insure our own obsolescence and if it could be made possible, we would be the first to applaud.

This has been but an overview of our rec-

ommendations, Mr. Chairman. Our submitted statement covers our proposals much more specifically and in greater detail. Our representatives will be more than happy to answer any questions you have now, and of course are available to work with you and your respective staffs, whenever they may be of assistance.

We hope this will be the first of many times we will be privileged to appear before this distinguished committee to submit our recommendations. We also hope the objectives we propose show originality and initiative and will become part of your legislative program.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1972

MEDICAL CARE AND REHABILITATION

1. We fully support the provisions of S. 2354 and H.R. 10880 which provide more outpatient care for eligible veterans without the necssity of previous hospitalization; provide shift differential for nurses in Veterans Administration Hospitals and other recruitment and retention measures in the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

2. We fully support S. 1988 which would authorize medical care in private facilities for veterans with service-connected disabilities in cases other than emergencies.

3. Extension of VA Medical Benefits to wives and widows, and minor children of service-connected veterans in receipt of Aid and Attendance, with such services being provided at other than VA facilities.

4. Appropriation of not less than one million dollars annually as a line item in the Veterans Administartion budget, to insure an ongoing cure/research program and provide the critically necessary medical maintenance research in renal dysfunction in paraplegics.

5. Enactment of enabling legislation to provide uniform mandatory driver training programs at all VA Spinal Cord Injury Centers and other hospitals where necessary for all severely disabled deemed capable of benefitting from such training.

6. We fully support the provisions of S. 2077 which would provide a Court of Veterans Appeals so that veterans would have proper legal recourse beyond the Veterans Administration in claim adjudication for compensation and pension cases.

VETERANS BENEFITS

1. We fully support the recently reported bill, S. 2013, which would increase the P.L. 702 Housing Grant to certain severely disabled veterans from $12,500 to $20,000.

2. Discontinuance of the discriminatory differential in the rates of compensation between "peacetime" and "wartime" service-connected veterans who are totally disabled as a result of their military service.

3. Discontinuance of the discriminatory language of Title 38 requiring Vietnam Era veterans to meet direct performance of duty criteria in order to qualify for certain benefits.

4. Provide a 20 percent raise in the compensation rate now payable to totally disabled service-connected veterans.

5. Provide that the death of any spinal cord injured veteran injured while in service be considered of service-connected origin due to the complexity of physical impairments caused by that type of injury or disease.

6. Provide for immediate amendment of P.L. 91-666, the Auto Grant Law, to provide that further power accessories necessary for the safe operation and comfort be specifically provided for. Also substitute the less restrictive line of duty requirements imposed upon the same category of veterans in the Vietnam Era as in World War II and the Korean Conflict.

7. The repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution no longer lends any "legal" basis for using August 4, 1964 as the date for computation of wartime rates of compensation and because of the presence of "hostile fire" throughout the present "peacetime" period, the date for these benefits should be set at February 1, 1955.

8. Due to the inequity of benefits available service-connected veterans who were medically "discharged" and those medically "retired," we request making the Career Compensation Act of 1947 retroactive to December 7, 1941, to provide equal benefits for each group of disabled veterans.

9. We support H.R. 8042 which would provide that duty in the WAAC would be considered service in the Armed Forces for compensation and pension purposes.

10. The PVA strongly recommends the adoption of a separate pension program for the total *physically* disabled veteran, and that this program be extended to "peacetime" veterans in need of regular Aid and Attendance.

11. An increase in Aid and Attendance allowances for both service-connected and non service-connected veterans, so that the amount received by either group would not be less than $336.00 per month.

12. Amendment of Title 38, Section 3012 (b) (1) to allow that eligible veteran's compensation continue until the last day of the month of his death.

13. Medical services should be on a "fee pay" basis for service-connected veterans while they are residing in a foreign country.

14. We urge amendment of the appropriate sections of Title 38 to allow medical supplies to be made available to non service-connected veterans who would otherwise be eligible except for their present employment.

15. Exclude social security disability benefits, or other retirement income in lieu of same, from computation of annual income for pension purposes.

16. We urge extension of the Veterans Administration Pension Program to those veterans disabled after honorable discharge who would otherwise be eligible except that it occurred during a so-called "peacetime" period.

17. Use of Veterans Administration medical facilities should be restricted to veterans only.

18. We urge that any retiree (retired for other than disability) from the Armed Forces, who has become totally and permanently disabled, be awarded from his branch of service the P.L. 702 Housing Grant and the benefits of P.L. 91-666 on the same basis as those retired or discharged for disability.

19. That the widow of a totally disabled veteran who was in receipt of Aid and Attendance, be awarded 50 percent of his compensation as a DIC benefit. This payment would be made to those married to such veterans for at least one year and would be stopped upon remarriage of the widow.

20. That an additional individual tax exemption be given to totally disabled, as is now the practice for the blind, who are paying income tax on wages earned or pensions received.

21. That a totally disabled veteran without dependents, shall continue to receive full pension benefits until the seventh month following admission to a Veterans Administration Hospital, and that any reduction that is made shall be limited to that portion received for Aid and Attendance.

22. To amend Section 351 of Title 38 to provide those veterans receiving compensation for disability due to VA treatment the additional benefits of the War Orphans and Widows Education Act, and, if totally and permanently disabled, the P.L. 702 Housing Grant and P.L. 91-666 Auto Grant should be awarded.

CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION LODGE NO. 185 OF CAMPBELL, OHIO, HOLDS TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING 50-YEAR MEMBERS

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 19, 1972, I had the pleasure of addressing a testimonial dinner honoring the 50-year members of the Croatian Fraternal Union Lodge No. 185 in Campbell, Ohio. The Croatian people are certainly among the outstanding members of our society, and the Croatian Fraternal Union is the organization which unites Croatian-Americans in the United States.

In the beginning of this century, there were four Croatian organizations serving Croatian people in the United States of America. They were: Croatian League of Illinois; St. Joseph Society of Kansas City; Young Croatian Society of Whiting, Ind., and National Croatian Society. These organizations were small and more or less local, in character. Membership of these organizations realized that in order to grow numerically and financially they needed to merge together. They knew that in unity there is strength and "united we stand, divided we fall." A special convention in the fall of 1923 in Pittsburgh, Pa., approved the merger of these four Societies and the name chosen for consolidated organization was Croatian Fraternal Union of America. Today the Croatian Fraternal Union membership numbers over 100,000 with national officers located in Pittsburgh, Pa.

About 1928, a lodge of Croatian National Society and a lodge of Croatian League of Illinois, both located in Campbell, merged into one lodge, under the name of "Knights of Croatia" and official number given by home office was 185. In 1946, Ladies Lodge "Gorska Vila" also merged with Lodge 185, to be followed in later years by two English speaking lodges of Campbell—Campbell Croatians—and Struthers. At present, there are 390 members of Lodge 185 and there are 150 junior members.

The 50-year members honored at the dinner were: Maria Butina, Maria Colaric, Jelika Plante, Stephanie Sambolec, Mary Stanfar, Katrina Zugcic, Agne Vilk, Paul Vilk, Paul Hrosh, Eli Karapandy, Dom Kucic, Tomo Kukec, Matt Mihelcic, Dom Mlacovic, John Roper, Rok Sabol, Ivan Stanchin, George Stankich, Nick Urichich, and Mile Tomich.

The program for the evening was as follows:

National Anthem, Happy Hearts Tamburitzans—American and Croatian.

Angeline Zadravec, director.

Invocation, Rev. George Georgevich, St. Michael's Church, New Castle, Pa.

Dinner music, Happy Hearts Tamburitzans.

Welcome, William E. Borak, Chairman.

Toastmaster, Judge Joseph M. Kolmacic, Campbell Municipal Court.

Remarks, Judge John J. Leskovyansky.

Guest speaker, Hon. Charles J. Carney, U.S. Congressman.

Presentation of awards, Edwards J. Tomich, President.

George Tablack, special award.

Benediction, Rev. Charles Georgevich.

Dance, Libby and her all girl tamburitzans.

The members of the dinner committee were: Judge Joseph M. Kolmacic, William E. Borak, chairman; Edward J. Tomich, Marian Urichich, Maria Tekal, Kaye Rabousky, Maria Blazo, Mickey Stankich, Helen Chapella, Kaye Fraino, and Helen Urichich.

In my address I discussed the Croatians' historic struggle for freedom and the Croatian contribution to America. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my address in the RECORD at this time.

The address follows:

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CROATIANS TO THE AMERICAN HERITAGE

It is a great pleasure to address you on this occasion, and to have the chance of expressing my admiration for the spirit of Croatia in America, and the grand accomplishments of Croatian-Americans in every walk of our national life.

The most basic American freedoms, beyond question, are freedom of political expression and freedom of religion. And to Croatian people throughout the world these freedoms have a special historical significance.

CROATIAN STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Following the experience of centuries of toil and drudgery without political power of any kind, the people of the Balkans began to organize, politically, toward the close of the Sixteenth Century. Feudal masters were taxing their hard-earned wealth to the point of rendering every man a pauper and regulating everything they did, in the spirit of oppression. The people protested, quietly at first, then angrily. In 1573, a spontaneous peasant uprising rocked all of Croatia, and in that moment the Croatian political conscience was born. Repressive governmental measures stamped out the peasant uprising, but could not stifle the burning desire for political reform.

The struggle for religious freedom was no less drastic and no less painful and disturbing. When the reformation movement attracted the attention of the Croatian people in the 1590's, it was savagely suppressed by the Arch Duke Ferdinand, and many Croatians fled the country in fear of their lives—a large number settling in Prussia. As time passed, however, the Prussian government became itself oppressive, and many Croatians decided on a second exodus, in search of liberty and religious independence. Their goal became the far-off American hinterlands, where it was said that freedom was a reality.

CAME TO AMERICA WITH COLUMBUS?

It has been written that Croatians were employed as members of the initial Columbus expedition, and there is no doubt that early traders visiting America included the Croatian brothers Konkendjevic, who landed here in 1520. Many Croatian and American writers have discussed the possibility that the Croatan Indians, who settled for the most part in North Carolina, were of Croatian origin.

EARLY CROATIAN-AMERICAN SETTLEMENTS

One of the initial Croatian groups of record to come to America accompanied an expedition to the colony of Georgia, in 1715, settling on the Ebenezer River, there to introduce to the new world the silkworm industry. They found that here indeed was freedom of religion and, comparatively speaking, freedom of political expression. They wrote home of this phenomenon, and in short time other Croatians were on the way.

A port-of-call for most Croatians sailing to the new world was New Orleans. Until the middle of the ninteenth century this was the chief Croatian settlement in the country. There they engaged in the oyster industry, controlling it for many years. Not all of them were fishermen, however. With the discovery of large iron and coal deposits, to the northeast, shortly preceding the American revolution, many Croatians traveled up to Pennsylvania and Ohio and other places where the mining industry was coming into being. Many became gold miners during the California gold rush of 1849. As time passed more Croatians flocked to the mines, and as the mining industries grew, so grew the Croatian communities in the mining areas. Centuries of hard physical labor had fitted the Croatian people to the task, and many hundreds of them took advantage of the fact.

Development of the locomotive and the establishment of the Baldwin locomotive works in 1831 gave steel a tremendous new outlet in Eastern Pennsylvania, and in a short time Western Pennsylvania was equally active. Johnstown became a major steel and coal center, and from the start the Croatian people had much to do with its creative capacity.

As a religious people, the Croatians have contributed heavily to the spiritual life of every American community in which they thrive. Pennsylvania today has the greatest number of Coatian parishes, the majority located near Pittsburgh. Although thousands of prosperous Croatians and their descendants founded only one Croatian parish in California, Croatians of lesser means have done considerably better in the east and middle west. Ohio has many also—among them the distinguished Sts. Peter and Paul Parish at Youngstown, founded by a large group of Croatian immigrants, July 4, 1911.

MAJOR CROATIAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Major Croatian contributors to the American heritage are numerous in almost every field of endeavor. In science there was Nikola Tesla, the great inventor in the field of electricity; in education there was Dr. Henry Suzzalo, past president of the Carnegie Foundation and author of many books on education; in business there was Captain Anthony Lucas, a pioneer in finding and producing petroleum in America; in art there was the great sculptor, Ivan Mestrovic.

Among the greatest singers of the current era, none surpasses the abilities of the extraordinary mezzosoprano Irene Kramerich of Youngstown, who made her debut in New York in 1955. Since then, she has appeared in almost every major opera house in the country and has also sung abroad. The New Orleans music critic, S. Meyers has proclaimed her one of the greatest of her time. In the sports world, Croatians of high ability include football coaches Joe Kuharich of Notre Dame and the Philadelphia Eagles, Nick Skorich of the Cleveland Browns; basketball stars George Mikan, known as "Mr. Basketball", and Leo Mogus of Youngstown; baseball stars Mickey Lolich and Johnny Pesky, and many others too numerous to mention.

The impact of Croatian tradition on America grows stronger, apparently, with every passing year, as the Croatian-American population continues to expand. Ohio has a group of over 70 thousand American Croatians of whom some 10 thousand immigrated after 1945. Cleveland's Croatians number more than 20 thousand. They have some 50 organizations and are one of the best known nationality groups in Cleveland. They have two parishes, one school, two national homes, two radio programs, and other establishments of their own. Moreover, Cleveland has the largest group of Croatian post World War II immigrants whose number is steadily increasing. Besides Cleveland and here in Youngstown, Croatian parishes also can be found in Akron and Lorain, where Croatian settlements are considerable. Other Ohio cities with Croatian settlements are Struthers, Canton, Dayton, Yorkville, Brewster, Warren, Mcdonald, Massillon, Dilles Bottom, Newton Falls, Powhatan Point, Willard, Girard, Toronto, Aliance, Toledo, Mansfield, and Columbia. All these places have lodges of Croatian fraternal organizations, and their own national homes.

According to the works of Croatian writers, the total number of Croatian immigrants to America is estimated at between 500 thousand and 800 thousand. On that basis, there are probably now—after three generations—over a million Croatians in the land. If these figures are correct, America today is the home of one-fifth of all Croatians on the face of the earth.

CROATIAN WORKINGMEN CREATE CROATIAN UNION

As the Croatian population began to grow in Pennsylvania, the need for organization became apparent to everybody. At the urging of the youthful journalists Zdravko Muzina and Peter Pavlinac, Croatian workingmen declared their mutual allegiance in January 1894, beneath the banner of "Harvatsko Radnicko Popupirajuce Drustvo Starcevic", a beneficial society honoring the name of the Croatian patriot Ante Starcevic. Muzina became the first president of the society. What he and his friends envisaged was a fraternal organization—a union of all Croatian societies, to aid sick workers and attend to funeral expenses. Soon, other Croatians were organizing for similar purposes, and in September, 1894, Muzina was chairman of a Croatian convention, out of which emerged the Croatian fraternal union of the United States.

The Croatian fraternal union is the best example of the spirit and vitality of the Croatian first, second, and third generations. By recent count the C.F.U. had about 117 thousand members, with some 1,069 lodges and junior nests in operation. During its seventy-six year existence, the C.F.U. has disbursed millions of dollars for fraternal and humanitarian purposes. The great strides, natural and spiritual, made by the Croatian people in this century must be attributed, at least in part, to the work of the Croatian fraternal union, which has demonstrated a civic concern worthy of the highest praise. Without such leadership, the tremendous gains of the last generation would have been impossible.

It is a great pleasure to have been with you on this occasion, and I wish you well, in the knowledge that you will ever persevere in the manner that has rendered the Croatian people among the outstanding members of American society.

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, while this action may be considered premature, as he will not retire until Jan-

uary, I cannot resist the temptation of informing the House of the high esteem in which our colleague, WATKINS M. ABBITT, is held by the press both in and out of the congressional district which he has represented so long and so well.

Here are some examples:

[From the Appomattox (Va.) Times-Virginia, Mar. 16, 1972]

ABBITT'S RETIREMENT

(By Calvin H. Robinson)

It seems but yesterday when friends and admirers here in Appomattox rallied to the news that our young Commonwealth's Attorney would seek to represent our District in the Congress of The United States. The veteran Patrick H. Drewry, of Petersburg had passed to his reward, and a respected State Senator, Hon. Morton Goode had announced as a candidate to succeed him. Appomattox was at the far western end of the District and only lately redistricted from the old Tenth District, long and ably represented by the late Harry St. George Tucker and A. Willis Robertson and more briefly by the late Judge Joel Flood. Population advantages favored the eastern end of the Fourth District. Yes, it seems but yesterday, as we recall what a great campaign effort followed, ending in victory for Mr. Abbitt. Many of our citizens remember election night that year as hundreds of supporters assembled at the court house to await the returns. It was a glorious victory for one of the finest men in our long and honorable history.

During the campaign, The Times-Virginian went all-out to support Mr. Abbitt. We wrote that he was the sort of public servant who could be elected and re-elected to build up all important seniority and who would faithfully represent his constituents. How right we were! Mr. Abbitt gained appointment to the Committee on Agriculture and soon became one of the experts in farm matters handling legislation so vital to our economy. Furthermore, Mr. Abbitt became a champion of the Conservative approach to public policy. He gained the respect of fellow Congressmen and went about his duties with skill and a natural gift for public affairs.

It is a testimony to his career that Mr. Abbitt rarely faced opposition for re-election. Many have said that Watt Abbitt knew, on a first-name basis, more people in his district than any other man in public life in Virginia. More than that, for he became the State Chairman for his party and was in constant demand for public appearances. The selection of an outstanding office staff enabled him to travel his District without neglecting his duties and the spread-out geography of his district, kept him in constant travel. Yet he found time to keep his home ties in Appomattox, with his church and civic groups and law practice. "A Man for All Seasons."

Somehow it is hard to realize that he has announced his retirement as of the end of his present term. We can only yield to his judgment. A new redistricting brought up a situation upon which he has decided that he can now safely "come home to Appomattox." Many of his friends think Watt Abbitt should make himself available for Governor. That would be a fitting climax to his great career.

As a Conservative, Mr. Abbitt was not always on the winning side in Congressional voting, but we are convinced that his convictions were sound and will eventually prevail.

The Times-Virginian congratulates Mr. Abbitt upon his outstanding career and feels that his usefulness will be called upon for future assignments.

When they call the roll in Washington, Abbitt is first on the alphabetical list. It is also first on our list.

(From the Danville (Va.) Register, Mar. 5, 1972)

AS REPRESENTATIVE WATKINS ABBITT STEPS DOWN

The decision of Representative Watkins M. Abbitt to retire from Congress at the end of his present term, a decision he said was reached some time ago but was announced only Friday after court action calling for a reapportionment of the State's congressional seats, is another step in the shifting of the political power center in Virginia.

Whether it is a long or modest step will depend upon what follows in the mapping of the congressional layout and who is elected in November to the Fourth District seat.

Watt Abbitt has served Virginia well in the House of Representatives for 24 years. Before his congressional service, he was Commonwealth's Attorney for Appomattox County for 12 years during which he developed into a political organizer of first rank among the younger leaders of the Democratic Organization headed by U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, It was widespread recognition of his ability and his service that enabled Abbitt to win election as successor to the late Rep. Patrick Henry Drewry of Petersburg on February 17, 1948.

Young Congressman Abbitt went to Washington and found a Republican majority in Congress and a crusty Harry S. Truman who was to campaign all that year against a "Do Nothing 80th Congress". Truman won reelection and so did Abbitt. And Abbitt kept on winning.

Virginians know Rep. Abbitt best for two things: As a powerful member of the House Committee on Agriculture, where he is fourth on the majority side; and as a member of the inner-circle of the conservative Democratic leadership of Virginia over the past quarter century, during half of which he was party state chairman.

Rep. Abbitt appeared on the verge of retiring from Congress two years ago but decided to stay on for another term when there were challenges to his continued tenure. He won handily. Now he can retire as an undisputed champion vote-getter in the Fourth and as a man who has a right to feel that he can take things easier because of his long and able service to the people of his district and to the nation.

By his retirement, Rep. Abbitt makes easier the task of the General Assembly in redrawing the lines of the congressional district with only numbers to be considered. When the present district lines were drawn, Democrats in the General Assembly were extending themselves to avoid putting Abbitt's home county into the Fifth District, so that he would not butt heads with Rep. W. C. "Dan" Daniel, also a Democrat.

Last month, when many Democratic leaders gathered in Richmond for a dinner, U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., remarked that the principal speaker, former Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., had a distinguished record of service but that there are Virginians who believe that he also has a future of distinction. It was assumed that Byrd meant Godwin would be available to run again for the governorship. It could be, in the light of the Abbitt decision, that former Governor Godwin might follow the precedent of former Governors Montague and Tuck and serve his district in the House of Representatives. He resides near the center of population of the Fourth District and would be a strong candidate, should it suit his inclinations to go to Washington.

[From the Petersburg (Va.) Progress-Index, Mar. 6, 1972]

CONGRESSMAN ABBITT'S DECISION

To thousands of his constituents it is a source of regret that Representative Watkins M. Abbitt of the Fourth Congressional District has decided not to seek re-election. The decision is not surprising since he was known prior to his most recent election to be seriously considering retiring from office. Instead he offered and went on to win a handsome victory against stiff opposition.

With almost a quarter of a century of service to his credit, Representative Abbitt is dean of the Virginia delegation in Congress. He has been repeatedly recognized and cited for his advocacy of constitutional government and for his support of sound fiscal principles.

Some attention centers upon expectation that his decision will simplify the redistricting task which the General Assembly faces, but the detail is overshadowed by the fact a long and distinguished legislative career will be coming to an end. He has served his party, his responsibilities as a legislator, and the interests of his constituents in a fine manner.

Political writers sometimes attached to him the description of the old-style Virginia congressman who was elected time after time without opposition. That never was quite accurate, and in recent years he demonstrated how to win handily over regular and write-in opponents, Republicans and independents. The election results attested to his skill at the same time they demonstrated that the majority of his constituents very much liked the quality of the representation they were getting.

Judging from the Democrats who in the past have considered seeking the nomination and the Republicans and independents who have sought the seat, the choosing of his successor could be quite a contest. With no one towering political figure—except former Governor Godwin, whose name raises interesting thoughts—in what the news likes to call the sprawling Fourth Congressional District, it might be a free-for-all.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Mar. 10, 1972]

"WAT" ABBITT'S VICTORY

For 24 years Watkins M. Abbitt has represented Virginia's Fourth District in the U.S. House of Representatives as well as any district has been represented in the Congress. He paid close attention to the problems of his constituents and he voted in the best, traditional interests of Virginia and the Republic.

Had there been more like him in the Congress, it is doubtful that there would have been a Korean or a Vietnam war, for the Communists would have known that the United States would have none of a no-win conflict, but would carry out its treaty obligations swiftly and surely.

The Federal budget would have been balanced and the national debt would have been reduced.

There would have been social legislation which would have opened areas of communication between the races, instead of "civil rights" which has restricted the rights of all citizens.

There would have been less, instead of more, government and governmental bureaucracy.

There would have been welfare only for those who cannot work.

The United States would have maintained its superiority in nuclear weapons, instead of falling behind its worst enemies.

Federal taxes would have been reduced, instead of increased to the point of confiscation.

The rights of the states would have been upheld, thereby strengthening the Federal system.

The courts would not have seized control of the nation's public school system in the

name of "integration" and the Federal Government would not be controlling mass education in the country.

The unions would have been held as responsible for their conduct as management is.

Crime would have been curbed because court permissiveness would not have been tolerated, and rehabilitation and prison reform would have been strengthened.

The nation would have remained at peace, domestically, and with other countries. There would have been no spasms of violent upheaval on campuses or in the streets, and Communists would not have been coddled.

That's the way it would have been because that's the way he voted.

This is only a partial resume of what would have happened had we had more "Wat" Abbitts in the Congress. The nation would have been a hell of a lot better off. He tried. He voted his convictions of what constituted the best interests of all the people. He failed to stem the leftist tide, because there were not enough like him, and too many "progressives" without foresight and integrity. His failure, therefore, is the failure of the country. And what we have instead is the victory of his opponents. It isn't a pretty picture. We are a disunited, resentful, frustrated people, cut adrift from our traditional moorings, weakened at home and abroad, without goals or purposes which serve the cause of individual freedom.

Now that he is retiring, the best we can claim is that he, and those like him, succeeded in keeping the leftward march from becoming a headlong plunge into totalitarian chaos. In so doing, he and his compatriots have given the American people a little, last chance to come to their senses. That in itself, considering the odds against him, was a mighty victory for humanity, per se.

[From the Farmville (Va.) Herald, Mar. 10, 1972]

FACE TO THE RISING SUN

Virginia, especially rural Virginia, is the poorer for the decision of Watkins M. Abbitt not to offer his candidacy for reelection to Congress from the Fourth District. His announcement came as a surprise to a large number of constituents he has represented in the House of Representatives for the past 24 years. As a long-time member of the Agriculture Committee, chairman of the Tobacco Subcommittee and a member of the Peanut, Livestock and Grains Subcommittees, he has been in a position to contribute considerable influence in federal legislation protecting and marketing the farm crops in the far-flung, agriculturally oriented Fourth District.

He is a strict constructionist, one who knows the tenets of the Constitution, and the fearless courage to stand for the basic principles which have made this nation great. Attesting his devotion to high principles, he is a member of the Administrations Committee, and the committee on Standards of Office Conduct, popularly known as the "Ethics Committee," one of the most important committees in the House.

He stands four-square on solution of problems and legislation for the best interest of his constituents and ever alert in support of those institutions for the betterment of Virginia. While his most outstanding record in the Congress has been in the field of agriculture—support of farm prices, development of markets, support of rural electrification, soil conservation, forestry, crop insurance, and others—he has also advocated development of highways, education, transportation and Virginia's port facilities.

"Watt," as he is affectionately known throughout Virginia and in national circles, served as chairman of the Virginia Democratic Central Committee from 1964 until he resigned in 1970. He is well known and held in high regard throughout the State.

Recognized in Washington among his peers as one of the leading congressmen in serving his constituents, nothing deters him in looking after their best interests. Wherever two or three are gathered together. Watt is among them, yet his record for attending roll calls and other duties in Washington has not suffered.

In his home town of Appomattox, he has taken an active part in the religious and civic life, as a Deacon and Treasurer of Liberty Baptist Church, member of the Board of the Baptist Home at Culpeper. He is also an active member of the Elks Club, Moose Club, Lions Club and Woodmen of the World, and director of the Farmers National Bank at Appomattox. He is a man of "many hats" and gets under them because he is in almost perpetual motion.

His recent decision not to stand for reelection is an example of his dedication to his people and to the Commonwealth, as it made the court-ordered redistricting much more simple for the State Legislature.

His loss as a congressman is to be regretted, but it should lead to a larger service to his State. We know of no man in public life more dedicated to the interests of Virginia, and no Virginian with a wider experience, or more capable to carry the standards of Virginia forward in 1974 than Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt, as Virginia's next governor. It would be a fitting recognition of his years of service, and his administration in the office would redound to the benefit of the State. He has the know-how; he is conversant with the needs; he can attract the support and cooperation of the largest group of dedicated people in public life, and consolidate the political efforts of the Commonwealth into a solid working organization as can no other man.

We suggest Watt Abbitt for the next governor of Virginia.

ECOLOGICAL COMMITMENT

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for the preservation of our environment, including the wildlife on our planet, is shared by all of us—not merely for a single designated day or week, but for each day of our entire life. It is appropriate, however, that at this time we pay particular attention to the needs and demands of our ecological commitment. Both Earth Day and the National Wildlife Week give us the opportunity to renew our vigor in this important area.

To be sure, the destruction of our planet has gone much too far. The blatant disregard for natural resources and careless disposal of poisonous chemicals and debris have placed in serious jeopardy our plant and wildlife. Man has polluted the air and the lakes, rivers and streams which serve us and beautify our surroundings.

Earth Week and National Wildlife Week should indeed remind us all of our commitment to the preservation of our environment. A positive attitude, a firm commitment and a high measure of citizen-government cooperation will undoubtedly contribute to an improved ecology for the benefit of us all.

The grave problem of extinction for animal species confronts us again. In the past, disaster has been narrowly averted by measures to preserve the buffalo, the whooping cranes, and the trumpeter swans which were all on the brink of extinction. However, the preservation of wild eagles is still in grave doubt. What a tragedy it would be if these majestic birds no longer graced our skies.

It is a great pleasure for me to pay tribute to the many fine organizations, church groups, and neighborhood associations which are dedicated to the goal of making the earth a better place to live—a showcase for the splendor of God's creation.

EASTERN STATE COLLEGE, OKLA., COACH WINS NEW TITLE

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Don Brown of Eastern State College at Wilburton, Okla., in my district has just been named "coach of the year" by Oklahoma-Arkansas Junior College coaches in region II of the National Junior College Athletic Association. In his seven seasons at Eastern State, Coach Brown's basketball teams have won 136 and lost 62 games and his baseball teams have been equally successful.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a copy of an article which appeared in the Statesman, All-American student newspaper at Eastern State, for Tuesday, March 7, which tells of this latest honor to come to Coach Brown:

BROWN NABS COACHING AWARD

Being recognized as an outstanding coach by his fellow coaches is just another honor for Eastern State's Don Brown who has been named Region II "Coach of the Year."

Coach Brown easily won the selection with near-unanimous results which is quite a tribute in an area full of successful junior college coaches throughout Oklahoma and Arkansas which constitute Region II of the National Junior College Athletic Association.

And this isn't the first time Brown has received an honor as "Coach of the Year," but the first from Region II.

While coaching high school ball at U.S. Grant High School in Oklahoma City, Brown was named Oklahoma City "Coach of the Year" in 1960 and 1962 for basketball and received the same honor for baseball coaching in 1962. Eastern State's student newspaper, The Statesman, named Brown "Oklahoma Juco Coach of the Year" in 1970.

Earlier this year he was named to the Century club, an honor roll of veteran coaches whose teams have won 100-or-more games in one sport.

The former Geary high school athlete joined the faculty at Eastern State in 1965 and has coached both basketball and baseball since that time. He played college basketball and baseball at Central State and later earned the masters degree at the University of Oklahoma.

"Busy, busy, busy" describes Brown's activities at Eastern where he not only devotes his time to coaching two varsity sports with the built-in time required for recruiting, scheduling and assisting graduates get located, but he serves as one of Eastern's three physical education instructors.

Brown coached nine years at U.S. Grant following one year at Midwest City and also served as athletic director his last three years at Grant.

His Grant teams won two conference championships in basketball in 1960 and 1962, one regional championship in basketball in 1960, and a conference championship in baseball in 1962.

Brown is in his seventh year at Eastern and has enjoyed much success during this period. In his first year, his basketball team compiled an 18–7 record and finished second in the conference. His next three teams were co-champions (14–9), third (10–15) and tied for second (22–8).

In 1969–70, Eastern climbed to 14th in the national poll with a 24–5 record and won the Oklahoma Junior Collegiate Conference undefeated. In 1970–71 Eastern came back strong to post a 25–8 record while repeating as conference champion.

This year Eastern finished second in the conference and posted a 22–10 season record going into the Region II Tournament Feb. 29–March 4 at Tulsa. Brown's basketball teams have a 136–63 record.

As an Eastern State baseball coach, Brown has coached his last three teams to conference titles. The 1971 team, ranked No. 1 in the nation based on the best win-loss percentage, won the conference and established a 25–4 record. Eastern swept the sub-district playoffs by taking four straight and advanced to the national-qualifying tournament in Kansas but couldn't advance.

The "Coach of the Year" recipient isn't limited to experience in high school and college coaching but has spent 11 summers coaching at the Chandler Baseball Camp and last summer volunteered to head the Wilburton Summer League Baseball programs.

In comparing his various coaching experiences, Brown said, "There's no big difference in coaching, whether at the high school or junior college level since the emphasis is on fundamentals—the real secret of coaching young folks."

"Biggest difference in junior college coaching is that the players have more desire to play because many of our basketball and baseball players at Eastern want to play senior college, university and, in some cases, professional ball," he said.

"In recruiting for junior college athletics, we have to find players who can play now and we can't afford the luxury of signing athletes who have definite potential to develop perhaps as a junior or senior," he added.

Brown chuckles when he tells the story about how he almost landed the great Bobby Murcer at U.S. Grant some years back. The big league scout, who signed both Mickey Mantle and later Murcer, asked Brown his opinion of Murcer's future in the pros.

"I'd watched Murcer play ball in high school and in Legion ball and I told the scout that I didn't think Murcer would make it as an infielder in professional baseball.

"And you know, I was right about his not making it as an infielder, but, boy, did he ever make it big as a superstar in the outfield," the grinning coach said.

The successful junior college coach reacted to a question about his future plans by explaining, "I'm not currently after a bigger coaching job but any coach wants to get to the top and likes to think about how he'd do in a higher level of coaching."

"In coaching, whether you're talking about high school, college or pro ball, a coach has got to keep pushing and not become complacent about his job and he'll find how quickly it spreads to the players," Brown said.

Agreeing that junior college athletics are really growing and that competition has become much tougher in his seven years here, Brown advocates the establishment of a state organization to set standards for all schools in lieu of the present two conferences and independents.

"Probably what is needed the most after we get the organization to establish standards is the creation of the position of Commissioner for Junior College Athletics to supervise and coordinate all athletics on the junior college level in Oklahoma," Brown said.

Admitting that being named "Coach of the Year" by his opposing coaches is a distinct honor, Brown can't enjoy sitting back and reflecting on the honor since the busy coach has just concluded the Region II basketball tournament and faces a 30-game baseball schedule beginning in March.

DINOSAURS ON U.S. ROADS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been substantial concern voiced by many in our country for the manner in which the Government is dealing with the problems created by the automobile, generally in terms of its noncoordinated, often apparently misbalanced approach. It is, therefore, refreshing to note an occasional suggestion which copes immediately with all aspects of the Government's efforts—and such a suggestion is put forth eloquently in the article I am including today in the RECORD.

Mr. Stanley I. Hart, a civil engineer with an extensive background in road development, presents in his article the suggestion that the size of the automobile ought more appropriately be the subject of regulation and control. I would commend this item to my colleagues' attention as I feel Mr. Hart's eloquent and comprehensive defense of his arguments bears careful consideration by all of those working to balance the automotive needs of our society with the obvious public health and welfare implications of a continuation of past trends of development and use of the automobile.

The article follows:

[From The Los Angeles Times, Mar. 12, 1972]

DINOSAURS ON U.S. ROADS

(By Stanley I. Hart)

Does the large size of American automobiles cause accidents?

One of my friends recently lost his mother-in-law. She suffered a heart attack at the wheel of her Cadillac and the car plunged through a freeway divider fence at 70 m.p.h. In the collision that followed, five people were killed.

One of the significant factors which contributed to those unnecessary deaths was her choice of a large prestige automobile.

If she had been driving a lighter and smaller car, it might not have plowed through the fence because, as Newton's Second Law of Motion states, force is the product of the mass of an object and its acceleration. Thus, the heavier the car, the greater the force it will exert in a collision.

Moreover, even if the lighter car had broken through the fence, its remaining energy would have been far less, greatly reducing the chance of serious injury or death. Being smaller, it might have missed the other car entirely.

While I was driving on the freeway not long ago, my Ford was struck on the left rear fender by a Lincoln that had wandered into my lane. The dent was half an inch deep and 12 inches in diameter. It cost $71 to repair

If one of our two cars had been one inch narrower, everything else having been precisely equal, there would have been no collision, no dent; I would have been on time for my appointment; all of the insured drivers as a group would have been richer by $71; and the owner of the Lincoln would not have had an embarrassing explanation to make to his insurance company.

The present design of the automobile (particularly its size) has an enormous and unfortunate impact on the public interest. This impact is shown in the increasing death and injury toll on the highways, in the increasingly rapid depletion of our resources of petroleum, in the pollution of our environment, in urban sprawl and in the congestion and inconvenience of our cities.

We could save tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of thousands of maimed and injured each year on American highways. We could save ourselves more than $50 billion in wasteful expenditures annually; we could free American highways and parking spaces of unnecessary congestion and we could reduce air pollution.

We could accomplish these things by creating and enforcing standards for the automobile industry that would establish optimum vehicle size, weight and power. These standards would also regulate the engine system, the suspension, the braking system, the body and chassis. The goal of these standards would be to prevent further abuse of the public interest and to obtain for it the greatest possible benefits.

Utopian? Perhaps. But let's examine the idea carefully.

Why do large cars have more accidents?

Your next accident, like almost all accidents, will be a random happening. Your automobile, out of control, will hurtle toward another car or toward a tree or a bridge abutment. The hurtling automobile is like a projectile, the bridge abutment its target.

The probability that your automobile will hit its target depends very much on the dimensions of your automobile and on the dimensions of its target. Smaller cars, narrower and shorter, are smaller projectiles, smaller targets. When a projectile is smaller, it is less likely to strike its target. When the target is also smaller, the probability of a "successful" hit is even less.

It is possible to show this "projectile-target" effect mathematically. Within limitations, we can calculate the probability of occurrence of a collision. For certain given and equal conditions, for instance, the probability of collision is reduced 27% when Volkswagen-sized automobiles are substituted for standard-sized automobiles.

Secondly, standard cars are not only larger, they are also much heavier. Their suspensions are notably less firm. The huge mass and the "Detroit mattress" suspensions have become part of our automobiles in response to our marketplace criteria. The American public, in its innocence, identifies the soft ride with "elegance," "prestige" and "comfort."

These elephantine automobiles on their tender springs are capable of high speeds. And because many drivers are not aware of the limitations of their cars in an emergency, they may find themselves trying to maneuver one of these monsters through a tight spot—with predictably unhappy results.

Another factor which contributes to the

accident rate of large cars is, simply, scale. There is an upper limit to the size of machines which man can control with ease. Human beings also have dimension. Men can handle huge trucks, enormous ships and great airplanes if their crews are qualified by proper training and experience. But our automobile drivers are not properly trained.

The fourth factor may be the marked early depreciation of the larger automobiles. There is little prestige in a 10-year-old veteran of highways. A 10-year-old Cadillac, provided it is in excellent condition, might be worth just as much as a 10-year-old Volkswagen. However, it is far less expensive to buy new tires and parts for a smaller car than for a larger car. It is likely, therefore, that old large automobiles will be in a poorer state of repair than old small ones.

The New Jersey Highway Authority, in late 1969, conducted a study of accidents on its Garden State Parkway. And that small cars won the safety test.

Among the results of the study was the observation that, although the small cars were 36% of the total mix of small and large cars using the parkway, the small cars were involved in only 24% of the accidents. The large cars, 64% of the mix, were involved in 76% of the accidents.

The Garden State Parkway study shows that the large automobile is almost twice as likely to be involved in an accident as is the small car.

The California Highway Patrol says exactly the same thing. It studied statewide accidents (almost 100,000) for the year 1961. This is how it stated the results:

"The small cars in the California vehicle population show a lower rate of accident involvement than do conventional passenger cars."

The California report is similar to the New Jersey report in its proportionate breakdown of accident involvement by automobile size class. The smaller cars, 16.5% of the total mix of cars in California in 1961, had an accident involvement of only 11.5%. The larger cars, 83.4% of the mix, were involved to an extent of 88.6%.

This immunity to accident involvement on the part of small cars was unfortunately overlooked in the main thrust of these reports. The reports emphasized that the small cars, when they were involved in an accident, more frequently suffered serious injury to their occupants and damage to the machine.

Considering both the New Jersey and the California mixes of automobiles, which were one-third or less small cars, it is clear the small car usually had its collision with a large car. The deceleration of the smaller car in such a collision will certainly be several times that of the larger car. It is equally clear that the occupants of the smaller car, subjected to a comparative rapid deceleration, will be more seriously injured than the occupants of the larger car.

But the principal cause of the more serious threat to the occupants of the smaller car is the *difference* in the sizes of the two cars—not the *smallness* of the small car.

There are three other pieces of evidence: First, Allstate Insurance Co. gives a preferred premium rate to small cars—which seems to be witness to the fact that small cars have a better claim record.

Second, it was recently announced that the national accident rate for the first nine months of 1971 had inexplicably leveled out. This had occurred once or twice before in the past 25 years but had apparently been explained on one basis or another. In this case there appears to be no convenient explanation. It is suggested that the great increase in 1971 of smaller automobiles on the streets and highways of America is responsible for the decrease in accidents.

Third, the California Highway Patrol has announced that the traffic death toll on Los Angeles freeways for 1971 has declined, inexplicably, by 25%. During the years 1962 to 1969 our domestic cars increased their dimensions 10%. In 1969 their dimensions stabilized. The accident statistics did the same.

Since 1968 the sale of imported subcompacts has skyrocketed. After 1969 the domestic subcompacts entered the market with some success. The proportion of subcompacts on Southern California highways is now approaching 50%. Result: the accident rate is declining!

Is it utopian to hope that the automobile industry can be required by law to use reasonable criteria in the engineering and in the design of its products?

Some safety and air pollution standards are being slowly adopted by the federal agencies, but these are vigorously opposed by the industry on the ground that its freedom to manufacture and sell dangerous, wasteful and frivolous vehicles is somehow akin to those civil freedoms protected by the Constitution.

Advances are slow and the measures which have been adopted, such as the collapsible steering column and improved braking, are important, but they seem almost superficial compared to those measures which are technically possible. Vehicle size is not even in the question stage at the present time—presumably because it is sacred to the marketplace.

There is nothing new or unusual about such standards. The building industry has long operated under building codes which, despite some inefficiencies and occasional stupidities, have long protected the public interest from the abuses of the marketplace.

The aircraft industry is protected from marketplace pressures by FAA regulation. The American aircraft industry owes its success to the fact that its design standards are not allowed to deteriorate. The FAA airworthiness certificate has established and protected safety and efficiency in air travel throughout the free world.

The automobile industry has taken the firm position in the past that nothing can be done about traffic accidents—that the automobile accident toll is caused by foolish drivers. There is a half-truth in this. Certainly the foolish driver (and who among us has not been foolish on occasion) is often responsible for beginning the chain of events which leads to an accident. However, far too often the oversized and poorly designed automobile contributes critically to the unfortunate end of the chain.

Foolishness is not recognized as a capital offense in our law. Why then should we allow our fools (and the innocents they meet on our highways) to be sentenced to death or disfigurement by an automobile stylist?

At the present rate, one person in 50 will die in traffic accidents; one in five will be seriously injured. Half of these casualties will be unnecessary.

We must insist that the automobile be purged of marketplace gimmicks—the excess size and power, the fake, the frivolous and the waste—and that it be remade into an honest and efficient mode of transportation once again.

CHICKASHA, OKLA., ALL AMERICA CITY

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, at noon on February 28, 1972, a special flag-raising ceremony was held in front of the city hall of a small, rurally oriented Oklahoma community. The occasion marked the unfurling of the official banner proclaiming Chickasha, Okla., an All America City for 1972.

Nine cities across the Nation were selected for the honor from among more than 100 entries in an annual contest sponsored by the National Municipal League and the Saturday Evening Post. The citizens of Chickasha have worked diligently and tirelessly for the past 4 years to revitalize their community, and in my opinion, have earned this citation as well as our congratulations and praise.

The following background information describing the hard work and devotion of the people of Chickasha will show just how it distinguished itself as an All-America City.

Chickasha's climb to recognition began in 1968 when civic leaders realized the rural-urban migration was hurting the southwestern Oklahoma community. Farm homes had been left empty. Thirty-eight downtown businesses had called it quits. The per capita income was down to less than $2,500, and the unemployment rate was above 6 percent.

The underlying problem was one of a deterioration of the socioeconomic condition. Chickasha needed two shots in the arm. The first necessity was for new industry and expansion of that which was already there. The second was to expand its present social programs so as to involve the new workers.

In order to overcome these problems, the community leaders called meeting after meeting of concerned citizens. Literally thousands of people attended called meetings in 1 year. The residents raised $250,000 to attract new industry, created an industrial development authority and approved industrial development bonds. A $1.4 million industrial park was established and roads and services necessary for firms were provided. It worked.

One corporation began a $9 million plant to employ 562 persons. A local firm expanded into the industrial area. Other firms came in and, altogether, the new park has accounted for more than 800 jobs.

At the same time another movement was taking place. An unbelievable enthusiasm had developed to solve and strengthen the social conscience of the city. Child care facilities were provided for 70 children through the combined efforts of the League of Women Voters and the chamber of commerce. Because of these efforts, Chickasha has been named as the pilot city for a five-State region of the Office of Child Development.

Volunteer workers joined to help start new programs in city schools. Workshops and training centers were established for the mentally and physically handicapped, and the Jane Brooks School for the Deaf was reinstated.

According to former Pennsylvania Gov. William Scranton, president of the National Municipal League—

The reason for the All-America City competition is to foster and recognize the efforts of people working and reasoning together in the endless struggle for constructive change—creating out of present divisiveness

a strong, responsive and more humane nation.

The community action of Chickasha has certainly proved that it has accomplished its efforts toward this goal. I take my hat off to its leaders and to each individual who took part in the challenge of making Chickasha the All-America City it is today.

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. DAN P. VAN GORDER ON FOOD PRICES AND AMERICAN AGRICULTURE—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people in an interview with the noted agricultural expert, Dr. Dan P. Van Gorder, on increasing food prices and American agriculture. I insert the report at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE IN AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. DAN P. VAN GORDER ON FOOD PRICES AND AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. RARICK. I have recently received numerous letters from constituents, mainly housewives, complaining of the increasing cost of food, especially meat products, and inquiring as to what can be done to halt the price spiral. The increase in meat prices seems to be nationwide. For example, during the past four months, a pound of bacon in Atlanta increased 22% from 59¢ to 75¢; and here in Washington, D.C., a pound of ground beef went up 18% from 59¢ to 69¢.

So, I thought today we'd talk about the high prices of food and meat products in the supermarkets—the causes and solutions to the problem.

To discuss this problem with me, we have as our guest Dr. Dan P. Van Gorder. Dr. Van Gorder is a long-time journalist and authority on agriculture whose farming column, "Things of the Soil," was nationally syndicated for 25 years. A Special Committee of Congress has referred to his files of farm statistics as the most complete and well-rounded in existence. Dr. Van Gorder is author of a startling book, *Ill Fares the Land*, which predicts a possible famine for this country if our agricultural policies are not changed. Welcome, Dr. Van Gorder, into the living rooms of our TV viewers.

What do you see, Dr. Van Gorder, as the causes for the recent price spiral of food products, particularly for beef?

VAN GORDER. First, of course, it is important in analyzing food price trends to recognize that prices are regulated either by the law of supply and demand or by regimenting, centralized control. The law of supply and demand was nullified in 1933 when the federal government clamped rigid production and marketing regulations on our formerly free farming industry. It is helpful, however, to observe that we of the temperate zone are a meat-eating people and our entire food economy is built around our once-prosperous livestock industry.

RARICK. You would say that meat today to the American people is like a status symbol—a sign of moving from lower or middle income levels to higher living standards—like the Joneses.

VAN GORDER. Yes, it is an interesting phase of our economy that general prosperity is so intimately interrelated with beef. For example, when the factory worker's wife goes to the supermarket and her husband is working only part time or is entirely unemployed, she probably buys a scrawny chicken. But if he is working steadily, wages going up and everything is prosperous, she buys a huge beef roast. Beef is actually a barometer—a chart indicating the wellbeing of urban workers.

RARICK. Well, Dr. Van Gorder, a few days ago President Nixon issued a proclamation authorizing imported meat quotas from foreign countries to be increased 7% over those of last year. Do you think this action by the President will be in the interest of the United States and our domestic livestock industry?

VAN GORDER. Definitely not. For example, in 1970 we imported $592,000,000 worth of footwear. This meant closed shoe factory doors and idled shoeworkers. When we increased beef and pork imports we are likewise hitting American farmers a lethal blow. And at the same time consumers, all consumers, are injured. We tend to overlook the truth that the farmer and the consumer are in the same boat—the wellbeing of one is inseparable from the wellbeing of the other. It is doubtful that our so-called farm problem will be solved until all consumers realize their dependence on a prosperous agriculture.

Apparently politicians in and out of government are blind to this simple truth and assume that the fewer than 3% of our total population remaining on the land are not worth considering—that is at the voting booth. I hope urban consumers will soon wake up to the fact that they are paying the bill for a major portion of the farm control tragedy.

RARICK. Dr. Van Gorder, what effect, if any, do you think the 7% allowable increase in foreign meat imports will have on the price of meat in the supermarkets of this country?

VAN GORDER. Little if any. For the five years, 1966 to 1970, inclusive, we imported over *four million tons* of beef. Thus, to increase or diminish this total by 7% or even 10% would make scarcely a dent in the retail supply or price. The greater importance lies in President Nixon's tacit admission that the United States, with its vast farming domain and varied climates and soils, with the most efficient farmers in the world, is supinely dependent on foreign farms for any meat at all. This is something the American people should be genuinely ashamed of. And I am certain they would be ashamed of it if their government officials would inform them of the sordid truth.

RARICK. In other words, we are importing foreign beef while paying our farmers not to produce by subsidizing them. Then we wonder why we have unemployment. Do you feel there is any relationship between the importation of meats and other foods from foreign countries and unemployment in this country?

VAN GORDER. The unemployment situation in this country is, I think, attributable directly to a general governmental policy that originated in the late 1920s and developed in the early 1930s—that we can have prosperity and at the same time pursue an appeasement course by importing ever-mounting quantities of manufactured goods and farm products from foreign countries. Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that an American mill or factory worker, steadily employed, is the best customer the farmer has or can have. It is doubtful, despite State Department propaganda to the contrary, that exports of farm commodities have ever been a profitable phase of American farming, not only because we do not always collect the bills, but more importantly because foreign trade trends are subject to the uncertain vicissitudes of that game known as diplomacy. And as Bismarck once said, *"Nobody can imagine . . . . the emptiness and quackery that passes for diplomacy."* Unemployment in this country, and this means the entire welfare travesty, bears the unmistakable trademark of Made in Washington.

RARICK. Well, you do feel then that this new increase in foreign imports will lower meat prices?

VAN GORDER. No, I doubt it will have but little effect on the price of beef for this reason: This is our general election year, a quadrennial season when abnormal factors are at work. I predict that we are going to have skyrocketing beef prices—not because imports are increased or decreased but because the apparent dilemma will be politically profitable. Secretary of Agriculture Butz recently announced that beef rationing is in the offing. It will probably occur by late July. Then, after beef prices soar, the government, like the knight in shining armor, rushes in and rescues the beautiful maiden. But we cannot expect anything constructive from a policy based solely on error and deception. We must always remember that when meat control was adopted in 1933 as part of the entire farm regimentation scheme, we had been on an import basis for the previous ten years. Yet between 6 million and 7 million cows and heifers were sacrificed in 1933 and 1934—*cows and heifers*—an early demonstration of birth control or family planning.

RARICK. Present action is more or less like an extension of wage and price freeze into the food market. In other words, everyone will benefit theoretically for a short time except the farmer.

VAN GORDER. That's right.

RARICK. Now Secretary Butz also said that if he went to rationing or put a ceiling on the prices of meat that the consumer could expect to go to the meat market and find the meat shelves bare. If we ration meat do you still see that we will have any abundance of meat available?

VAN GORDER. I doubt that we'll ever have an abundance of meat on the meat counters of this nation until we get completely rid of government interference in the market place.

RARICK. Dr. Van Gorder, two years ago before the Agriculture Committee of which I'm a member we had as a witness, a farmer from North Dakota, Mr. John Scott. He made an unusual statement to us here in government. He said, "We who remain on the farms and ranches of this nation are fighting for survival. We simply cannot endure a continuation of the restrictions, regulations, and meddling that have beset us these forty years. We earnestly beg relief. We desperately need an end to federal farm programs." As a solution to the problem, what do you think should be done in the best interests of the United States citizens, the American farmers and meat processors?

VAN GORDER. I personally have known John Scott for several years. He's not only an intelligent, patriotic American and a good farmer but he has his fingers on the pulse of the farm situation particularly throughout the Middle West. In answer to your question, I think that there's but one course we can take and that is to get the government out of agriculture and get agriculture out of the government. I don't think there's any other solution. There is no halfway point because price control and the annulment of the law of supply and demand can't stop at halfway measures. You've got to go all the way. We must bow to complete control or demand and obtain complete freedom.

RARICK. In other words, do you have any suspicions in your mind that perhaps the problems we face today . . . couldn't have been more crucial if planned that way?

VAN GORDER. Well, personally I don't think many things happen by accident in government. I think it was planned that way. And there are too many coincidences and too many inter-related factors operating to think that it just happened. I think farm control

is planned as I mentioned in my book to bring about complete rationing in this nation. Obviously that was the original and remains the present purpose of farm control.

RARICK. We have unemployment while many persons leave the farm and continue to crowd into urban life with welfare rolls increasing. Have you compiled any statistics regarding the correlation between the number of people who have fled the land and the number on relief?

VAN GORDER. Yes, I am glad you mentioned that matter because there is something that supports my theory that the entire farm control and urban welfare program are integral parts of a pre-planned strategem. Note this: Since 1933 the net loss of farm population in this country ranges between 16 and 17 million. The number of persons on relief today is between 16 and 17 million.

RARICK. Just by coincidence?

VAN GORDER. I do not think there is even a remote phase of coincidence in this. Rather it is a demonstration, probably a fatal demonstration, of cause and effect in operation, destroying the world's greatest industry (American farming) and bringing an end to constitutional government via bankruptcy, perhaps famine and incipient anarchy.

RARICK. What do you think was and is the overall goal?

VAN GORDER. Complete dissolution of the American way of life and the melding of this nation into a One-World government.

RARICK. On what do you base that opinion?

VAN GORDER. That question brings us back to our livestock industry again. In 1912 we suffered the first import balance of beef. The next year (October 1913) most meats were put on a free import basis. Only World War I saved our livestock industry from ruin, a ruin trend that resumed in the mid-1920s. Again World War II resuscitated this branch of our agriculture. But what of the present? In 1921 we imported $18,800,000 worth of edible animals and meat; in 1970 over $1,163,000,000 worth—an increase of more than 6,000%. Every statistical fact points the direction—*down and out.*

RARICK. Thank you very much Dr. Van Gorder. We've had as our guest today the noted author and expert on agriculture, Dr. Dan P. Van Gorder. We're happy to have had you on our "You've a right to know program" and wish we had more time.

VAN GORDER. Well I've enjoyed it anyway.

THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE ON BUSING

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, I had the pleasure of watching "Comment," an NBC television program, on which Mr. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., appeared. Mr. Jordan, executive director of the National Urban League, presented his views on the busing issue.

Mr. Jordan, a native of Atlanta, Ga., is a graduate of De Pauw University of Indiana, and the Howard University Law School. In 1961, Mr. Jordan personally forced a path through an angry white mob so that a black coed could enter the grounds of the University of Georgia under court order. A year later, he became field secretary for the Georgia branch of the NAACP and led a successful boycott against stores in Atlanta that refused to hire blacks.

In assuming the leadership of the National Urban League, Mr. Jordan heads an organization that attacks economic and other institutional barriers to equal opportunity.

I am pleased to introduce into the RECORD the remarks of this brilliant and articulate leader of one of America's most important institutions:

STATEMENT BY VERNON E. JORDAN, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

The long-simmering controversy about busing to desegregate the public schools has flared into a full-scale debate that is being used as a political football to divide and polarize the nation. Constitutional amendments have been proposed which would recreate a system of dual schools, separate and inherently unequal. By appointing a top-level group to study ways to circumvent recent court decisions ordering integration and busing as one of the means to achieve it, the President has lent the weight of his office and the dignity of his position to those who have been defying the law of the land. And he has completely undermined his own statement of two years ago, when he said: "Quality is what education is all about; desegregation is vital to that quality."

It is clear to me that the attempts to inflame public opinion against busing, which is but one tool to desegregate the schools, represent a cease-fire in the moral and social revolution this nation has been struggling to achieve. By politicizing the issue, parents and children are being used as pawns in an effort to roll back and nullify the historic 1954 Supreme Court decision that held dual school systems unconstitutional and inherently unequal. But almost twenty years later half of the black children in Chicago, for example, go to all-black schools. To the extent that desegregation has been achieved, it has been in the South under court-ordered plans that frequently include busing.

The courts have spoken loud and clear on this issue. In last year's Charlotte-Mecklenburg decision, Chief Justice Warren Burger affirmed that "desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school," and the Court unanimously approved busing to achieve desegregation. In January, a Federal Court ruled in Richmond, Virginia, that political boundary lines cannot be used to prevent desegregation. Its order that the districts merge will probably mean slightly more busing and substantially more integration.

Busing is now controversial because it is a racial issue. America's school systems have always bused children; about forty percent of all students are bused to school for reasons that have nothing at all to do with desegregation. Black people need only think back a few years to recall how they were bused far from home, past nearby predominately white schools, to attend all-black ones. And many white parents today put their children on school buses that drive past integrated public schools and stop at all-white, segregrated private schools. Anyone who proposes that the current opposition to busing is not based on racial grounds is deceiving himself. I say if we could use busing as a means to implement segregation and defy the law, we can use it now to implement desegregation and obey the law of the land and the higher law of morality as well.

The hysteria over busing obscures the fact that what is at the end of the bus ride is what matters. White children in an all-white school environment are deprived of the diversity that reflects the world in which they will have to live. Many studies including one by the Civil Rights Commission, conclude that integration is a significant factor in giving black children and poor children a fairer chance at a better education.

Busing is a tool to achieve quality, integrated education. So long as the nation creates and maintains pockets of racial and economic isolation, it cannot afford to dispense with any mechanism that will implement and strengthen the role of its public schools in providing a democratic environment that prepares our children to live in a world that is three-fourths nonwhite. To have busing become prey to the kind of hysterical and irrational debate that can only polarize the nation further is tragic; to have busing eliminated would be disastrous.

It is highly possible that the proposed Constitutional amendments are but a smokescreen to obscure pending legislative action that would nullify the historic 1954 Supreme Court decision and return the nation to the institutionalized racial separation from which it is struggling to escape. It is entirely possible that liberal legislators will declare themselves against the amendments, only to pass legislation that accomplishes the same ends but will be buried in better-sounding phrases and less easily-understood complexities.

But we cannot escape the dilemma posed by the busing issue by taking cover in political expediency and verbal maneuvers. Busing is a phony issue. The real issue is whether this nation has the moral backbone to create a pluralistic, open society in which equality is not bargained away. Short-term expedience cannot substitute for moral leadership and rational action. In this issue, as in the great civil rights issues of the 1960's, the very soul of the nation is at stake.

THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED—A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY—PART II—THE 88TH CONGRESS

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the second installment of the documentary history of the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962, as amended. Today's materials cover the development of an expanded and improved MDTA by the 88th Congress.

The material follows:

[88th Cong., 1st Sess., S. Rept. No. 458]

AMENDING THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

August 23, 1963.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDOLPH (for Mr. CLARK), from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following Report together with Minority Views [To accompany S. 1716].

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1716) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE AND EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

S. 1716 was proposed in a message to the Congress by the President on June 19, 1963. Its purpose is to postpone the effective date of the State matching requirements under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 from June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1965, in order to provide the State legislatures with sufficient time to appropriate matching funds. This means that the Federal Government must assume full responsibility for financing for an additional year in order to

maintain the training levels contemplated by the act at the time of its enactment. Accordingly, the bill also proposes to increase the third year authorization for training programs under the act from the present $161 million to $322 million.

NEED FOR THE BILL

A. Postponement of effective date of matching requirements

The Manpower Development and Training Act (hereinafter referred to as MDTA) provides for 100 percent Federal financing of occupational training programs during the first 2 fiscal years following its effective date and for 50 percent State matching of funds during the third fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1964. Accordingly, the establishment or the continuance of any training program in any State after June 30, 1964, will depend on whether the State assumes 50 percent of the training costs.

Twenty-nine of the State legislatures meet biennially in the odd-numbered years. For that reason it was necessary for them to authorize matching funds during their recent 1963 sessions if they were to meet the June 30, 1964, deadline.

Only four[1] of these States enacted the necessary authorization. The 25[2] legislatures which took no action will not reconvene until January 1965, well after the matching requirements go into effect. The failure of these States to act will necessarily require a rapid deceleration of their existing and projected training programs during fiscal 1964. Indeed, their programs will terminate at the end of the 1964 fiscal year unless Congress is willing, through S. 1716, to extend full Federal financing for an additional year. Eleven of the States in this group (Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) have for this reason addressed letters and telegrams to the committee urging favorable action on the bill.

In its hearings on this bill, the committee was satisfied that the deadline set by the statute has failed to provide the State legislatures with sufficient time to assess the value and worth of the MDTA program. MDTA presented an entirely new approach to the critical problem of retraining the unemployed. The budgets for the States were developed in late 1962 at a time when the MDTA program was still in its early stages and was largely untried and not well understood. In 10 of the 29 States with biennial legislative sessions in 1963, no MDTA training of any kind was underway in the late fall when State legislative programs were being formulated. In the remaining 19 States only 63 MDTA projects involving less than 2,400 trainees had begun by late autumn.

The program began to gather momentum during the early months of 1963, but even now, within any one State, the total impact of the program is just beginning to be realized. It appears in retrospect that unless the State legislatures are afforded sufficient time to see the results which can be gained through a retraining program of this kind, the likelihood that they will appropriate funds from severely strained State treasuries is slight.

In an exchange with one of the witnesses during the hearings on the bill, Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, a member of the subcommittee, speaking as a former Governor and State legislator, gave strong emphasis to this point. He expressed the judgment that the States needed more time than was given to them by MDTA to determine whether there was sufficient warrant for legislative action, referring to such factors as the high turnover among the members of the State legislatures, the inexperience of both the old and the new members with the MDTA program, and the shortness of the sessions. He noted that "the mills grind very slowly at the State level" and that in view of the consideration which he had emphasized, it was "expecting a good deal for these States to have come out wholeheartedly in support of this program" in their 1963 sessions.

Most of the States are extremely hard pressed financially. It should be remembered that the debt of our State and local governments has increased by 600 percent since World War II, while Federal debt increased by only 10 percent. No evidence was offered at the hearings indicating that the caution of the State legislatures is based upon any lack of interest or diminution in the widespread support for the MDTA program exhibited at the time of its enactment in 1962. To the contrary, Secretary Wirtz testified that the Department of Labor had received "positive, affirmative reactions" from almost all States with respect to the urgent need for the continuance of the training courses.

B. Increase in third-year authorization

The original goal set by MDTA provided for the training of approximately 400,000 of the unemployed during the 3 years authorized for the program. MDTA goals contemplated the training of approximately 200,000 trainees during its third year. The authorized appropriation of $161 million for this period required to reach this goal necessarily implied State matching in like amount since the condition of third-year training is that the State will assume 50 percent of training costs. If matching is to be postponed for 1 year as proposed by the bill, provision must be made for the assumption of the States share for the third year in order to maintain existing training goals. Thus the bill provides for a doubling of the Federal authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, to $322 million.

MDTA has achieved its goal of 60,000 trainees in training set for it during its first fiscal year of operation. As of today training is proceeding at the rate of 108,000 trainees per year. Training capacity has now been developed to a point which will make it possible to meet the 3-year goal to train 400,000 unemployed provided, of course, that the necessary appropriation levels are maintained and that S. 1716 is enacted so that the life of the program may continue to the expiration of the original authorization.

CONCLUSION

The committee is satisfied that the MDTA program has maintained the pace necessary for it to realize the goals set for it by Congress when the program was enacted. It is noteworthy that 70 percent of the trainees completing training courses so far have been placed in jobs related to their training.

Extension of the requirement for State matching for 1 year as proposed by the pending bill should provide the Federal Government and each of the States with a full opportunity to give this important attack on the roots of unemployment a fair tryout so that the legislatures, both Federal and State, may determine whether the program should be continued.

The recommendation by the committee should not be construed by the States as in any way indicating that the committee does not expect them to assume their full share of the cost of the program once MDTA has demonstrated its effectiveness. A number of the members of the committee pointed out that within 9 months following the effective date of the Federal-State matching program under the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program, eight States had programs in effect; three States had submitted plans to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval; and seven additional States had enacted legislation but had not as of that time submitted their plans. Two years later 28 States had Kerr-Mills programs in operation, and 8 additional States had enacted enabling legislation which would become operative either at a fixed future date or upon approval of the plan by HEW. Within the comparable 9-month period under MDTA, only four States had enacted matching authorizations. Although the committee recognizes that the factors underlying matching in the Kerr-Mills program are distinguishable from those bearing on MDTA, it expects that State matching authorization under MDTA will proceed at an increased pace during the next 18 months.

If this bill is enacted, the committee will continue to maintain a careful review of the effectiveness of this program and of the States participation in it during the extended year of Federal support. Both factors will have a bearing upon any recommendations which the committee may make with respect to future legislation.

The committee has concluded, however, that the 12-month record developed thus far is totally inadequate as a basis for judging the worth of this important program dealing with the urgent domestic problems of unemployment. Enactment of the bill will make it possible for the fair testing of MDTA over the full term of 3 years as specified in the statute itself.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1(a) of the bill, as reported by the committee, amends section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 by striking the year "1964" and substituting in lieu thereof "1965" with the result that State matching will begin on June 30, 1965, rather than on the earlier date.

Section 1(b) of the bill amends section 231 of the act by striking the year "1964" and substituting in lieu thereof the year "1965" with the same result as above.

Section 2 amends section 304(b) of the act by striking the words "a like amount" referring to an authorized appropriation of $161 million and substituting therefor the sum of "$322 million" as the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II.

DEPARTMENT REPORT

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for comments on S. 1831, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and similar bills, S. 1716, S. 1691, and S. 1725.

S. 1831 would amend the training provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act in the following respects: (1) training for functional literacy and basic work skills would be authorized under the act, and persons receiving such training would be eligible for up to an additional 52 weeks of training; (2) the minimum age limit for training allowances for youths would be lowered from 19 to 16; (3) the proportion of total training allowances for youths under 22 years of age would be increased from 5 to 15 percent; and (4) to assure that youths are not encouraged to drop out of school to benefit from the above provisions, no allowances would be paid to youths until 3 months after dropping out of school.

S. 1716 provides for two amendments to the Manpower Development and Training

---

[1] Connecticut, Kansas, Montana, and Tennessee.

[2] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Act. First, it eliminates the State matching provision in the act. Secondly, it increases the maximum authorization for title II in fiscal 1965 from $161 to $322 million to finance the elimination of matching.

S. 1691 provides for improved provisions for training allowances to youths similar to those embodied in S. 1831 except that: (1) the maximum proportion of total training allowances which could be spent on youths would be increased to 20 percent rather than 15 percent in 1965 and the maximum number of youths to receive such training in 1964 would be 45,000; (2) a 6 months' waiting period after leaving school would apply rather than 3 months; and (3) the authorization would be increased by $45 million in fiscal 1964 to finance such provision. As in S. 1831, this bill would also lower the minimum eligible age for training allowances to 16.

S. 1725 would also amend provisions of the act respecting training allowances for youths. The minimum age limit would be lowered to 18 rather than to 16 as in S. 1831, and the maximum proportion of such allowances to be used for training of youths would be increased to 20 percent, as in S. 1691, rather than to 15 percent, as in S. 1831.

Neither S. 1691 nor S. 1725 provide for literacy training as embodied in S. 1831.

As indicated in the President's message on civil rights to the Congress on June 19, 1963, improvements and expansion of the training provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act is fully supported by this administration. This position was reiterated in the Secretary of Labor's testimony on S. 1831 and S. 1716 before your committee on July 16, 1963, when he fully endorsed enactment of these two bills. The Bureau of the Budget concurs fully with the Secretary's testimony. S. 1831, however, as introduced, does not include the increased authorization which had been requested for these purposes. We recommend that the committee amend the bill to provide these funds.

While the general nature of the amendments proposed in S. 1691 and S. 1725 are also along the lines supported by this administration, the specific changes proposed in each differ materially from those in S. 1831 or S. 1716. The latter two bills more accurately reflect the President's proposals in this area as outlined in his message to the Congress on Civil Rights, and therefore this administration would favor their enactment.

I am authorized to inform you that enactment of S. 1831 and S. 1716 would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

(An act 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 assembled,

* * * * *

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PART A—DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

* * * * *

TRAINING ALLOWANCES

SEC. 203. * * *

(d) After June 30, [1964], *1965,* any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments.

* * * * *

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

GENERAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 231. * * *

The State agency shall be paid 50 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, except that for the period ending June 30, [1964], *1965,* the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed persons.

* * * * *

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

* * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 304. * * *

(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] $322,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II.

* * * * *

MINORITY REPORT ON S. 1716 OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER AND SENATOR JOHN G. TOWER

We are opposed to the enactment of S. 1716.

The purpose of this bill, if enacted, would be to eliminate the provision contained in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, requiring State matching for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964. Since the States would be relieved of their financial responsibilities under this program, the Federal Government would be required to finance 100 percent, the cost of the MDTA for fiscal 1965, at a cost of $322 million.

Since the enactment of MDTA in March 1962, only three States, Connecticut, Montana, and Tennessee, have enacted enabling legislation and completed action appropriating funds in order to receive Federal matching grants under this program. The legislatures of the remaining 47 States have either taken only preliminary action or no action at all. Because of this overwhelming lack of response to the MDTA by the State legislatures, the administration now urgently requests the Congress to waive the requirement for State matching and allow the Federal Government to foot the entire bill.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was enacted in March 1962. Since that time every State legislature has met either in 1962 or 1963 and most legislatures again will meet during 1964. Thus there has been ample opportunity for every State legislature in the country, if they so desire, to authorize the necessary matching funds. To date, however, only three States (Connecticut, $200,000; Montana, $20,000; Tennessee, $500,000) have authorized appropriated funds which represents approximately one-half of 1 percent of the total authorization of $161 million contained in the act.

The net effect of the proposed legislation is to relieve the States of the burden of assuming their responsibility under this program and transferring it to the back of the already overburdened and deficit-ridden Federal Treasury. And this is sought to be accomplished in full knowledge of the fact that 47 State legislatures have refused to enact matching legislation.

Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, in his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee commented:

"Lack of action by the States does not mean lack of interest. Instead, we have had urgent messages from many State employment service directors expressing their deep concern and earnest hope that these programs can be continued and accelerated."[1]

It is significant that while Secretary Wirtz may have received many messages from State employment service directors urging continuing of MDTA he apparently did not receive a single communication from a State legislature pleading for the passage of this bill. Since it is the legislature of the State and not the State employment service director which has the authority to appropriate State moneys, we believe that it is advisable for the Senate to give heed to what 47 State legislatures have refused to do, for whatever reasons, and therefore we urge the Senate to reject this legislation.

The administration's pressing entreaties for the passage of this proposal in the light of large-scale State inactivity stands in sharp contrast to its footdragging and general apathy to the implementation of the medical assistance for the aged program, the so-called Kerr-Mills Act, which too requires State matching.

It is common knowledge that the present administration, in its attempts to couple a medical assistance program for the aged to the Social Security System, has thrown up every roadblock at its command to hobble and shackle the Kerr-Mills Act. So far these attempts to scuttle that act have been unsuccessful as the record will indicate.

As of July 25, 1963, 32 States and territories have programs in effect for receipt of funds under Kerr-Mills; 12 have plans submitted, drafted, or in some other stage of implementation; and only 10 States need legislation. Compared to the nationwide disinterest exhibited by the States to MDTA, the Kerr-Mills program can be viewed as a rousing success.

It is our belief that any program, such as MDTA, which has the unqualified and enthusiastic endorsement of the administration, should stand or fall on its own merits without extraordinary inducements being offered in its behalf in order to keep it functioning.

BARRY GOLDWATER.
JOHN G. TOWER.

Appended below is the progress report on the medical assistance to the aged program (Kerr-Mills) as of July 25, 1963.

REPORT AS OF JULY 25, 1963—ACTIVITIES OF THE 54 JURISDICTIONS TO PUT INTO EFFECT THE PROGRAM OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

A. Programs in effect, 32 States:

Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida,[1] Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, and Kentucky.

Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey,[2] New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and Oregon.

Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.[2]

B. Plan submitted; not in effect, 1 State:

South Dakota.[3]

C. Plan being drafted, 1 State:

Iowa (appropriation available after July 4, 1963).

D. Legislation enacted; plan not yet submitted, 5 States:

Kansas (effective January 1, 1964).
Minnesota (effective July 1, 1964).
Nebraska.
North Carolina (effective July 1, 1963).
Virginia (1962 session; effective January 1, 1964).

---

[1] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, July 16 and 18, 1963.

[2] Plan submitted, not yet approved; program in operation as of July 1, 1963.

[3] To become effective upon approval of State's plan.

E. Legislation in process to give basis for program or to provide appropriation, 2 States:

Passed both houses: Missouri.[4]

Legislation pending: Wisconsin.

F. Need legislation, 10 States:

Alaska
Arizona [5]
Colorado [5]
Delaware
Indiana [6]
Mississippi
Montana [5]
Ohio [5]
Rhode Island [5]
Texas [7]

G. Have authority for MAA; implementation indefinite, 3 States:

Georgia: Enacted 1961; no funds available.

New Mexico: Has legal authority; 1963 appropriation request denied.

Nevada: Enacted 1963; tax funds for program not voted.

[Senate, Sept. 4, 1963]

AMENDMENT OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I turn to the pending business, S. 1716. It is a little bill on a big issue. The bill itself is only 11 lines long. It continues for a third year, or through fiscal 1965, which is June 30 of that year, the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which imposes the entire cost of the program on the Federal Government. In other words, it waives the provisions in the original bill, for 1 more year, which would require 50-percent matching on the part of the several States.

In determining whether to pass the bill, the Senate is really deciding—I hope today—to continue the Manpower Training and Development Act. However, if the extension is not passed, I think I can safely say, having heard all the testimony and having been chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which reported the bill, that the training program will die. It will die through apathy, just as it is getting off the ground; just as it is beginning to retrain in employable skills at the rate of 108,000 Americans per annum, retraining them in ways in which they will get jobs. Experience to date shows that 70 percent of those who have completed retraining courses will get those jobs.

The program is at present operating in all 50 States and in Puerto Rico and Guam.

Mr. CLARK. The program is just getting off the ground. There are good reasons why that is the case. The act was passed in 1962, but it was for an authorization only. The appropriation was not made until toward the end of the legislative session last year.

As is customarily the case with new programs of the Federal Government, a number of months were required to organize the program, to place it in operation, and to provide the necessary coordination betwen the employment offices in the 52 jurisdictions, the local school boards in the areas where such boards were responsible for the training programs, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington, where machinery was set up to enable that Department adequately to screen the training programs in the interest of preventing boondoggling and eliminating waste. Therefore, it was not until the spring of 1963 that the program really got underway.

During that period, there was nothing to show for the program in the several States. During that period, some 29 legislatures met. From everything we have learned from the testimony and our contacts with the State employment agencies, the States were not alerted and were not aware that if they did not provide money for meeting the Federal program with matching grants, the Federal program would grind to a halt on June 1 of next year. Twenty-nine State legislatures will not meet in 1964, for they meet only on a biennial basis. Accordingly, those States will have no opportunity, unless special sessions of their legislatures are called, to provide the matching grants necessary to continue the program after June 30 of next year.

Accordingly, at the request of the administration, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings to determine whether the proposal requiring State-matching grants should be postponed for 1 year. The conclusion was reached, unanimously in the subcommittee, and by a vote of 13 to 2 in the full committee, that it was the better part of wisdom not to kill the program just as it was getting off the ground. Whether or not proposed civil rights legislation were to be brought before Congress, I would strongly urge the passage of this manpower development and retraining bill. There is every reason why the program should be continued for another year, in order that its full benefits and the impact of the reemployment which it generates might be brought home to the general public.

Nevertheless, I feel compelled to note that this particular bill was recommended in the President's message on civil rights, which he sent to Congress on June 19, 1963. I quote from page 9 of that message:

Specifically, I now propose:

(A) That additional funds be provided to broaden the manpower development and training program, and that the act be amended, not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State-matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program.

The first part of the Presidential recommendation, namely, an amendment to the act to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State-matching requirements, is contained in the pending bill, S. 1716.

A few minutes ago, I sent to the desk S. 1831, a bill which would enact the other recommendations of the President's program. That bill is in the form of a report submitted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That bill also cleared the committee by a vote of 13 to 2; but it is only the relatively narrow amendment to the act, dealing with waiving State payment for 1 more fiscal year and, accordingly, increasing the authorization for expenditures under the program, to take up the slack at the Federal level, which will now not become available at the State level, that we are dealing with today.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the RECORD should show—and I should have so stated in my opening remarks—that the Senator from West Virginia is the principal sponsor of the bill. He reported the bill to the Senate from the committee. On several occasions he was kind enough to preside over hearings when it was impossible for me to be present. He has followed the bill with great zeal, and is probably the leading expert on the subject in the Senate today. I commend him and thank him for the speech he is making in support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Pennsylvania is very gracious. I assure him that it is my responsibility to join Senators who have sponsored the bill, those on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, in moving to successful passage this vital and urgent measure. I think the Senate will respond affirmatively to the proposal.

It was evident during the hearing on S. 1716, and, of course, on other amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act—that the Congress, in enacting the original measure, admittedly did not allow adequate time for the development of the program and its assessment by the States before the deadline, when the States would be called upon to authorize matching funds.

So in proposing this amendment of S. 1716, we have come to the Congress in an effort to repair that impediment.

We are not considering a problem which is going to emerge 5 years from now. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said, it is at this moment a problem of national scope. It is a serious problem in the Appalachian States and in certain other States. It is here now. Whereas there has been automation in manufacturing and in mining, automation—by whatever word one wishes to characterize it—is now moving into the field of goods and services, marketing, and the activities of the Government itself, in the various agencies. For example, the Census Bureau has 50 statisticians today doing what it took 4,100 persons to do 10 years ago. In the Internal Revenue Service, in processing data on returns, 80 persons are today doing tasks which were carried on by more than 4,000 persons only a few years ago.

The ragged edge of a rail strike of a few days ago, with all its implications for a shutdown of a major portion of the freight carrying facilities of the country, had its basic cause in the loss of jobs. There are 40 percent fewer railroad workers handling the freight cargo of the United States, which is not much less than it was a few years ago. The problem daily becomes more acute. That is the reason why we faced a possible strike.

Two hundred thousand fewer persons a year are living on our farms. This attrition goes on every 12 months. People do not desire to go into the cities from our rural sections merely to make a move; it is because mechanization of the farm is a reality, as a mechanization of our transportation facilities, processes of mining and manufacturing.

So when the Senator from Tennessee speaks, as he did, so eloquently, although in brief remarks, about this problem being a national one, his statement is abundantly true.

Whereas the problem came with tragic impact a few years ago in West Virginia with the mechanization of our mines, and it is already moving into practically all other sections of our country.

I have faith that, regardless of party, Members of the Congress will respond to the urgency of continuing the program, because to return this measure to the committee would be to kill it. To propose loans would strike at the very core of the effort which is now emerging into a workable program.

We come forth today indicating that there was not sufficient time for the States to assess the program prior to their authorizing matching funds; we are attempting by this amendment to repair the deficiency.

The question of maintaining the present rate of progress in our manpower training program is of the utmost immediacy and urgency. To refer again to the testimony of Secretary Wirtz before our committee, the Secretary stated that:

"We have just finished the first year of the administration of this program. We finished * * * with considerable pride in the accomplishment. The thing has just been moved into high gear. And * * * it will slow down

---

[4] Awaiting action by Governor.

[5] Considered by 1963 legislature; not enacted.

[6] Vetoed by Governor. Was not reconsidered in subsequent special session.

[7] Passed resolution for constitutional amendment, which, if ratified by popular vote, may be followed by enabling legislation.

from here on out unless this matching problem is met, and met immediately."

The Congress must not allow this program to be placed in jeopardy because of the calendar of the State legislatures. The manpower development and training program is now in full stride, having passed its target enrollment of 60,000 for fiscal 1963, and is now maintaining an enrollment level of 108,000. Of those who have completed their training, an astonishing 70 percent have been placed in jobs for which they were trained under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Yet, if S. 1716 is not enacted in this session, the entire—and I emphasize the word "entire"—manpower development and training program will be crippled. The original goal established by the Manpower Development and Training Act provided for the training of approximately 400,000 of the unemployed during the 3 years authorized for the program. This is hardly an extravagant program, in view of the continued rate of unemployment which hovers near 6 percent, with more than 4 million workers in a state of enforced idleness.

The original Manpower Development and Training Act program envisaged the training of approximately 200,000 persons during its third year. With this goal in view, the Congress authorized the appropriation of $161 million for this period, with the expectation that the States would match this with an equal amount. As has already been pointed out, however, at the time the budgets of the States were being drawn for fiscal 1963, the program had not been in operation long enough or on a sufficiently wide scale to elicit cooperative action from the State legislatures which convened in 1963. Twenty-five of those States—those which did not act this year—will not again have the opportunity until January 1965, 6 months after the deadline in the original Manpower Development and Training Act.

There are, therefore, only two alternatives before the Congress: to reject the remedial action proposed in S. 1716, and thereby cripple the manpower training program in all of the States; or enact S. 1716 to authorize the additional $161 million, and thereby help move the American economy forward by maintaining the thrust of the original intent of the Congress as expressed in the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962.

Today or tomorrow, when the vote is finally taken—and I trust it will be within a few hours—there will be an opportunity to accept the proposed amendment to the Manpower Training Act.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the need for S. 1716. As I have previously stated in the Senate, the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment has for many months been conducting hearings on the entire range of manpower and employment problems. From every source of testimony we have received evidence of the drastic toll on our human resources being taken by unemployment.

Especially is this so among our young people. As Secretary of Labor Wirtz pointed out in testimony before our committee, although employment rose last year by some 800,000, unemployment also rose by 400,000 as a result of the continued growth of our labor force. The main impact of the increase of the jobless fell upon our most youthful group of workers. There were, in fact, 300,000 less jobs in June 1963, for young people under 20 than there were in June of the year preceding.

The administration has embarked upon a broad program to ameliorate the problems of our disadvantaged youth. The Manpower Development and Training Act is an essential part of that program. By deferring for 1 year the date at which the States must provide matching funds, the Congress will enable the Manpower Development and Training Act program to proceed with the task of making our young people more employable and providing them with a broader foundation in work skills. This program must not be placed in hazard by the calendar of our State legislative sessions nor by the contingencies of economic expansion and contraction. The need for maintaining a consistent level of activity in this program should be equally apparent to those who administer it in such matters as the approval of training programs under the act and the application of the test of a reasonable expectation of employment.

Though I would offer this precautionary advice to those who administer our manpower program, my primary responsibility is to bring to the attention of the Senate the preeminent importance of the need to enact S. 1716 and provide the additional authorization to keep the manpower program going at full strength. I therefore join the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has provided such active leadership in the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee, in urging the Senate to approve the amendment under consideration. I have been joined in proposing S. 1716 by Senators CLARK, MCNAMARA, PELL, KENNEDY, MCINTYRE, and RIBICOFF. It is our belief that this measure is needed to insure the training of workers without cutting the very heart of the manpower program.

I recently returned from 5 days in my own State of West Virginia, where I found that the compelling need for the passage of the pending bill, to continue the Training Act unimpaired, is understood by our people. I believe Congress, if it carries this program forward, will do much not only to alleviate unemployment in our Nation, but also to enable us to meet the problems generated by the technological revolution of American industry. I therefore recommend approval of the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have listened attentatively to the very able presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CLARK) and the equally able presentation made by the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH). It is difficult to stand on the floor of the Senate and be opposed to retraining in general. It is like being opposed to mother love and wide roads.

However, some questions existed in the minds of the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and I feel it is incumbent upon me to speak about them.

Senators who oppose the enactment of the proposed legislation are not opposed to retraining. I believe most Senators have committed themselves to further expenditures in this field in the President's civil rights package. They feel that training is constantly needed. However, we do not feel that the Federal Government should be the sole judge of where and how the training should be conducted.

We do not deny that there is something wrong, something that has been wrong for some time, something that crosses the paths of two administrations.

We must admit that there is something wrong, because there is continued unemployment at a rate which I do not believe anyone can find acceptable.

In July, according to the Economic Indicators, our unadjusted rate of unemployment ran at 5.7, which, while it is considerably better than it was in January, is a little worse than it was a year ago.

Retraining is a necessary thing. I believe basic training is urgently needed. That is one of the reasons why many Senators on this side of the aisle have supported vocational training and junior college proposals, and talked about and supported interest in industrial-type high schools or manual training high schools, aimed at young people who are not going through high school and never had any intention of going through high school. These problems could in large measure be solved. I remind Senators that the dropout rate when I was in high school was higher than the one we are experiencing today. In those days, however, a young boy who knew he was not going to finish high school could go to an industrial high school or a manual training high school, whatever the case might be, and there acquire some skill.

I agree with the proponents of the bill that today there is little or no demand for unskilled labor. The idea that if one cannot do something with his hands, he can always get a job using a pick and shovel, is a fallacy. Those days have passed. Automation has moved into the fields of the pick and shovel to the point that such jobs do not exist. It is to that group that the proposed legislation is directed.

Another factor I wish to touch on, other than the drop-out situation and the need for employment at higher skilled levels, is one that I mentioned earlier, which at least crosses over the administration's proposals, and probably more than that.

The only way in which jobs can be created is to have more capital investment. Capital investment is the lifeblood of any free enterprise economy. This has always been true. During or immediately following the years of high capital investment, unemployment has been reduced. As I look at Economic Indicators for August, I note that in 1957, capital investment, under the heading "Expenditures for new plant and equipment," was $36.96 billion. It dropped the next year, and then started to rise slowly. But the rate this year, 6 years after 1957, if the Indicators prove to be true, will be $39.24 billion, an increase in 6 years of $2.28 billion; or, to put it another way, an increase of about 5 percent over the 6 years.

We can retrain to perfection every unemployed person in the country; but if there are not jobs for them to step into, the retraining is wasted. Particularly is it wasted upon a man who wants to work. He does not want to be on relief. He wants to work with his hands and brain. He wants to be productive.

So before I proceed with my basic argument against the proposal, I call the attention of Senators to what I consider to be the real problem in the employment picture in America today. Our tax structure is so lopsided, difficult, and unfair that investment is not encouraged. More money is available for investment today than at any other time in the history of the country. If my memory serves me correctly, the amount is in the neighborhood of $400 billion in savings by the American people. This money is not being invested in new capital equipment, new factories, or new buildings at the rate I feel it should be invested, in order to relieve the basic unemployment problem. What should the rate be? I do not know. As a onetime businessman, I should judge that possibly a rate increase of 4 to 5 percent a year would produce the desired results. If that were true, instead of the figure running slightly more than $39 billion this year, compared with $36.96 billion in 1957, we could possibly expect it to be in the nature of $79.90 billion being spent for new equipment and factories in this year.

We can talk indefinitely about unemployment and education, and about what we intend to do for area redevelopment; but until this Congress or some subsequent Congress attacks the basic problem, which is wrapped up in taxation and is depriving the American wage earner and investor of initiative and

ambition, and particularly the desire to have his money work for him, there will be a continuation of the unemployment problem throughout the country.

There must be some reason for the failure of the States to exhibit more interest than they have. I have read the hearings carefully. I have read the report carefully. I cannot find the answers that I think we should have, although possibly we cannot get them. I read from page 61 of the manpower retraining hearings before the Sucommittee on Unemployment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the first session of this Congress. This report was submitted by Dr. M. D. Mobley, executive secretary of the American Vocational Association. The title of the report is: "Summary of Replies from State Directors of Vocational Education Regarding Matching Funds for the Manpower Development and Training Act for 1965."

At the outset, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the replies are from State directors of vocational education; they are not from the State legislatures or the Governors. Perhaps there would have been a much better understanding of what direction should be taken legislatively had we heard from the people charged with the responsibility of accepting the matching fund programs. The report contains a series of questions that Dr. Mobly answered. I shall read the questions and the answers:

1. If MDT matching funds for vocational education were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amounts requested.

Thirty-six States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $83,000 to $3,150,000.

2. If MDT matching funds for vocational education were appropriated by your 1963 legislature, indicate amount appropriated.

Three States indicated that funds had been appropriated. One of these three States received one-half of the amount requested and no funds were earmarked for training or allowances.

3. If MDT matching funds for training allowances were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amount requested.

Thirty-nine States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $100,000 to $3,150,000.

4. If MDT matching funds for training allowances were requested from your 1963 legislature, indicate amount appropriated.

None of the States had any funds appropriated.

5. If MDT funds for vocational education are to be requested from your 1964 legislature, estimate amount to be requested.

Forty States indicated "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $50,000 to $2 million.

6. If MDT funds for training allowances are to be requested from your 1964 legislature, estimate amount to be required.

Forty-six States replied "none." Other States replied with amounts ranging from $50,000 to $2,500,000.

7. Will your State be able to participate in the Manpower Development and Training Act program when matching is required?

Thirty-four States indicatd "no." Six States answered "yes." Other States replied "doubtful," "probably," "questionable," "depends," "only to a limited extent," "very unlikely," and "yes."

I note that the report is dated July 3, 1963. As was stated in the minority views, the purpose of the bill, if enacted, would be to eliminate the provision contained in the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, requiring State matching for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964. Since the States would be relieved of their financial responsibilities under this program, the Federal Government would be required to finance 100 percent of the cost of the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal 1965, at a cost of $322 million.

The reason why I read the report submitted by Dr. Mobley was to set forth the questions that arise in the minds of Senators who oppose the enactment of the bill.

Why have so many States refused to participate in the program? I am sure I have no pat answer for all the States. I cannot even give an answer as to why my State of Arizona has not participated, unless it be that under our vocational training program the State director or Governor or legislature may feel that the program is not needed. This question has not been answered. I would appreciate answers to it, because I think they would have some effect on the final disposition of the program.

Since the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in March 1962, only three States, namely, Connecticut, Montana, and Tennessee, have enacted enabling legislation and completed action appropriating funds in order to receive Federal matching grants under this program. The legislatures of the remaining 47 States have either taken only preliminary action or no action at all.

Because of the overwhelming lack of response to the Manpower Development and Training Act by the State legislatures, the administration now urgently requests the Congress to waive the requirement for State matching and to allow the Federal Government to foot the entire bill.

Again, Mr. President, if we had had from the States some understandable answers as to why they were not interested in it, when all of the funds are Federal Government money, we might better be able to understand why the administration is urging the action it is urging today.

I may say that this act was passed in March 1962, and since that time every State legislature has met either in 1962 or in 1963. Most of the legislatures will meet again during 1964.

Thus, there has been ample opportunity for all the State legislatures in the country, if they so desire, to authorize the necessary matching funds. To date, however, only three States—Connecticut, $200,000; Montana, $20,000; Tennessee, $500,000—have authorized appropriated funds which represent approximately one-half of 1 percent of the total authorization of $161 million contained in the act.

The net effect of the proposed legislation is to relieve the States of the burden of assuming their responsibility under this program and transferring it to the back of the already overburdened and deficit-ridden Federal Treasury. And this is sought to be accomplished in full knowledge of the fact that 47 State legislatures have refused to enact matching legislation.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, in his testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee commented:

"Lack of action by the States does not mean lack of interest. Instead, we have had urgent messages from many State employment service directors expressing their deep concern and earnest hope that these programs can be continued and accelerated."

Again I invite the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the fact that other requests, in this expression of urgency, have come from those from whom we would expect them to come—namely, the State employment service director.

It is significant that while Secretary Wirtz may have received many messages from State employment service directors urging continuing of the Manpower Development and Training Act, he apparently did not receive a single communication from a State legislature pleading for the passage of this bill.

I do not mean that it did not come or that it does not exist. It was not indicated that it did. If it did, I am not aware of it.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator from Arizona is quite correct when he says there have been no urgings from the State legislators. I believe one can almost conclude that the State legislatures are rather disinterested in this program. For that, there could be two reasons: First, because the program did not really get underway until this spring; and therefore, the impact within the States is relatively small. In the State of Arizona only three projects, with a relatively small number of trainees, are underway. However, I call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to page 186 of the hearings, where there appears a letter addressed to me by J. R. Cullison, director, vocational education, Phoenix, Ariz. My staff tells me that he is the State director of vocational education. In the letter he says:

"It appears that no State funds will be available to match Manpower Development and Training Act beginning July 1, 1964. The approval of S. 1716 is urgent."

It is probably true that a State director of vocational education has a certain vested interest in a program of this sort; so perhaps we should take his letter with a grain of salt, before giving his urgent recommendation our 100-percent backing. But I do think it is an indication that the man who is responsible at the administrative level for the vocational educational program in the State of Arizona believes the enactment of this bill is urgent. To me, that is fairly good evidence that we have, on the one hand, a program—which is just getting off the ground—with which he is familiar; furthermore, the fact that it has not gotten very far off the ground is one reason why members of the State legislatures are not particularly interested in it.

As I said earlier, in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], all of us know, I believe, the very heavy financial obligations of the States and their limited tax resources. I think those considerations, when taken together, explain why there has not been a great upsurging of support from either the State legislatures or the Governors. One may conclude from that—as my good friend the Senator from Arizona does—that we should drop the program because there is not any real urging behind it. But I would draw a different conclusion. I should say that there is an enormous amount to be gained by continuing the program, now running at the rate of 108,000 trainees a year, inasmuch as we have had the successful experience with the first 60,000 of the trainees of placing 70 percent of them in jobs because we have given them employable skills.

This decision must necessarily be a matter of judgment; but I respectfully disagree with the conclusions which the distinguished Senator from Arizona has drawn from the fact he has stated—which is correct—namely, that there has been no great urging from either the State legislatures or Governors for this proposed legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who has so well presented his arguments, that we always receive such notes of urgency from the State directors of programs financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. Each year, I am urged by my good friend in Arizona, the head of the vocational training program, in which I have much faith and confidence, to build and build and build. But I do think it is unusual that at some point in the testimony there was not submitted an argument which presented the position of a State legislature or of a Governor. I would not take this position, except for the fact that 47 States have failed to act. If only a few States had failed to act—as in connection with the Kerr-Mills Act, which 32 States have taken advantage of—one would be justified in concluding that, for various

reasons, the other States had felt it wise to take advantage of the program.

Mr. Cullison, the Arizona State director, is a very capable man. With my limited knowledge of the field, I dare say probably he is one of the most capable fieldmen in the entire program. I think he probably would be influenced—as he should be for other purposes—by the map contained in the hearings; and I speak now only for my own State of Arizona and also from a rather intimate knowledge of the States directly to the east, to the west, and to the north. When I consider the rate of functional illiteracy, I find that 30 percent or more is entirely in the Navaho and the Apache Indian Reservations, where I doubt that an understanding of the English language is possessed by more than 10 to 15 percent of the people. They are very fine workers when they learn English and move off the reservations to places where they can employ their skills. When I consider the 20 percent or more in my State—represented, in large part, by those on the Navaho and the Apache Reservations; in fact, I may say that all of the shaded areas on the map are either very thinly populated or are populated by Indian tribes, most of whom—with the exception of those who live around the major cities—have not yet learned to speak English—I realize that that would constitute a convincing argument, if I considered only the map. But from my knowledge of New Mexico, I am sure that State also has—with one or two minor exceptions—the same problem, which fundamentally is an educational problem, which I may say we are dealing with.

After too many years of inattention in these fields, the Federal Government now has a highly commendable program of education on the large reservations which contain large populations. The rate of illiteracy will disappear almost entirely within the next 10 to 15 years. But when we discuss functional illiteracy I comment as I have done because it might appear that my State was in bad shape, when the truth is that the map reflects areas in which we could not expect to find any functional illiteracy.

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

Mr. Goldwater. I yield.

Mr. Clark. I agree with what the Senator from Arizona has said about his own State. He knows far more about it than I could ever hope to know. I point out that the question of functional illiteracy is not involved in the pending measure. It has to do with matters that will be discussed when the bill S. 1831, comes to the Senate for action.

Mr. Goldwater. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for calling attention to that point. I thought I had the report on the other bill. But it is interesting anyway.

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

Mr. Goldwater. I yield.

Mr. Randolph. The Senator from Arizona appropriately asked the attitude of the Governor of States in which no action had been taken. This afternoon I talked with the Governors of States in which no action had been He authorized me to say to the Senate that the program in West Virginia is important, and that men and women who are unemployed are now being trained under the program. The skills of those people will be channeled into productive work in the State of West Virginia, and, in some instances, West Virginians will work in other States.

I have the conviction that if Senators were able to talk with their Governors, 90 percent, or even more, of the Governors of the 50 States would enthusiastically endorse the program as it is now moving forward, and would ask that no curtailment or impairment of the program come from the Senate.

Mr. Goldwater. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for those remarks. I recognize that the problem which exists in his State is probably one of the most pressing and vital in the entire Nation. Many times I have said that in a State like West Virginia training and education is the only answer. While I believe more coal is being mined in West Virginia than was ever mined before, it is being done with about 30 percent of the people who were formerly employed in the occupation of mining. That situation gets to the very heart of the problem.

I wish that the committee had thought of those things before the report was written. I wish that Senators had consulted Governors and legislators to find out what their feeling is. When a program has been in progress and only three States have participated in it, some of those not participating being very conspicuous by their absence, I say that we are confronted with quite a mystery.

To continue briefly, since it is the legislature of the State and not the State employment service director which has the authority to appropriate State moneys, we believe that it is advisable for the Senate to give heed to what 47 State legislatures have refused to do, for whatever reasons, and therefore we urge the Senate to reject this legislation.

The administration's pressing entreaties for the passage of this proposal in the light of large-scale State inactivity stands in sharp contrast to its foot-dragging and general apathy to the implementation of the medical assistance for the aged program, the so-called Kerr-Mills Act, which too requires State matching.

It is common knowledge that the present administration, in its attempts to couple a medical assistance program for the aged to the social security system, has thrown up every roadblock at its command to hobble and shackle the Kerr-Mills Act. So far these attempts to scuttle the act have been unsuccessful as the record will indicate.

As of July 25, 1963, 32 States and territories have programs in effect for receipt of funds under Kerr-Mills; 12 have plans submitted, drafted, or in some other stage of implementation; and only 10 States need legislation. Compared to the nationwide disinterest exhibited by the States to the Manpower Development Training Act, the Kerr-Mills program can be viewed as a rousing success.

It is our belief that any program, such as the Manpower Development Training Act, which has the unqualified and enthusiastic endorsement of the administration, should stand or fall on its own merits without extraordinary inducements being offered in its behalf in order to keep it functioning.

In closing, I come to one of the chief fears of those who oppose the measure; namely, that it is not merely an extension of the program for 1 year with full participation by the Federal Government. If the Senate passes the bill, as sure as we are gathered here this Wednesday afternoon, the program will become another permanent program of the Federal Government. It will be another effort by the Federal Government to convince the States that the Federal Government can do these things better than the States can. As the proponents of the bill well know, the opponents of the bill do not lend themselves to Federal action unless it becomes absolutely necessary. Since 47 State legislatures have shown that they do not feel such Federal action is necessary, we who oppose the measure feel that the States can best do the job, or at least they should be given the opportunity to do it.

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

Mr. Goldwater. I yield.

Mr. Carlson. Kansas is one of the States of the Union in which the legislature acted last January. Funds were made available as of January 1, 1964.

I should like to refer to the last statement by the Senator from Arizona. Looking to the future, there is grave danger that we will not require matching funds by States.

I believe I can speak rather frankly on the question, because our State has already made plans to match funds. But I am concerned that if the Senate passes the proposed legislation today, all that will be done will be to add 1 more year to the program. Next year we shall come back and attempt to do the same thing. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that that is the danger in the program. It is not the fact that there is a program with State matching funds. Our State has now voted matching funds, so I can speak frankly about the program. It is a good program. I have talked with people in my State about it. They are not complaining about the program. But I dislike voting for a program with the feeling that all we are doing is building a new Federal training program which I think should be taken care of through other programs, including vocational training and others.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. Goldwater. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. Prouty. Mr. President, I move that the bill, S. 1716, be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with instructions to that committee to report the bill to the Senate not later than 1 week after the filing of a conference report on H.R. 5888, the Health, Education, and Labor Appropriations bill for fiscal 1964; or not later than 1 week after the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported to the Senate a Vocational Education bill, whichever shall last occur.

Mr. President, on the motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Prouty. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. At the outset, let me say that I have no intention of sabotaging the manpower retraining development program. However, I feel that we should look at this subject in a little deeper perspective than that in which it has been viewed up to now. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through its subcommittee, held two committee meetings. Five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. Three of them were administration witnesses, and the other two witnesses were persons who generally are sympathetic to this program.

Very few Senators, perhaps, realize the amount of money that is involved in the program. But I believe we should remember, too, that there are other bills before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare dealing with this subject. That committee has voted to report another bill, which would add $100 million to this program for the current fiscal year, and $100 million for fiscal 1965.

The Senate has already approved an appropriation of $110 million. With the appropriation and authorizations which are being sought during the next 2-year period, that is, fiscal 1964 and 1965, $632 million will be available for the manpower program.

I have seen no evidence which suggests that this amount of money can be justified. As I have said, the subcommittee has spent very little time on the various bills which will be before it. In addition to requests for the manpower program, $100 million has been approved by the Senate for the Youth Employment Act, which is now in the House. The Senate has a bill before it at the present time for vocational education, starting with $108 million for fiscal 1964, and running up to $243 million in 1967.

I make my motion to recommit in the hope that the committee will combine the various vocational and educational training and manpower bills in order that we can determine how much money can judiciously be spent. Under the requests for the manpower development and retraining program, and appropriations already made, and the au-

thorizations requested, we can spend up to $632 million during the next 2 years.

At the present time only 22,142 persons have enrolled in the program. If my motion is defeated, it will be my purpose to offer a substitute amendment which will combine two bills, the one which the Senate is now considering, S. 1716, and S. 1831, which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has voted to report to the Senate.

In effect, I would reduce the funds, but certainly would not cripple the program in any way. I feel that the proper approach at this time is to return the bill to committee, in order that the committee may consider all bills of a similar nature and make as certain as it can that there is no duplication of effort, which I am sure will be the case if the various bills which are before us, some of which have been approved and some of which have not been approved, become effective, in the interest of sound fiscal policy and with a sincere desire to make certain that an education and retraining program will be put into effect and will be effective, and also will be as reasonable in cost as can possibly be anticipated. That is the only reason I have submitted my proposal at this time to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It will be noted that my proposal does not suggest that the committee should reduce the bill in any way. My purpose is to have all the bills brought before the committee, so that it can take sufficient time to study them and understand what they provide, and what is needed, and to invite experts from the agencies to tell us what the facts are. We have not had them; we could not possibly have obtained them during the two very brief hearings that were held.

In the interest of sound fiscal policy, and because I sincerely believe that a workable program can be effectuated for much less money than is proposed at this time, I hope the Senate will feel it proper to sustain the motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first, the hearings, a copy of which is on the desk of every Senator, occupy 214 pages, most of them in small print. The hearings on this particular bill are a part of comprehensive hearings on the entire subject of manpower and employment, which has been before the subcommittee ever since the early days of the year. Much of the other testimony has a bearing on the pending bill in an overall, general sense.

The background and need for the bill have been as fully explored in the subcommittee as has any other piece of legislation with which I have had anything to do since coming to the Senate. The fact that only 5 witnesses testified with respect to this small bill of 11 lines is no indication that the very voluminous statements and the other testimony which have been adduced with respect to other phases of the whole unemployment subject have not been carefully considered by the committee. The two key witnesses were the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education, who should be well advised on the need for the proposed legislation.

Second, the subcommittee, of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is a member, unanimously reported the bill to the full committee. To be sure, the Senator from Vermont reserved his right to submit amendments, and also reserved all his rights on the floor of the Senate.

I say without qualification that, as chairman of the subcommittee, during our hearings on the whole unemployment question, from the early days of this year forward, we have investigated the possibility of overlapping or duplication in various Federal-State programs. I think it is fair to say that there is no such duplication. In my opinion, the programs are inadequate in size. All of them are needed. I hope this one will be a part of the overall package.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the bill to the Senate by a vote of 13 to 2. It is a part of the President's civil rights program—the first part to come before the Senate for action.

I believe the necessity for the proposed legislation has been established on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we must not operate under the misconception that there was a failure adequately to consider this proposal in the subcommittee. More than 40 persons either testified directly or filed statements with the subcommittee. I should like to have that statement clearly understood. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Vermont would not disagree with it.

Mr. PROUTY. I agree with the Senator. The statements were filed; but they are in small print, which is very difficult for anyone to read.

I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will agree that the subcommittee held only 2 days of hearings on the bill, and that only five witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. Am I not correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct. I said that some 35 statements were filed; and five witnesses appeared in person, making 40 or more witnesses, as I have indicated.

Mr. PROUTY. In addition to reporting the Senator's bill, the committee also voted to report another bill, one which involves $200 million for the present fiscal year and fiscal year 1965.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senate is not acting on that bill today; but it is a part of the package of the entire program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to recommit, and I should like to express my reasons for so doing.

I believe it is rather unusual that, with the exception of four States, the State legislatures which met in session in 1963 did not take any action on the program, and did not provide matching funds. Also, I would have been glad to have heard more testimony and received more information about the effectiveness of the program, including the number of projects which have been started in the States and the placing of trainees at work.

My reasons for voting against the motion to recommit can be quickly stated. Perhaps a few of the States do not have the necessary funds, though that is doubtful. My judgment is that legislatures of the various States did not appropriate funds because they consider the problem of unemployment a national problem. I believe it is, too.

The reason that people are more fully employed in one State may result from special conditions. For example, the great defense industries in some States of the Union provide the people of those States full employment. But those industries are supported by the taxpayers of the United States through massive defense expenditures.

Similarly, unemployment exists in other States for reasons which are beyond the control of those States. These reasons include the great technological improvements which have closed industry and reduced employment. Perhaps the failure of the Congress to enact tax programs has also had its effect upon employment. I will admit to my leader that there is merit in what he has said about the fiscal program of the administration which has failed to move the economy. Continued deficits do have an adverse effect upon investment and unemployment.

Unemployment is not purely a local or a State problem. It is affected by great national movements and by circumstances which are beyond the control of State governments. I believe that the question of unemployment and its future impact is the most serious of the domestic problems which affect our country today.

It is argued in the Senate and by some who write to me that private enterprise can handle unemployment. But private enterprise is not handling this problem in the main, and the fact is that people are still out of work. The training program is probably the most sensible program we have to fit young and even older people for some productive employment.

I really do not see what would be accomplished by recommitting the bill. It will be reported to the Senate again, and we shall vote on the issue again, unless in some way it becomes involved in the question of civil rights. Then it might not be voted upon at all.

Because I believe the problem of unemployment is the greatest domestic problem that will be facing our country, and because it is a national problem and not a State problem, I think that we must provide for this training program to continue even if the Federal Government is to pay for it.

The program is underway. Funds needed have not been provided. It will not be possible to provide them the third year unless the Congress looks ahead and faces this problem.

For these reasons, I intend to vote against the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think perhaps the Senator is not aware that my motion to recommit is not merely a straight recommittal motion. The committee would be directed to report after the conferees on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to this program, made their report, or after the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported the vocational education bill.

The purpose of this procedure is to mesh all the various bills for vocational education, for retraining, and so forth into a package, if possible, so that Senators may know what they are voting for, and can provide adequate money, and not a nickel more.

If the motion should lose, I shall offer a substitute which would provide about $432 million for the training program during the present fiscal year and fiscal year 1965.

This motion is not directed as a blow against the retraining program, in which I believe. We have been asked to provide much more money than can possibly be spent efficiently or effectively. I think no Senator can justify throwing money away when it cannot be efficiently or effectively used. That is my interest in the proposal at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with instructions.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

[No. 150 Leg.]

NAYS—44

Allott, Boggs, Carlson, Curtis, Dirksen, Dominick, Ellender, Goldwater, Hruska, Lausche, Morton, Pearson, Prouty, Robertson, Russell, Smith, Stennis, Thurmond, and Williams, Del.

YEAS—19

Bayh, Bartlett, Beall, Bible, Brewster, Byrd, W. Va., Cannon, Case, Church, Clark, Cooper, Dodd, Douglas, Gore, and Gruening.

Hart, Hill, Holland, Humphrey, Inouye, Javits, Johnston, Keating, Kennedy, Magnuson, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGovern, McIntyre, and Metcalf.

Monroney, Morse, Muskie, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Symington, Talmadge, Waters, Williams, N.J., Yarborough, and Young, Ohio.

NOT VOTING—37

Aiken, Anderson, Bennett, Burdick, Byrd, Va., Cotton, Eastland, Edmondson, Engle, Ervin, Fong, Fulbright, and Hartke.

Hayden, Hickenlooper, Jackson, Jordan, N.C., Jordan, Idaho, Kuchel, Long, Mo., Long, La., McClellan, McGee, McNamara, Mechem, and Miller.

Moss, Mundt, Neuberger, Ribicoff, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Smathers, Sparkman, Tower, and Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's motion to recommit with instructions was rejected.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it seems to me entirely appropriate that the Federal Government should extend for another year its 100-percent underwriting of the manpower development and training program.

The matching requirement was originally delayed for 2 years in order that the program might be gotten underway and its usefulness demonstrated to the States.

This has taken longer than anticipated. In many instances vocational education programs were not geared to undertake this kind of retraining program. Often the machinery had to be built from the ground up.

Also, these retraining programs have had to be initiated against the statutory requirement that there be an expectation of jobs for the trainees on their completion of a retraining course.

This has meant that the retraining program has not only been running a race again the abolition of semiskilled and unskilled jobs by automation, but it has also been faced with the fact of continuing unemployment among skilled persons. Happily this latter situation has improved over the last 2 years.

We in Michigan are ironing the bugs out of this program. The fact that 80 percent of those who have completed retraining courses have been employed is evidence that this program can prove of real value in Michigan if given a chance.

But it is clear that we do need additional time. Until the effectiveness of this program can be proven without a doubt in Michigan and across the country, we cannot ask the individual States, most of which have continuing fiscal problems and are burdened with the increasing costs of existing education programs, to appropriate funds for manpower retraining.

I believe it is equally clear that we cannot afford to let manpower retraining be stillborn because of the premature withdrawal of full Federal support.

Just as the fact of unemployment is a national problem, so too are the roots of unemployment national problems.

Because of the high mobility of Americans, the lack of educational and training opportunities in one State may well become the unemployment problem of another State. Michigan knows that unemployment in Detroit is the product not only of automation and the decentralization of the auto industry, but equally of the limited educational opportunities of many of our citizens who have moved to Michigan from other States in the last 25 years.

It is significant that the bill before us today is the result of a recommendation by the President in his civil rights message of June 19. It is significant because it means recognition of the vicious and perpetuating circle formed by discrimination, lack of education and training, unemployment, and economic deprivation.

Certainly manpower retraining is only a partial answer—but we cannot let even partial answers go unfulfilled.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe it is imperative that we approve the bill before us and give the manpower development and training program this extra impetus to become the effective weapon against unemployment which I believe it can become.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1716) was passed.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203(d) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(b) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "a like amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "$322,000,000".

[88th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. No. 480]

AMENDING THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

September 4, 1963.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, submitted the following report together with minority views.

[To accompany S. 1831]

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1831) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

In his message to the Congress on June 19, President Kennedy made certain recommendations "designed to improve the training skills, and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike." Included in these recommendations were amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act "not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also (in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment) to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

S. 1831 incorporates each of these proposals: [1] (1) It provides for training in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as manual training in the use of tools, for those of the unemployed who are unable to take occupational training courses because they lack these skills; (2) it provides for the expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 16; and (3) it would increase the percentage of funds available for the youth training program from 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances to 15 percent.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

A. Pertaining basic education course

Section 1 of the bill provides for the establishment of training courses in functional literacy and basic work skills for the benefit of those persons who would otherwise be unable to take part in an occupational training program under the act. The term "functional illiteracy" means inability to read or to understand elementary written materials, instructions, or messages (such as help wanted ads), or inability to do elementary grade problems in arithmetic, or inability to write. In standard technical usage, the term "functional literacy" refers to educational attainments equivalent to less than 5 years of schooling. The term: "basic work skills" includes knowledge and familiarity with handtools and techniques which are common to a whole range of occupations.

Training under this provision of the bill will be provided by appropriate State education agencies and will include whatever instruction in the basic subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic may be necessary to prepare an unemployed illiterate or semiliterate to qualify for direct occupational training available under the act. In addition to these elementary verbal and mathematical studies, the basic pretraining course contemplated by the bill can include manual training. This covers instruction in the use and application of handtools in such trades as woodworking, metalworking, and welding. The basic work skill courses can be joined with those in elementary verbal and arithmetical skills to make it possible for the trainees to continue training in a suitable occupational course.

These basic literacy and work skills are essential even to man a gas pump. A service station attendant must be able to fill out a credit card receipt and add up the charges.

It is expected that most of the candidates for the pretraining courses offered under the bill will be selected from among persons who have been rejected from the Manpower Development and Training Act program because of inadequate educational attainment. These persons, by and large, constitute the immovable hard core of the unemployed who, but for their inability to "read, write, or figure" might otherwise be eligible for training programs which would prepare them for useful employment. Rejections under the Manpower Development and Training Act are presently running as high as 8 to 1, with only a small percentage of the illiterate unemployed making the attempt to qualify for the Manpower Development and Training Act training. Candidates may also be drawn directly from the ranks of the illiterate or semiliterate in search of work if they demonstrate the required aptitude for regular training. Under normal circumstances, however, candidates who have completed more than eight grades of schooling would not ordinarily be eligible for enrollment in the pretraining courses with the possible exception of those special cases in which the comprehension level is well below what might be expected of the individual on the basis of his having completed eight grades of school.

The bill authorizes the payment of training allowances to trainees in these special courses on the same terms as now provided by the act to regular trainees. These payments are limited to unemployed persons who have had not less than 3 years experience in gainful employment and who are either heads of families or heads of households as provided in section 203(c) of the act. The bill authorizes a maximum period not to exceed 52 weeks for literacy training. This would be in addition to the regular 52-week period available under the present Manpower Development and Training Act occupational training program.

B. Lower age limit and increase in proportion of training allowances in youth training program

Section 2 of the bill provides for an urgently needed expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act training provisions for out-of-school and out-of-work youngsters. It does this by dropping the age limit on youth training allowances from 19 to 16 and by tripling the proportion of these allowances from 5 to 15 percent of the total funds available for allowance purposes. The bill contains provisions to dissuade youngsters from dropping out of school in order to enroll in the program. It provides that no training allowance shall be paid to any

[1] Other than the proposal to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements which was incorporated in S. 1716, reported to the Senate on Aug. 23, 1963 (Rept. No. 458).

young person under 19 years of age who has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary of Labor has satisfied himself that he has been out of school for at least 3 months during the regular school session and that all efforts to induce him to resume have failed. This screening process will include careful testing and counseling as well as close cooperation with the appropriate school or other local authorities to redirect the youngster in the most effective way possible.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of $100 million to be divided equally between the basic literacy and the expanded youth training programs for the current fiscal year and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

It is estimated that the 46,000 additional youths can be training during the current year under the provisions of the bill. It is also estimated that 50,000 of the severely disadvantaged adults can be given basic literacy and work-skill training during the same period.

NEED FOR THE BILL

Despite the success of the Manpower Development and Training Act program during its first 12 months of operation, it has become increasingly apparent that there are two glaring deficiencies in the program: (1) The failure to include the illiterate and the semiliterate, (2) the exclusion of the out-of-school and out-of-work youngster within the 16- to 18-year age bracket.

The first group represents the hard core of the unemployed of today. The second represents the hard-core unemployed of tomorrow. Together they constitute the forgotten one-quarter of the unemployed, numbering more than 1 million of present and future public charges. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act program as presently constituted, the men and the women in these groups cannot be trained for useful employment either because they cannot read or write adequately, if at all, or because, as a practical matter, they fall just below the age group reached by the Manpower Development and Training Act. Without occupational training they cannot find work.

The bulk of these people have the capacity to be helped and to help themselves onto the track of useful employment. The President's proposals, which have been incorporated into the bill, provide the means by which this can be done.

A. Basic literacy and basic work skills

There are 3 million in the labor force today who are severely handicapped by their inability to read and to write. These are the illiterate and the semiliterate, and few if any are equipped to find jobs in our rapidly changing economy.

More than 800,000 of them are counted among the unemployed. Of these a disproportionately high percentage are nonwhite. Most cannot be trained either because they cannot read or write at all or because their command of the three "R's" is so limited that they cannot follow instructions in the simplest occupations. Some have tried to enroll in the Manpower Development and Training Act training courses, but inevitably they have been screened out for failure to reach this threshold of educational attainment. Others, recognizing the hopelessness of their condition at this time, have not even made the attempt.

In the service-oriented economy of today, even the unskilled jobs require some ability to read, write, and compute. The jobs in the factories, stockyards, goods-producing industries, mines, and farms for which the illiterate and semiliterate in past years could qualify are no longer available. The great shift which has taken place toward the service industries has dispossessed this group and has left them stranded without the means or the capacity to adjust to the requirements of midcentury employment which might otherwise be available to them were it not for their literacy handicap.

They cannot qualify for training even in basic unskilled categories. Their lack of an acceptable comprehension level bars them from consideration as cooks, waiters, gas station attendants, chambermaids, hospital orderlies or practical nurses, to name but a few. One must know how to read, write, compute, and measure to take instruction in any of these occupations. This simple fact explains the plight of hundreds of thousands of severely disadvantaged unemployed today. This is why they have come to be known as the hard core unemployed.

The Manpower Development and Training Act cannot begin to chip away at this core and to rehabilitate this huge segment of the unemployed unless provision is made to bring these men and women to at least the minimal literacy level required for occupational training and employment in today's market. For them literacy training is truly vocational training. Without it they remain helpless.

The desperate conditions of the illiterate and semiliterate jobseeker is development by the Manpower Development and Training Act record. Twenty percent of all of the unemployed have less than 8 years of schooling. Yet less than 3 percent of the first 19,000 of the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees were in this group. Of Negro trainees in the manpower program, only 5 percent had completed no more than the eighth grade of school, although 44 percent of the Negro unemployed have not progressed past the eighth grade.

Of course, grade school attainment is not an accurate measure of the literacy capacity of a member of the unemployed. A study of welfare recipients in a Negro section in the south side of Chicago demonstrated that while 6½ percent of those on public assistance lacked 5 years of education, more than one-half of the group were functioning at comprehension levels below the sixth grade, the cutoff point which itself is below the minimum for participation in the complex economy of today. Thus, it is generally recognized that grade school attainment is at best only a rough and inexact measure of the literacy level needed for occupational training.

The manpower program, as it is now written, is geared to the selection of candidates who are most likely to succeed, and conversely is calculated to exclude from training those who most desperately need it. The aptitudes among the thousands of illiterates and semiliterates who have been excluded may be as high or higher than those of the more fortunate literate selectee. Those in the excluded group can be taught the three "R's" within 1 year (perhaps in as little as 4 to 6 months time according to the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel) and once taught, they can be trained and employed in occupations for which the Manpower Development and Training Act prepares them. The cost of salvaging the disadvantaged in the labor force is estimated at $2,000 per individual, one-half of which would be used for the literacy pretraining programs provided for in S. 1831 and the remaining half for occupational training under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Without this opportunity these people are doomed to jobless lives dependent upon public assistance, condemned to a life of poverty and social uselessness. Compared to the social costs of public assistance, the committee feels that the cost for redirecting this group into socially useful occupations is an investment we cannot afford not to make.

This point was emphasized by Raymond M. Hilliard, director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid in Illinois, in his description of a recent graduation ceremony marking the completion of the Cook County literacy course by 211 adults. In his statement to the committee he said:

"I wish that you could have been with me to see 25 men go off relief in a body at a graduation exercise of a class where they had learned to become Yellow Taxi drivers; 266 former recipients have now received this training, and 215 are currently employed. Many of these men were able to qualify because they had been taught to read and to write in our basic literacy classes, and, as a result, they could make out trip sheets, write receipts and reports, and read street signs."

The $50 million appropriation which the bill proposes for the basic literacy program would provide for 50,000 in this group.

B. Expansion of youth training provisions

The proposal to include the 16- to 18-year-old group under the youth training provisions of the Manpower Act has already been considered and approved by the Senate. In August 1961 it passed S. 1991 which eventually became the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. S. 1991 authorized the Secretary of Labor to pay training allowances to youths over 16 but under 22 whenever he found that such allowances were "necessary to provide occupational training." In the conference on the House and Senate bills in March of the following year, however, it was agreed to eliminate the 16–18 group from the youth training allowance program, thereby restricting the program, as a practical matter, to young men and women within the 19–21 age range.

The President's Committee on Youth Employment concluded in its report of April 1963 that the exclusion of these out-of-school and out-of-work youngsters from the Manpower Development and Training Act was a serious mistake and urged congressional reconsideration of this decision. The President, in his message of June 1963, followed these recommendations and proposed lowering the age limit for training allowances to 16, as provided for in this bill.

The experience during the first year under the Manpower Development and Training Act has demonstrated that these unemployed youngsters cannot be ignored. During the first 6 months of 1963, there was an average of 720,000 within this age group out of school and out of work, who were steadily moving in the direction of crime, delinquency, and hard-core unemployment. This figure climbed to 1,156,000 in May of this year, representing the biggest figure ever recorded since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began recording this data in 1949. One out of five of these youngsters is nonwhite.

There are additional tens of thousands of youngsters who, although out of school and out of work, are not seekng employment and are, for one reason or another, excluded from the official unemployment statistics.

Dropouts leave school for many reasons not necessarily related to their intellectual capacity or potential. Their reasons are rooted in the poverty, discrimination, and social chaos in which they have been reared. Their motivation has been corroded by a hostile society. Sometimes, their leaving school may reflect inadequacies of the educational system, directed too much toward teaching college and other aptitudes which have little direct relationship to the lives they themselves will lead.

Thirty-six million youngsters will enter the work force in the 1960's. Among these will be 7½ million dropouts, at least one-half of whom will be 16. Between now and the end of 1965 there will be 5½ million new entrants into the working force, and of these 2 million will be dropouts.

In the past year, there were 1,200,000 new entrants into the work force competing for only 800,000 new jobs.

Under the Manpower Act these youngsters may enroll in youth training courses, but they are not eligible to receive training allowances. These allowances are fixed at one-half

of the unemployment compensation in the State in which the program is given (averaging approximately $17 per week). Exclusion of the 16–18-year-old group from the training allowance program has had the practical effect of removing them from the training program. Of the first 19,000 trainees enrolled under the act, only 4 percent were under 19 years of age, yet nearly 16 percent of all of the unemployed are in the 16–18 bracket, and most are dropouts.

These youngsters are generally severely disadvantaged with inadequate housing and minimal financial resources. Under these circumstances they have little comprehension of the need to continue their education.

Without the youth training allowances these youngsters lack both the means and the motivation to participate in a youth training program. In most cases their families cannot supply even the minimum sum which would be essential for clothing, carfare, and food. The small training allowances which the bill would make available to them should be sufficient to provide them with a reasonable opportunity to equip themselves for a useful adult life through the Manpower Development and Training Act training.

The same facts have demonstrated the urgent need for increasing the overall size of the youth training program from its present level of 5 percent to a more reasonable level of 15 percent of the total funds available for allowances generally. The alarming trends both with respect to the rate and the size of youth unemployment have been described above. Expansion of the size of the youth training program as proposed by the bill is required not only to provide training for the newly covered young men and women within the 16–18 group but also to provide a realistic training opportunity for the youngsters already covered. The reduction of the age limit to 16 and the increase in the proportion of funds available for training will make it possible to reach the tens of thousands of additional youngsters each year who desperately need guidance and training.

The bill recognizes the necessity for developing safeguards to insure that no 16- or 17-year-old youngsters will attempt to drop out of school to enroll in one of these programs.

It has been said that it would be penny wise and pound foolish to train thousands of older workers under the Manpower Development and Training Act and at the same time to allow thousands of young dropouts to become the unemployed and untrained of tomorrow. Unless the programs proposed by the bill are adopted, the future of these youngsters will be bleak and barren. The bill provides the means by which they can be returned to a training progam designed to fit their special situation.

The bill provides for an authorization of $50 million for the expanded youth training program which will make it possible to train an additional 46,000 youngsters for the fiscal year ending June 1964 and a similar amount for the year ending June 1965.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

Section 1 of the bill, as reported by the committee, would add a new subsection (h) of section 202 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, providing for the establishment of functional literacy and basic work skill training programs for eligible persons who thereby will be able to pursue courses of occupational training. Referrals under the new subsection (h) would be considered referrals for training within the meaning of the Manpower Development and Training Act with the following two exceptions: (1) The condition that there must be "a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupation for which the person is to be trained" specified in subsection 202(d) would not apply, and (2) trainees will be eligible for 52 weeks of basic literacy training allowances in addition to the 52 weeks which would be available to them under the present Manpower Development and Training Act occupational training program.

Section 2 of the bill would amend subsection (c) of section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act by striking out the word "nineteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sixteen", thereby lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from its present level of 19 to 16. It would strike out the words "5 percent" in the same subsection and would insert in lieu thereof the words "15 percent", thereby raising the ceiling on youth training allowances from its present level of 5 percent of the total funds available for allowances to 15 percent. It also provides that no training allowance shall be paid to any individual under the age of 19 who has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary of Labor is satisfied that the individual has been out of school for a period of not less than 3 months during the regular school session and that all procedures to induce the individual to return to school have failed.

Section 3 would expand the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's authority under section 231 in order to enable him to enter into arrangements with appropriate education agencies to provide basic literacy and basic work skill training.

Section 4 would strike the word "vocational" from section 302 of the act and section 5 would make the same change in section 305(b) of the act in order to conform these provisions with the new section 202(h) providing for basic literacy training.

Section 6 would add a new subsection (e) to section 304, authorizing an appropriation of $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like sum for the year ending June 30, 1965, for the purpose of carrying out title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, of which the programs proposed by the bill are a part.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1963.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for comments on S. 1831, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and similar bills, S. 1716, S. 1691, and S. 1725.

S. 1831 would amend the training provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act in the following respects: (1) Training for functional literacy and basic work skills would be authorized under the act, and persons receiving such training would be eligible for up to an additional 52 weeks of training; (2) the minimum age limit for training allowances for youths would be lowered from 19 to 16; (3) the proportion of total training allowances for youths under 22 years of age would be increased from 5 to 15 percent; and (4) to assure that youths are not encouraged to drop out of school to benefit from the above provisions, no allowances would be paid to youths until 3 months after dropping out of school.

S. 1716 provides for two amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. First, it eliminates the State matching provision in the act. Secondly, it increases the maximum authorization for title II in fiscal 1965 from $161 to $322 million to finance the elimination of matching.

S. 1691 provides for improved provisions for training allowances to youths similar to those embodied in S. 1831 except that: (1) The maximum proportion of total training allowances which could be spent on youths would be increased to 20 percent rather than 15 percent in 1965 and the maximum number of youths to receive such training in 1964 would be 45,000; (2) a 6-month waiting period after leaving school would apply rather than 3 months; and (3) the authorization would be increased by $45 million in fiscal 1964 to finance such provision. As in S. 1831, this bill would also lower the minimum eligible age for training allowances to 16.

S. 1725 would also amend provisions of the act respecting training allowances for youths. The minimum age limit would be lowered to 18 rather than to 16 as in S. 1831, and the maximum proportion of such allowances to be used for training of youths would be increased to 20 percent, as in S. 1691, rather than to 15 percent, as in S. 1831.

Neither S. 1691 nor S. 1725 provide for literacy training as embodied in S. 1831.

As indicated in the President's message on civil rights to the Congress on June 19, 1963, improvements and expansion of the training provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act is fully supported by this administration. This position was reiterated in the Secretary of Labor's testimony on S. 1831 and S. 1716 before your committee on July 16, 1963, when he fully endorsed enactment of these two bills. The Bureau of the Budget concurs fully with the Secretary's testimony. S. 1831, however, as introduced, does not include the increased authorization which had been requested for these purposes. We recommend that the committee amend the bill to provide these funds.

While the general nature of the amendments proposed in S. 1691 and S. 1725 are also along the lines supported by this administration, the specific changes proposed in each differ materially from those in S. 1831 or S. 1716. The latter two bills more accurately reflect the President's proposals in this area as outlined in his message to the Congress on civil rights, and, therefore, this administration would favor their enactment.

I am authorized to inform you that enactment of S. 1831 and S. 1716 would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted as enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

(An act 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 assembled,

* * * * * *

TITLE II—TRAINING AND SKILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

PART A—DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

* * * * * *

SELECTION OF TRAINEES

SEC. 202. * * *

(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of functional literacy and basic work skills those eligible persons who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of

this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional fifty-two weeks of training allowances.

TRAINING ALLOWANCES

SEC. 203. * * *

(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 are either heads of families, or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that he may pay training allowances at a rate not exceeding $20 a week to youths over [nineteen] *sixteen* but under twenty-two years of age where such allowances are necessary to provide them occupational training, but not more than [5 per centum] *15 per centum* of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths[,]: *Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under 19 years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 3 months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed.*

* * * * *

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 needed to equip persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals, *except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies.* * * *

* * * * *

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

* * * * *

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 Education Act of 1946, except for reductions unrelated to the provisions or purposes of this Act.

* * * * *

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 304. * * *

(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.

* * * * *

(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 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.

LIMITATIONS ON USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

SEC. 305. * * *

(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.

* * * * *

MINORITY REPORT ON S. 1831

We are opposed to the passage of this legislation.

Briefly, S. 1831, would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act in the following manner: (1) Authorizing the Secretary of Labor to refer persons for courses in the development of functional literacy and basic work skills and to provide such persons with training allowances for an additional 52 weeks; (2) lower the minimum age limit for training allowances from 19 to 16 provided that the youth has failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 3 months during the regular school session; (3) increase the amount that can be used to pay training allowances to youths from 5 to 15-percent; (4) authorize an additional appropriation of $100 million to carry out the above new programs.

The Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) came into being in order to assist men and women, who became unemployed due to automation, technological change, and relocation of industry, to receive training in skills needed to secure new employment. In the report submitted to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in support of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the basic objectives of this program were outlined as follows:

"It (the bill) 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 the upgrading of many employed persons, so that they can make a greater contribution to the national economy.[1] "

Now, less than 2 years after enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the worthy objections of this act are proposed to be diluted by attaching to it a functional literacy and basic work skills program. Like tail fins on an automobile, such a program can add nothing of value to the Manpower Development and Training Act and can only detract from its effectiveness.

The Secretary of Labor would be given the authority to refer persons for training, not in a skill or craft, but in a program of functional literacy; in other words to teach a person how to read, write, and do simple arithmetic.

This proposed new program would not be limited solely to unemployed men with a wife and children who have lost their jobs and must overcome their lack of a basic education before they can hope to rejoin the ranks of the employed. It is also contemplated to permit children as young as 16 years old who have quit school to be referred for functional literacy training and to be paid as much as $20 a week as a training allowance while learning the alphabet and the multiplication tables. Such a proposal would be ludicrous if it were not such a tragic and wasteful expenditure of the money gathered from the pockets of the American taxpayers.

The Senate is now being asked to put up another $100 million, part of which will be used to give children $20 a week just to go to school. This program raised some very interesting questions, the most important of which is: Since training allowances will be paid to children aged 16 and older, provided they are referred for training in functional literacy, what have these children been learning in school for the past 10 years? If a child has not been able to conquer such rudimentary subject matter as reading, writing, and simple arithmetic over a 10-year period, then what reason do we have to believe that the same child can master his functional illiteracy within the space of 1 year?

This legislation presupposes that there are no programs in operation today providing basic education courses and, therefore, it is necessary to provide such courses by way of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Obviously such is not the case. In addition to our public school systems throughout the country almost every community in the Nation offers adult education courses open to all who desire to obtain a basic education or improve and upgrade their education.

We firmly believe that the program set forth in this legislation has no place in a manpower training program. Further, we believe that the payment of training allowances up to $20 a week to children who have quit school will merely serve as an inducement for more children to drop out of school at a time when every effort should be made by parents, teachers, and other responsible elements of society to encourage and assist our young people to continue their education.

We urge the Senate to vote down this unwise and costly proposal.

BARRY GOLDWATER.
JOHN G. TOWER.

[Senate, Sept. 6, 1963]

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need on the bill.

S. 1831 is a companion measure to S. 1716, which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday of this week. Both bills incorporate amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, recommended by the President to the Congress. Both bills are of some assistance in the upgrading of the labor skills of minority groups.

In his message of June 19 President Kennedy made certain recommendations "Designed to improve the training, skills, and economic opportunities of the economically distressed and discontented, white and Negro alike."

He further recommended amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act "not only to increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements, but also—in keeping with the recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment—to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youths, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

S. 1831 incorporates each of these proposals.

First, it provides for training in reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as manual training in the use of tools, for those of the unemployed who are unable to take occupational training courses because they lack these skills.

Second, it provides for expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 16.

Third, it increases the percentage of funds available for the youth training program from 5 percent of the estimated total training allowances to 15 percent.

The bill authorizes additional annual ap-

[1] 87th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. No. 651.

propriations of $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, in order to meet the cost of the expanded program.

The need for this bill arises from the fact that there are 3 million workers in our labor force today who can neither read nor write. Eight hundred thousand, or more than one-quarter of them, are unemployed. Perhaps as many as 25 percent of unemployed illiterates are Negroes.

In the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act program eight applicants were rejected for every trainee accepted in the program. Many of them were rejected because they could neither read nor write, or had no knowledge of elementary mathematics, principally arithmetic.

In other words, they did not even have knowledge of the three R's, and yet, in order to be a gas station attendant today, one has to be able to handle a charge account; he has to be able to write out a bill; he has to be able to add and subtract; he also has to be able to do a little simple multiplication. A taxi driver has to be able to read road signs and his meter. He has to be able to make change. But 300,000 of our unemployed are unable to perform these elementary acts; and these are the hard core of the unemployed.

In addition to teaching the three R's under this bill, there would be training in how to use basic tools common to many occupations.

An interesting bit of testimony was that of Secretary of Labor Wirtz, who told the committee of an instance in which 500 women were interviewed recently in one public employment office before 30 were found to fill a class in practical nursing. In order to line up 20 trainees for hotel and restaurant cooks, 287 persons had to be interviewed. Many of those rejected were rejected because they could not read the simple instructions needed to carry on the occupation; others because they could not do the simple exercises in writing necessary to fulfill their jobs; still others because, as I have said, they could not add, subtract, or divide.

Under normal circumstances, those who will receive literacy training under the bill would have been applicants for ordinary occupational training in a manpower development and training course, but were rejected, because they could not read, write, or figure.

It is important that the intent of the literacy training program should not be confused with the normal instruction we expect of our educational system. We are speaking, by and large, of teaching older heads of households who must have some source of income while they learn the basic educational skills essential to obtain employment. We are talking for the most part about the 45-year-old unemployed coal miner and those who share his lot. The statistics on illiteracy among our unemployed reflect this: In March 1962, about only 4 out of 10 of workers 45 to 64 years of age had completed high school, compared to 6 out of 10 of those 35 to 44, and almost 7 out of 10 of those 18 to 44.

While the bill, for the sake of flexibility, permits literacy courses to run for as long as 52 weeks, Commissioner Keppel advised the subcommittee that the normal instruction period will last from 4 to 6 months. Of the $100 million which would be authorized additionally under the bill, it is expected that $50 million will be allocated to the functional illiteracy program provided by the bill, and that 50,000 literacy-deficient unemployed can be trained at that cost.

I turn now briefly to the parts of the bill dealing with youth. The bill would lower from 19 to 16 the age limit for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and it would increase the share of the training cost which may be allocated to youth.

Between January and June of this year a net increase of 400,000 unemployed between 14 and 19 entered the labor force. Only 100,000 of them got jobs. The remaining 300,000 were added to the unemployed. The unemployment rate for teenagers was 18 percent for boys and 19.3 percent for girls, compared to the national average of 5.6 percent.

It is important to note that these are young people looking for work they cannot get; and that of all the unemployed in 1962, 15.6 percent were under 19 years. Yet under the first year of the Manpower Development and Training Act, only 4.3 percent of the first 22,500 workers were under 19.

In making this change, the Senate is not being asked to do anything new. The age limit was brought down to 16 when the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed in 1962. The House raised the age limit, and in conference we accepted the House figure. In passing the pending bill, which I hope the Senate will do, it will be merely going back to the provision of the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Some concern was expressed that the training courses for young people might encourage them to drop out of school in order to receive training with pay. This matter was fully explored by the subcommittee with Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education. We feel that we have eliminated the possibility of young people moving into training courses in order to receive pay for training while completing their education, by providing that before they can qualify they must have been out of school for 3 months of the school year, consecutively. In other words, they cannot quit school during vacation time, for a full 3 months, and then go back to school. They must really have dropped out of school and be bona fide seekers of jobs in the labor force, or they will not qualify under the act.

There was a good deal of discussion as to whether the period should be increased to 6 months in order to further discourage people from dropping out of school in order to take these courses.

It was the consensus of opinion of the large majority of the subcommittee members, based on Dr. Keppel's recommendations, that 3 months was about the right figure. No one can be sure, of course, but that was our view after looking into the subject quite carefully.

The other $50 million authorized under the program would go for the adult training to which I have referred earlier. Therefore, between the adult training for literacy and the expanded youth program, the appropriation requested would be split 50–50. I should point out that when we increase the percentage of the number of youth who can be trained under the bill from the 5 percent presently incorporated in the law to 15 percent, as called for by S. 1831, we are doing more than tripling the number of young people who can be trained. This is because the training allowance for young people under the act cannot exceed $20 a week, and is presently averaging at $17 a week, because it is fixed at one-half of the unemployment compensation payment made in the particular State.

When we triple the percentage of the youths who can be trained, we more than increase the actual number, because the money involved is less for the young people than it is for the older people.

I believe that adequately explains the purpose of the bill. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. In the report I notice the reference to the purpose of the bill—namely, to protect against the possibility of purposeful dropouts from regular school in order to receive the stipends for training proposed under the pending bill. The committee report does not seem to me to spell out in satisfactory detail these safeguards. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania point them out?

Mr. CLARK. On page 2 of the bill is a proviso which stiffens to a certain extent the original proposal of the administration.

It reads as follows:

"Provided, That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than three months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counseling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed."

In addition, the program will train only 50,000 young people a year. The fact is that 36 million youngsters will enter the work force in the 1960's. Among those will be 7½ million school dropouts, at least one-half of whom will be 16 or over. So that between now and the end of 1965 there will be 5½ million new entrants into the working force. Of these 2 million will be school dropouts. With those safeguards in the bill it seemed to the committee, based on the opinions given by Dr. Keppel, Commissioner of Education, and Secretary of Labor Wirtz, that with the 3 months' waiting period and the additional requirements of the Secretary being satisfied, there was very little prospect that a youngster would drop out of school in order to get this money for training allowance, or that the program would be abused.

Mr. GORE. What is the stipend?

Mr. CLARK. It is one-half of the weekly unemployment compensation payment for the State in which the trainee resides.

Mr. GORE. Which on a national average is what?

Mr. CLARK. It is about $17 a week. One could not get rich on that.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 8, it is proposed to insert "who are over 35 years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and" after "persons".

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is agreeable to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I can explain it very briefly. Originally it was my purpose to prevent anyone who had completed or had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education from being eligible for any activity under the so-called literacy program envisaged by the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested that there were probably some people in the country who had had the equivalent of an eighth-grade education but were 35 years of age or over, and therefore perhaps have been unable to keep up on their reading and writing. It seems to me that those people would be very few in number. So with that change in the amendment, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania would be willing to accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would eliminate from the program, if I correctly understand—and I ask the Senator if I do—anyone under 35 years of age who had been through 8 years of school. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. Or had the equivalent of 8 years of school.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont would not apply to older workers—those 35 years of age or over—regardless of how much schooling they had had.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see no serious objection to the amendment. I have polled most of the members of the subcommittee. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On the first page, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the words "functional literacy" and insert in lieu thereof the words "elementary reading, writing and arithmetic".

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is also agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not like the word "elementary." I understood that the amendment would merely refer to "reading, writing, and arithmetic." I would be prepared to accept an amendment to that effect, but when the word "elementary" is added, confusion might result. I hope that the Senator will be willing to withdraw the word "elementary" and make the language read "reading, writing, and arithmetic," in which case I would be happy to accept the amendment.

Terms such as "functional illiteracy" seem like gobbledygook. I like the simpler wording.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the word "elementary" in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the commitee, I accept the modified amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "6".

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would require that in order for a school dropout to be eligible to participate in the training program under the act, he must have been out of school for 6 months continuously during the regular school term. The bill would require a 3-month period for school dropouts. The longer period of 6 months would lessen any incentive which a potential school dropout might have to leave school in order to enter the program.

It seems to me that the last thing we would wish to do under the program would be to encourage any boy or girl to drop out of high school by reason of the fact that he or she would be entitled to an amount up to $20 per week under the allowance program. It is extremely doubtful that a 3-month period would be sufficient to discourage many boys and girls who might have a tendency to or be thinking of leaving school. I think that would be most unfortunate. Dr. Keppel, the Commissioner of Education, expressed some concern about that particular question. He said "We do not know what will happen. If too many drop out, we can change the law."

But I think perhaps the time to do that is now. In its present form, the bill is superior to the act, which does not require any time limitation whatsoever. But I believe that a 6-month period is far more realistic than a 3-month period. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Let the RECORD show that the best judgment of the Commissioner of Education and the best judgment of the Secretary of Labor is that 3 months is a long-enough time to keep school dropouts out of these training courses. No one knows what the right period is. There is no experience. But the professional educators are of the view that it would be wiser to allow a youngster to start retraining if during the school year he had been out of school for 3 continuous months.

Vacation periods are not included. However, this must be in the realm of judgment and of speculation. After having conferred with the members of the subcommittee who are present in the Chamber, I am prepared to take the amendment to conference. Therefore, I will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for accepting the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. After line 17 on page 3, it is proposed to add the following new subsection:

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than 30 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in this section shall be used for training costs, exclusive of training allowances, of projects under title II of this Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment would limit the funds which could be spent for training costs of the projects under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The amendment would place the limitation at 30 percent of the funds appropriated.

The Department, up to the present time, has been operating at this percentage, or relatively close to it. Considering the large authorization which was passed by the Senate on Wednesday, September 4, of this year, the amendment would insure that training costs would not increase merely because there was more money to be spent.

I have a list of obligations by activity, which shows that with respect to the $140 million appropriated by the House for this program the training cost allowance is about 33 percent. I would reduce the percentage to 30, because it seems to me that perhaps administrative expenses and other costs, while the program was getting underway, were somewhat higher than is necessary now.

I think the money should be made available to the trainees, rather than be used to build up a huge administrative staff which is perhaps not necessary.

I point out that this would not be a limitation of dollars, but would be a limitation of a percentage of the appropriations made.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I regret that I must oppose the amendment. The amendment would to some extent put into a legislative straitjacket what ought to be the administrative discretion of the people who operate the program.

The Senator from Vermont has figures which appear to satisfy him that the administrative costs have been running about 33 percent. The figures the staff has made available to me indicate that these costs have been running as high as 40 percent. The Senator proposes to limit those costs to 30 percent.

I point out that it is a misnomer to call these costs administrative costs. We are paying some 40 percent of the money available to the local school districts to create and staff the courses necessary to do the retraining. This purpose of the program is not merely to pay training allowances to the people who are unemployed. In my opinion, that should be incidental. The purpose of the program is to finance, at the local school district level and through on-the-job training, an educational process for these people. To me it would be a grave mistake to put into the act definite cost percentages divided between training allowances and the necessary expenses for teacher's salaries, for the rent of classrooms, and for the buying of textbooks and tools with which training can be given. That is the purpose of the program.

I hope the Senate will not put the administrators into a legislative straitjacket. So far as the record shows, the administrators are doing a first-class job under the terms of the law, during the first year.

The committee will take a careful look at the program, as it has in the past. There will be a report from the Secretary month by month and year by year as to how the costs are divided.

I hope the Senate will exercise a bit of restraint as to writing legislative requirements into the act, and accordingly I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have seen the figures prepared by the staff or by someone downtown—I am not sure where they originate—which tend to justify the Senator's point of view. I have tried without success to determine how those figures were arrived at.

I have figures issued by the Department which indicate the obligations by activity. The estimate for 1964 shows that the training costs will amount to 33 percent. With respect to the appropriation of $140 million passed by the House a short time ago, the estimate indicates that the same figure will be applicable. The revised estimate for 1963 indicates that the costs for training will be 26 percent.

When we consider the $110 million appropriation approved by the Senate, we find that the training costs were 66 percent of the actual allowance payments. That seems rather high. I believe that the figure of 30 percent is adequate. If I can be persuaded later that it is not, I shall be the first to suggest a higher figure.

In view of the facts I have, which I think have not been rebutted to any successful degree, the figure of 30 percent is accurate, realistic, and one which we should require.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that up to now the Department has actually been operating within a 30-percent limitation?

Mr. PROUTY. About 33 percent.

Mr. MILLER. About 33 percent. So it would appear that the Senator's amendment would not curtail or impede the operations of the Department?

Mr. PROUTY. It is not intended to. I am sure it would not.

Mr. MILLER. Why should the Department need to have more flexibility, to go over 30 percent? The Department should be trying to cut down, rather than to increase, the costs.

Mr. PROUTY. As the program expands, they will find it quite possible, if they so desire, to reduce the administrative figure. That includes administration as well as equipment, instruction, and things of that nature. The 30 percent figure is a generous, fair and realistic one. I hope the Senate will see fit to go along with my proposal.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his response. I am inclined to support the amendment, and there should be a yea-and-nay vote on it, so I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 152 Leg.]

Yeas—18

Aiken, Allott, Beall, Byrd, Va., Carlson, Curtis, Dominick, Goldwater, Hruska, Jordan, Idaho, Lausche, McClellan, Miller, Pearson, Prouty, Smith, Thurmond, and Williams, Del.

Nays—49

Bartlett, Bible, Brewster, Byrd, W. Va., Cannon, Case, Church, Clark, Cooper, Douglas, Eastland, Edmondson, Ellender, Ervin, Fong, Gore, and Hart.

Hayden, Hill, Holland, Inouye, Javits, Johnston, Jordan, N.C., Keating, Kennedy, Long, Mo., Magnuson, Mansfield, McCarthy, McGee, Metcalf, Monroney, and Moss.

Muskie, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Ribicoff, Robertson, Russell, Smathers, Stennis, Talmadge, Walters, Williams, N.J., and Young, Ohio.

Not Voting—33

Anderson, Bayh, Bennett, Boggs, Burdick, Cotton, Dirksen, Dodd, Engle, Fulbright, and Gruening.

Hartke, Hickenlooper, Humphrey, Jackson, Kuchel, Long, La., McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, Mechem, and Morse.

Morton, Mundt, Neuberger, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Sparkman, Symington, Tower, Yarborough, and Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with "In" on line 13, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I said on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, the Senate should consider all programs related to the one being considered today; that is, programs involving vocational and educational programs of one kind or another.

I should like to read into the RECORD—and I feel certain I have missed some items—the amount of money which has been either appropriated or authorized or for which requests for authorization have been made in the field of education, manpower retraining, and development.

The Senate has already appropriated $110 million for the manpower development and training program for fiscal 1964. The bill before the Senate, S. 1831, authorizes $100 million for fiscal 1964.

S. 1761, which the Senate passed on Wednesday of this week, authorizes $322 million for fiscal 1965.

S. 1831, the bill the Senate is now considering, authorizes $100 million for fiscal 1965.

That is a total of $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act for fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965.

In addition to this amount, $100 million has been appropriated by the Senate for the Youth Employment Act. The vocational education bill, which is before the Senate at the present time, will appropriate for this year $108 million, and for fiscal 1965, $153 million.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, there is a program involving $4,500,000 for retraining and vocational education.

There is also an additional appropriation or authorization for $15 million for the vocational education; another authorization of $50 million for vocational education.

These items total $1,072,500,000 for the next 2 fiscal years.

Perhaps I should say that I have added $30 million to that figure to conform with the House appropriations for the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that in the next 2 years the Government will be spending $1,072 million under what is known as the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. No; it is $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act. I say it will be spent; that is not completely accurate. That will depend on the amount appropriated. These are amounts which have been authorized or for which authorization is now being sought.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will be $632 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition, $440 million could potentially be spent under other authorizations?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the total amount, from all sources, for retraining would be $1,072 million in the next 2 years?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I do not wish to impose on the time of Senators who already have general knowledge of the outcome of the vote on this amendment.

The information I have, based on this $632 million figure, is that during the fiscal year 1964, 204,000 individuals can come under 1 of the 3 programs envisaged by the Manpower Development and Training Act as the bill proposes to amend it and during the fiscal year 1965, 385,000 will be eligible. That total can be broken down in different ways, but that is the maximum number of those who can be included under the program and under the funds which have been either appropriated or authorized, or for which authorization is sought.

It seems to me it is humanly impossible for the Department to administer a program of this magnitude, inasmuch as it is just barely getting off the ground at the present time. If double the money could be profitably used for this manpower development and training program, I would be willing and happy to vote for it; but all this money is unnecessary. We authorized $322 million last Wednesday. Two days later we are asked to authorize an additional $200 million, which would make a total of $522 million.

None of that money needs to be spent for an illiteracy program. None of it needs to be spent for a youth program. None of it needs to be spent for an adult program. There is no need to spend it for all or for one or two of these programs. So what is proposed today is simply that we add a $200 million authorization to the $322 million authorization we approved last Wednesday. I believe there is no justification for doing this.

I believe my record shows that I am and have been a friend of legislation of this type. I believe we are faced with very serious problems affecting our young people, and our unemployed; and I want to do everything humanly possible to help them. But simply to authorize and, later to appropriate money is not enough. The program must be administered in an effective way. I believe Senators have approached this problem on the basis of faith, hope, and charity. All these are admirable virtues; but we must apply a little analytical judgment, as well.

I am not opposed to the program, but I object very strenuously to authorizing or appropriating about twice as much money as can possibly be spent.

Mr. President, that is about all I have to say. I favor the program; but I am opposed to throwing money away or appropriating more than can possibly be used in an effective manner. In my opinion, the issue before us is as simple as that.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of the time under my control.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if this amendment is agreed to, the number of individuals who can be trained under this program and under the new program provided for in Senate bill 1831 will be cut from 100,000 to 60,000. In other words, if the amendment is adopted, 40,000 of those who now have no employable skills will continue to be unemployed.

The cost of the program is running about $1,000 a trainee. The Senator from Vermont proposes to cut $40 million from the program. Relatively few Americans are functional illiterates; most Americans can do elementary mathematics in their heads. So it is clear that if the authorization is reduced from $100,000,000 to $60,000,000, 40,000 people will be deprived of the benefits of the program. The issue before us is that simple.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that last Wednesday we added $161 million to the program authorization, thus increasing it to $322 million. Now it is proposed that we add $200 million to all that. Certainly the two should have been combined, so that at that time Senators could have known the total which would confront them.

The pending amendment would strike out of the proposed authorization $140 million which is absolutely unnecessary.

The remaining $60 million authorization would be somewhat larger than I think necessary; but I am willing to have that amount authorized, in order to make my amendment more palatable to Senators who otherwise might oppose it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 153 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken, Allott, Beall, Byrd, Va., Carlson, Cooper, Curtis, Dominick, Eastland, Ellender, Goldwater, Hill, Holland, Hruska, Johnston, Jordan, N.C., Jordan, Idaho, Lausche, McClellan, Miller, Pearson, Prouty, Robert-

son, Russell, Smith, Stennis, Talmadge, Thurmond, and Williams, Del.

NAYS—38

Bartlett, Bible, Brewster, Byrd, W. Va., Cannon, Case, Church, Clark, Edmondson, Ervin, Fong, Gore, and Hart.

Hayden, Humphrey, Inouye, Javits, Keating, Kennedy, Long, Mo., Magnuson, McCarthy, McGee, Metcalf, Monroney, and Morse.

Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Proxmire, Randolph, Ribicoff, Smathers, Walters, Williams, N.J., and Young, Ohio.

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson, Bayh, Bennett, Boggs, Burdick, Cotton, Dirksen, Dodd, Douglas, Engle, and Fulbright.

Gruening, Hartke, Hickenlooper, Jackson, Kuchel, Long, La., Mansfield, McGovern, McIntyre, McNamara, and Mechem.

Morton, Mundt, Neuberger, Saltonstall, Scott, Simpson, Sparkman, Symington, Tower, Yarborough, and Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the question of passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken, Bartlett, Beall, Bible, Brewster, Byrd, W. Va., Cannon, Case, Church, Clark, Cooper, Edmondson, Fong, and Gore.

Hart, Hayden, Humphrey, Inouye, Javits, Keating, Kennedy, Long, Mo., Magnuson, McCarthy, McGee, Metcalf, Monroney, and Morse.

Moss, Muskie, Nelson, Pastore, Pell, Prouty, Proxmire, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, Walters, Williams, N.J., and Young, Ohio.

NAYS—26

Allott, Byrd, Va., Curtis, Dominick, Eastland, Ellender, Ervin, Goldwater, Hill, Holland, Hruska, Johnston, Jordan, N.C., Jordan, Idaho, Lausche, McClellan, Miller, Pearson, Robertson, Russell, Smathers, Smith, Stennis, Talmadge, Thurmond, and Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson, Bayh, Bennett, Boggs, Burdick, Carlson, Cotton, Dirksen, Dodd, Douglas, and Engle.

Fulbright, Gruening, Hartke, Hickenlooper, Jackson, Kuchel, Long, La., Mansfield, McGovern, McIntyre, and McNamara.

Mechem, Morton, Mundt, Neuberger, Saltonstall, Simpson, Sparkman, Symington, Tower, Yarborough, and Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 1831) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended by adding at the end of section 202 the following new subsection:

"(h) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the development of reading, writing and arithmetic and basic work skills those eligible persons who are over thirty-five years of age or who have neither completed the eighth grade of school nor otherwise acquired the educational equivalent of the eighth grade of school and who will thereby be able to pursue courses of occupational training, and such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, except that the provisions of subsection (d) of this section shall not apply to the selection of persons under this subsection, and such persons shall be eligible for an additional 52 weeks of training allowances."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "nineteen" and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof, by striking out "5 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 per centum", and by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: *"Provided,* That no training allowance shall be paid to any individual who is under nineteen years of age and has not been graduated from high school unless the Secretary shall have satisfied himself that such individual has continuously failed to attend school classes for a period of not less than 6 months during the regular school session, and that all appropriate procedures (including guidance and counselling by appropriate local authorities) to induce such individual to resume school attendance have failed."

SEC. 3. Section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence, inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: "except that with respect to referrals under subsection (h) of section 202 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the training to be provided under such subsection (h) through other appropriate education agencies".

SEC. 4. Section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "vocational" before the words "education and training".

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 305 is amended by striking out the word "vocational".

SEC. 6. Section 304 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) In addition to the amounts authorized by subsection (b), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 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."

[88th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives, Rept. No. 861]

AMENDMENTS OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

October 18, 1963.—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. 8720]

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

In his message to the Congress on June 19, 1963, President Kennedy suggested several amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, hereinafter referred to as MDTA. These were to—

"Increase the authorization ceiling and to postpone the effective date of State matching requirements * * * to lower the age for training allowances from 19 to 16, to allocate funds for literacy training, and to permit the payment of a higher proportion of the program's training allowances to out-of-school youth, with provisions to assure that no one drops out of school to take advantage of this program."

H.R. 8720 incorporates each of these proposals in modified form: (1) the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 is waived and the act is extended for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; (2) it authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake such training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized; (3) it provides for the expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects; and (4) for these changes one-half of the President's request for new funds, $50 million, is authorized for fiscal 1964 and the full request, $100 million is authorized for fiscal 1965.

H.R. 8720 also incorporates in modified form many of the proposals developed by the Select Subcommittee on Labor under the chairmanship of Congressman Elmer J. Holland after extensive hearings and recommended in its bill, H.R. 8419. Thus (1) it provides for a minor widening of the eligibility requirements for those who can receive training allowances by reducing the work experience requirement from 3 years to 2 years and by permitting payment of an allowance to any one member of a family in training if the head of the family is unemployed; (2) it shifts from the National Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Labor the authority to require, where appropriate, the establishment of local and State advisory committees; (3) it provides for a training incentive of up to $10 a week and permits trainees to engage in part-time work up to 20 hours a week without a reduction in the training allowance; and (4) it authorizes a pilot program for labor mobility demonstration projects limited to a maximum expenditure of $4 million and with authority for this to expire June 30, 1965. Finally, the full committee provided in H.R. 8720 for additional utilization of private training institutions in those cases where the quality is comparable and the cost to the Federal Government is lower.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The record for the first 12 months of operation of MDTA is an unqualified success. It is now clear that the target set by Congress for the 3-year program of approximately 400,000 unemployed workers retrained and placed in productive employment will be achieved.

This success comes at a time when the need for retraining may be growing far beyond the level originally expected. One of the leading makers of automation equipment, John L. Snyder, chairman and president of U.S. Industries, Ltd., testified to the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower on October 3 as follows:

"Last week, before a Senate labor subcommittee, a top productivity expert for the Bureau of Labor Statistics stated that the Department felt that rising productivity—another way of describing automation—would eliminate 200,000 jobs a year, or 4,000 jobs a week.

"Personally, I think this is a gross underestimate of the real situation and that automation is a major factor in eliminating jobs in the United States at the rate of more than 40,000 a week, as previous estimates have put it."

Experience under the act so far demonstrates that three important changes are necessary at this time. First, to sustain the program over a period long enough to permit a fair appraisal, the present State matching requirement has to be postponed for 1 year. Second, the plight of the undereducated unemployed needs more attention and special provision is now made for them. Third, the present provisions for unemployed youth have likewise been improved.

The inadequately trained youth represents the hard-core unemployed of today. The uneducated represents the hard-core unemployed of tomorrow. Without help they have no other prospect than as public charges, currently and in the future. Yet the bulk of these unemployed have the capacity to be helped and can be put on the road to productive employment.

The changes provided in the bill will enable the training of approximately 93,000 additional persons divided equally between youth and adults on an annual basis. For this an increased authorization of $100 million annually is provided. Only half of this amount can be used in the remainder of this fiscal year and for that reason the increase in authorization for fiscal 1964 is $50 million.

Other changes provided by the bill reflect the experience so far with MDTA. With one exception they do not add significantly to the costs of the program. The exception, an improvement in the training allowance, can be absorbed within the existing authorization.

BACKGROUND

This bill fully reflects the findings made after 2 months of public hearings during July and August by the Select Subcommittee on Labor, Congressman Elmer J. Holland, chairman. Full opportunity was provided for all interested persons to be heard and a total of 39 witnesses appeared. Additional statements and material were furnished for the record. These witnesses reflected a wide range of experience with MDTA and most were qualified to appraise the achievements and deficiencies of the program. All levels of government, Federal, State, and local were represented. Others came from advisory committees established under the act, business firms familiar with the program, business organizations, and labor unions.

There was a remarkable consensus, considering the diversity of these spokesmen, to the effect that the program had been launched successfully during its first year despite great obstacles. Moreover, it appears that the goals set by Congress for the 3-year program will be met. Yet witnesses, with one exception, agreed that the full potential of the retraining effort could not be achieved without expansion and modification of the act. They provided supporting evidence of the need for the changes incorporated in the bills before the subcommittee, H.R. 6991, H.R. 7000, and H.R. 7377. They also proposed many additional changes to the subcommittee.

From among these many proposals by those in the best position to judge their validity and need, the committee selected only those having the highest priority in terms of the operation of the current program. Many worthwhile changes accordingly were rejected. This simply reflects a conviction that more experience, or in a word, know-how, is required before these and more novel proposals can be considered.

There was reflected also in the committee choices, general agreement with the philosophy expressed by Dr. George P. Shultz, dean of the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, in a speech to the annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which was furnished for the record. Dr. Shultz commented as follows:

"In looking to the future, then, we must recognize that a great many employers find it in their interest to provide training for their employees and we can infer that such training will help those in the median age ranges and with higher educational attainments to acquire specific skills. Many more employees will receive job training this way than through any governmental program, however grandly conceived. Yet the role of the Government program is a vital one. It should help those who fall outside the natural scope of private efforts. In so doing the Government takes on the toughest problems—but these are just the problems that would otherwise be neglected. The Government program, then, should be conceived not as massive and general, but as directed to special objectives derived from inadequate formal education and the residue of displacement left from a changing economy. The unskilled and the unschooled are most in need of help and least likely to get it from the present array of Government training programs."

The committee is aware some question may be raised as to the relationship of MDTA to the Vocational Educational Act of 1963. That there may be an overlap is apparent only under superficial examination. Historically, vocational education has been available throughout the country for many years. But it had little impact upon training of the displaced unemployed for the simple reason that no adequate means were available to maintain the financial support needed by a breadwinner for his family during the period needed to complete his training. The act passed by the Congress last year was primarily to plug this void. Some 60 percent of its appropriations is spent for training allowances alone. It covers training costs, but normally these are costs of special courses set up for full-time training outside the normal operations of vocational education. Moreover, new or expanded vocational training facilities cannot be provided under MDTA. Therefore, sums spent on vocational education are complementary to the program here under consideration, since additional facilities provide more opportunity for meeting effectively the training needs of the unemployed under MDTA.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

EXPLANATION AND NEED

A. Postponement of effective date of State matching requirement and extension of the act

MDTA provides for 100-percent Federal financing during the first 2 fiscal years and for 50-percent State matching of funds during the third fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1964. Continuation of any training program in any State after June 30, 1964, therefore depends on whether the State assumes 50 percent of the training costs.

Twenty-nine of the State legislatures meet biennially in the odd-numbered years. For that reason it was necessary for them to authorize matching funds during their recent 1963 sessions if they were to meet the June 30, 1964, deadline.

Only four[1] of these States enacted the necessary authorization. The 25[2] legislatures which took no action probably will not reconvene until January 1965. Even those meeting in January 1964 will not be able to act in time to prevent a serious decline in the program. On this issue Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz testified as follows on July 8:

"Beginning right now, however, any training program of 52 weeks will run into the next fiscal year and right up again to the matching requirement. Each succeeding week that goes by from now on cuts another week from the length of the training programs that can be approved without running into the matching requirement period.

"Because of the long leadtime involved in developing and approving training projects, as well as the length of many of the important courses, I must point out that the entire training program will begin to taper off early in this fiscal year in the absence of assured continuity of Federal financing.

"To be forced deliberately to slow down a program which has gotten off to a flying start would be a tragic waste—and more important, a tragic elimination of a new hope and a new opportunity for thousands of jobless workers."

These facts are incontestable, and events since July have validated Secretary Wirtz' dire forecast. The reasons for State inaction likewise seem understandable. Nothing in the record developed by the subcommittee would indicate that the States lack interest in the program, have doubts as to its value, or consider the costs to be too high. Instead, consider these facts: because of delays in the granting of appropriations the program did not begin until September 1962. By then the budgets to be presented to legislatures, meeting in January 1963 were in their final stages of preparation. In 10 of the 29 States with biennial legislative sessions in 1963, no MDTA training of any kind was underway in the late fall. In the remaining 19 States only 63 MDTA projects involving less than 2,400 trainees had begun by late autumn. Obviously, experience permitting a valid assessment of the worth of the program, was entirely lacking. Further it should be noted that the average training program extends for 22 weeks. Thus it was nearly mid-1963 before the early results were in. The increasing momentum of the program was not achieved until near the end of the second quarter of 1963. Full appraisal of the results in all areas of the country will not be possible until the end of 1963.

Consequently the committee has become convinced that full Federal financing for 1 more year is most urgently required. To do otherwise means the certain elimination of the program precisely at the time when graduates are beginning to emerge from training courses in sufficient numbers to provide the opportunity for a fair appraisal of the program. Having invested so much time, energy, and money so far, without being willing to continue long enough for a fair test, would be a high tragedy.

Approximately 60,000 unemployed entered training during the first fiscal year. Currently, training is proceeding at the rate of 108,000 trainees per year. Training capacity and accompanying knowledge is sufficient to provide confidence in our ability to train over 200,000 during the third year of the program. Thus the original goal set by Congress of approximately 400,000 unemployed retrained within the 3-year period now appears to be realistically in sight.

For this purpose a total authorization of $161 million for title II for the third year was provided. But to achieve this training goal State matching for an equal amount was contemplated. Therefore, if State matching is postponed, as proposed by this bill, provision must be made for the assumption of the States share during the third year. This is provided by the bill.

However, in the opinion of the committee Congress should at this time clearly preserve and reinforce the principle of State matching in MDTA. Therefore, simple waiver of the third year matching by States is not accepted. There is no disagreement with the fundamental soundness of the concept of shared financial responsibilities. Manpower development and training involves both national and local responsibilities. The unemployed reside in the localities. This is where job opportunities in the main are to be found. Only local agencies are in a position to determine these opportunities and provide, through training, for the matching of the worker and the job. Witness after witness when questioned confirmed the necessity for State financial support. Few were prepared to argue for full Federal responsibility. To most, State support seemed essential if the program is to be both effective and efficient. The committee, therefore, reaffirms its continued adherence to the principle of State matching.

The present bill is designed to make this possible. By extending the act for 2 additional years and providing for State matching of one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967 the committee believes a realistic proposal is provided. Waiving the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 will provide sufficient experience with the program so that the Federal and

[1] Connecticut, Kansas, Montana, and Tennessee.

[2] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hamsphire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

State Governments can evaluate the results. If these prove to be favorable, the States will have sufficient time to act to provide for the continuation of the program. Moreover, the pressure on the financial position of the States is lessened since the stepup to the original level of 50 percent contemplated is spread over 2 years.

In making this proposal the committee is aware that its intentions can be misinterpreted. It should be understood that at no time during the deliberations of the subcommittee and full committee was there any consideration given to the possibility of full Federal financing. Instead of the commitment to State matching was accepted without question. There remained only the problem of devising a realistic means of achieving this goal. This, the committee believes, is provided by the bill. Therefore, it should be explicitly understood by all concerned that the committee has given full consideration to possible contingencies and cannot foresee any circumstances arising that would require further modifications in the State matching requirements.

B. The youth training program

The bill proposes changes designed to strengthen and broaden the youth training program. The enthusiastic response to the youth training program and its demonstrated potential in meeting the serious youth unemployment problem have convinced the committee that the program should be expanded.

From May 1962–63, the number of workers in the labor force increased by 1.2 million but only 900,000 new jobs were available. There was a resultant increase in unemployment of 300,000. Nearly the entire impact of this rise in joblessness was felt by the 16 to 19 year old youth in the labor market. Their unemployment rate rose to over 20 percent, approximately four times the rate of the adult labor force.

The record of youth unemployment for recent years during the month of October is presented in the following table:

TABLE 1.—UNEMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS 16 TO 21 YEARS OLD, NOT ENROLLED IN SCHOOL, BY AGE AND SEX, OCTOBER 1959–62 [1]

Age and sex	Number unemployed (in thousands)				Unemployment rate [2]			
	1962	1961	1960	1959	1962	1961	1960	1959
Both sexes, total, 16 to 21 years	601	708	652	607	11.4	13.5	12.7	12.9
16 and 17 years	84	118	117	121	16.8	20.9	18.6	21.4
18 and 19 years	277	340	315	279	12.6	14.9	14.8	14.2
20 and 21 years	240	250	220	207	9.4	10.5	9.3	9.5

[1] "Special Labor Force Rept. No. 34," U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
[2] Percent of civilian labor force who were unemployed.

This record for the month of October is most relevant as it does not include youths seeking work during the summer vacation period. For October 1962, these youths, 16 to 21 years old and out of school, comprised only 7 percent of the labor force. Those who were jobless, however, accounted for 18 percent of the unemployed. It should be noted that these facts understate the true magnitude of the problem. Among boys 16 to 17 years old who have left school, only three out of four were working or seeking work. Hence there are tens of thousands of youths who are excluded from the official unemployment statistics presented above who are out of work and not in school.

This situation is certain to grow worse in the near future. The postwar baby crop is now beginning to reach working age. One million more young people will have become 16 in 1963 than reached that age in 1962. Although a steadily increasing proportion of young people have graduated from high school in the last 30 years at the same time changing technology is eliminating, at a faster pace, the unskilled jobs which traditionally provided work opportunity to those not completing their education. More than 5½ million new young workers will be seeking work between now and the end of 1965. Among these will be approximately 2 million school dropouts.

Three-fourths of all school dropouts in 1962 were 16 to 17 years old. Age 16 is the most common age for leaving school. Among nonwhites the rate is disproportionately high. In 1962, 57 percent of the nonwhite youth, 20 to 24 years of age, were dropouts. Yet, the corresponding rate for white youths of 28 percent is also too high. It is alarmingly true, as Secretary Wirtz has observed, that the dropout in our present society is committing economic suicide. The committee hopes that other programs will in time reduce the dropout rate to manageable proportions. In the meantime the Nation faces a current problem of crisis proportions. Dr. Conant has aptly characterized the present situation as social dynamite.

The Chief Executive in his message of June 19, 1963, followed the recommendation of the President's Committee on Youth Employment in its report of April 1963 and proposed lowering the age limit for training allowances to 16, subject to reasonable precautions to avoid the allowances becoming an incentive for those in school to dropout.

The record demonstrates that training allowances are essential to certain disadvantaged youths if they are to enter training programs. Those who have dropped out of school did so for reasons not necessarily related to their intellectual potential. Frequently, they come from a severely impoverished environment which has corroded their motivation. For this limited group the training allowance becomes essential to an effective training program. Lacking financial resources, these youths do not have access to the minimum sums required for carfare, food, and clothing and other expenses incurred during the training period. Moreover, the training allowance provides a favorable stimulus that can develop and sustain the interest required for successful training.

In the current program, Congress restricted training allowances to youth ages 19 to 22, and further restricted the proportion of the funds that could be used for such purposes to 5 percent of the total. Based on experience thus far this 5-percent limitation can be usefully raised.

Given these facts and in the light of the experiences so far encountered, the bill provides for urgently needed expansion of training provisions for out-of-school and out-of-work youth. It does this by reducing the age limit for use of the youth training allowance from 19 to 17. In proposing this change, the committee has recognized the necessity for developing safeguards to prevent any encouragement to youths to drop out of school so as to enroll in the training program, as follows:

First, at least 1 year must elapse before the school dropout becomes eligible for the training allowance, Second, the bill requires that local authorities are to use all appropriate procedures to secure a return of the youth to school and only after these have failed will the youth be eligible.

The committee is well aware of the fact that nearly every witness in the hearings supported the reduction of the age limitation to 16 and a waiting period for the dropout of from 3 to 6 months. It should be emphasized, however, that there is no waiting period for training itself. The waiting period applies only to eligibility for training allowances. The committee further recognizes the concern expressed by those currently working on youth projects over the possibility that a longer waiting period may contribute to the development of juvenile delinquency, thereby making more difficult subsequent training of the youth. Offsetting these possible dangers, in the committee's view, are the advantages that may be gained with a longer waiting period in terms of demonstrating to the youth the need for additional training if he is to qualify for meaningful job opportunities. Since most dropouts occur at age 16, the provision of a 1-year waiting period will make them eligible for training allowances at the new minimum age limit of 17.

The bill further provides for a change in the present ceiling of 5 percent of total funds for youth training allowances to a figure of 25 percent of the total trainees receiving allowances. The shift from a percentage of funds to the number of trainees provides for a simpler method of allocation. The 25-percent figure will permit approximately the same number of trainees as that contemplated by the President's proposal for a figure of 15 percent of total training allowance funds.

The President further proposed that $50 million additional funds be authorized annually so as to provide for the expansion in the youth training program. This additional money, which the committee recommends, would support an increase in the number of youth trainees from the approximate 10,000 at present to a rate of nearly 60,000 for the end of the current fiscal year. It is a point of outstanding significance, however, that this substantial increase will provide training for about 10 percent of the out-of-school and out-of-work youth.

Further, it should be noted the use of training allowances is restricted to those youth "who require such training allowance in order to undertake training," and "who are referred for training in accordance with section 202(b)." Section 2(b) of the bill contains the language of new section 202(b) of the act referred to above. This merely clarifies the authority already given to the Secretary to provide a special program for the testing, counseling and selection of youths by addition of the word "referral" and by specifying that the youths for whom this special program shall be provided are those "who because of inadequate educational background and work preparation are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without such training and schooling."

Recognition is thereby given to the broad differences existing among the unemployed youth. Those most seriously impoverished require special treatment if the training effort is to succeed. For them counseling must be enriched and made more extensive. Deficiencies must be analyzed and then corrected. Other developmental work in the area of basic work skills may be necessary prior to specific occupational training. These youth simply are not ready for, nor could they adjust successfully to, the more standardized occupational training programs. For them special tailormade programs are essential if the objective of successful employment is to be achieved. Since their needs are diverse and no single pattern will fit them all, maximum flexibility in approach, as authorized in this bill, is essential.

Other youth, less severely disadvantaged, can and do enroll in regular occupational training programs established under MDTA. Administrative convenience may at times produce separate classes of youth and adults

preparing for a particular occupation. Yet no fundamental changes in content or approach are thereby required. In these cases, the committee is convinced that provision for a training allowance to the youth is not required. Their position in this respect is similar to that of the unrelated and unemployed adults for whom training opportunities only are provided.

The training allowance, in other words, is not automatically available to every trainee. The committee continues to support the original philosophy of the act which was reflected in the provision of a training allowance for those whose need was greatest. One example is adults with family responsibilities. Similarly the committee recognizes the need for the use of a training allowance in those cases where training might not otherwise be feasible such as the undereducated and disadvantaged youths.

It should be noted that the distinctions outlined above conform to the general practice of the Secretary of Labor under the act. Training allowances are already restricted to those youth for whom special programs are necessary. Hence no major shift in policy is required. It is expected, however, that effort may have to be directed to the question of providing in practice for meaningful and careful distinction of the special and regular programs required by this bill.

C. Basic education provision

Certainly one of the principal expectations of Congress at the time MDTA was passed, was that hard-core unemployed could be salvaged and returned to productive employment. Yet, when available job opportunities are discovered and the necessary training program devised, the vast majority of the unemployed cannot pass entrance examinations. In fact, large numbers cannot even be tested since they are unable to read or write. The original act was written carefully to insure that only those with a reasonable expectation of success would be accepted for training. Nationally, only one in eight of the unemployed have qualified. The chairman of the Indiana Manpower Advisory Committee, Mr. Franklin D. Schurz, provided testimony regarding a survey in South Bend, Ind., which revealed that 60 percent of the unemployed in that area could not qualify for projected training courses because of inadequate educational attainment.

The problem is illustrated very clearly by the figures given to the committee on the educational attainment of the unemployed. Twenty percent, or 800,000, have not completed the eighth grade in school. Another 16 percent, 640,000, have only an eighth grade education.

Three percent of MDTA trainees so far have come from among those with less than an eighth grade education. In the opinion of the committee the success of the retraining program at higher levels has demonstrated that we can now focus effectively on the even harder "hard core" of unemployed. These are the least educated and least usable workers in today's world. Without opportunity this group is predictably doomed to a lifetime of joblessness and dependence upon public assistance.

Mr. Raymond M. Hilliard, the director of Cook County Department of Public Aid in Illinois, has calculated the probable cost to society of such continued dependency to be in the neighborhood of $30,000 for a single individual. If they can be salvaged at a moderate cost of $1,200 to $1,500 the financial saving to society alone can be significant.

The central question is whether this group is potentially employable. On this question the evidence is overwhelmingly yes, provided we are willing to eliminate the educational deficiencies preventing their training. Cook County, under Mr. Hilliard's direction, has pioneered in this effort. By the end of the year, according to his testimony, they expect to have a 20,000 able-bodied and potentially employable welfare recipients in basic education training. That this program is working was amply demonstrated in the evidence Mr. Hilliard presented to the subcommittee. A brief excerpt provides some examples:

"In carrying out this program, I have witnessed some deeply moving scenes. I think of a boy who brought his father for the first night and who helps him with his homework and also of the 50-year-old man writing his name for the first time and then writing it over and over again. Or there is the father of 13 who dropped out of school 38 years ago in the third grade and who entered our literacy program, and in the space of 5 months raised himself or was lifted to a point where he passed an eighth grade examination and was awarded his elementary school diploma. On his graduation night, he remarked, "No kid of mine will ever drop out of school." He now has a good job and is also attending high school where in night classes he hopes to get a diploma in 2 years.

"This new program has, for the first time, brought hope to these people and this new hope is education itself. In Chicago, we have seen the new light of hope radiate from the faces of our welfare recipients. I wish that members of this committee had been with me to attend a recent graduation of 211 adults from the eighth grade and had seen the face of each, beaming with pride, illuminated with hope, as he or she received an elementary school certificate. I wish that you could have been with me to see 25 men go off relief in a body at a graduation exercise of a class where they had learned to become Yellow Taxi drivers; 266 former recipients have now received this training and 215 are currently employed. Many of these men were able to qualify because they had been taught to read and to write in our basic literacy classes and, as a result, they could make out trip sheets, write receipts and reports and read street signs."

Similar findings have emerged from special or demonstration projects which were designed to test the feasibility of training for illiterate and semi-illiterate adults. One of the most important of these experiments is underway at Virginia State College. Ninety men past the age of 25, including among them 50 who had exhausted their unemployment compensation and who could not have qualified for normal training, were placed in a special MDTA program. Because of inadequate education it was found that they would need a full year's training. A combined program was provided enabling these men to improve their educational skills while they were learning the job skills required to become electronic technicians, brick masons, automobile mechanics, sheet metal workers, and building maintenance men. Within 6 months those of the group, 40 percent, who had less than 7 years of schooling had averaged a gain of almost 2 school years in reading ability.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BASIC EDUCATION TRAINING

The bill proposes to provide greater opportunity for those now excluded from training by extending the period for which training allowances can be provided for another 20 weeks. Only those who cannot enter any occupational training because of inadequate education will be eligible for this additional training. The purpose of the provision is to make possible the development of the basic education skills which are required if a person is to qualify and benefit from any occupational training. It is expected that in the usual case this will involve special training in the general area of reading, writing, language skills, and arithmetic. The committee believes additional restrictions are unnecessary since the term "basic" can in the context of a training program be readily distinguished from advanced work to the extent the latter is found necessary, it qualifies more appropriately within the present provisions for occupational training. Those to whom the proposed provision applies face the quite different problem of developing their educational pretraining skills to the level required for entry into any occupational training. With this objective of the amendment establishing the distinction between the purpose and nature of basic education skills and those which are part of occupational training, the committee believes there will be little difficulty in practice in determining the precise content of the basic educational program which may need to be provided for a particular group of trainees.

Moreover, the proposal provides for necessary flexibility so that a wide range of possible combinations can be utilized. Committee members were impressed during the hearings with the success that has been achieved at Virginia State College in a program providing for simultaneous education and skill training. But there may be other situations where more success could be achieved by having the education training precede occupational training. No attempt was made by the committee to prejudge this question since it is possible either approach may work in some situation but not in others. Where the education training precedes occupational training, however, the bill provides that those referred must indicate their intention to subsequently enter occupational training. In these cases, too, it is provided that precise determination of occupational objective need not be made before the educational training begins, provided the Secretary has reasonable assurance that the level of educational training achieved will permit the trainee to enter occupational training of a type for which reasonable expectations of employment exist. The same test applied to other trainees remains, therefore, but unnecessary rigidities are avoided.

For the same reasons that flexible combinations of training are permitted, the bill also permits flexible use of the time permitted for training. The extended period of training permitted for this group simply recognizes that more time is required if they are to be made employable through basic education added to occupational training. How it is to be used can only be determined by those who are most familiar with the needs of the group to be trained and the requirements of the ultimate job situation. For some a few weeks of basic education training, followed by 15 to 20 weeks of occupational training may be sufficient. Others may require 7 or 8 months of basic education before a similar period of occupational training.

For this expanded program the President recommended an appropriation of $50 million on an annual basis and this is recommended by the committee. It is estimated that these funds will permit the training of 47,000 annually.

D. Training allowance

Section 3 of the bill provides for some needed adjustments in the training allowance provisions of MDTA. The necessity for these was amply demonstrated by witnesses during the hearings. The present level discourages many unemployed from undergoing training and is not sufficient to retain those who enter training if the opportunity for even a casual job arises while in training. Most trainees have family responsibilities. Normally having experienced a period of unemployment before entering training they cannot be expected to have sufficient resources available to support themselves and their families while in training. Moreover, the training itself imposes additional costs that would not otherwise be encountered in the form of transportation, food away from home, clothing, and incidentals. Those with

sufficient motivation to undergo the burdens of training ought not to be impeded or penalized by being placed in a worse position, as a result of such extra costs, than if they had remained on unemployment compensation. Therefore, to provide in part for those costs which are a practical necessity and thus reinforce the incentive to enter training, the Secretary is authorized to pay a training bonus of up to $10 a week over the current average level of unemployment compensation for the State. It should be emphasized that it is the committee's intent that up to $10 in excess of the average unemployment benefit is to be paid only where the training allowance is so low that it is jeopardizing the ability of the individual to maintain training.

In addition trainees are permitted by the bill to engage in nominal part-time work up to 20 hours a week without a reduction in the training allowance. Beyond that amount the hourly earnings for the excess hours will be deducted from the training allowance. The purpose of this provision is to provide a flexible offset rather than a penalty for initiative. As a by-product this will reduce some of the pressure on trainees to drop out whenever part-time work becomes available. The resultant saving to themselves and to the government should be signficant.

E. Advisory committees

Section 5 of the bill provides for changes in the present provisions of the bill. Presently the National Advisory Committee is given the authority to encourage and assist in the organization of these committees. Yet, this body which meets twice a year is hardly in a position to exercise this authority. As a result, only limited development has occurred. Wherever such committees are established, as demonstrated by testimony from the members of such bodies to the subcommittee, their contributions to the scope and success of the program has been impressive. Knowledgeable individuals representative of various sectors of the economy, serving in a volunteer capacity, are the best guarantee of both a wise and efficient utilization of the funds provided for MDTA. Therefore, the committee has become convinced that such bodies should be established at the local and State or regional level wherever appropriate and their advice sought before projects are approved. Authority for this is, therefore, transferred to the Secretary of Labor since this fits in with and is necessary to the discharge of his other operating responsibilities. While the Secretary is directed to establish such advisory committees it is recognized there might be situations such as rural areas and small towns where establishing such a committee would be difficult and serve no useful purpose. Therefore, such committees are not required if in the Secretary's opinion they are not appropriate. Even here, however, it is expected that at some higher level an appropriate and representative advisory committee would be established and could thereby be called upon for advice on the projects being developed.

F. Labor mobility demonstration projects

Section 5 of the bill provides authority for a pilot program of limited experimental work with relocation allowances and loans for the period ending June 30, 1965. For this purpose 2 percent of the appropriated funds of $4 million, whichever is less, is provided.

At the time of the original formulation of MDTA, proposals for relocation allowances received strong support before the committee. Without experience to provide guides, the committee ultimately concluded it would be premature to provide this authority. In the recent hearings on amendments to MDTA support for this authority in one form or another was overwhelming. Only one witness was opposed. As is well known, several European countries have found the provision for relocation allowances to be a vital element in overall manpower programs. And academic experts seem to agree that similar provisions are adaptable to the American environment and would be of great value. Given this virtual unanimity of opinion and informed judgment, the committee believes limited authority to conduct experimental work should be provided. From this experience it can then be determined whether this assistance should be provided on a wider basis. If it should be decided to provide such authority, the experience permitted by this will provide the guidelines this committee will require in developing its legislative recommendations.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

A. The preamble

Section 1 of the bill provides for the insertion in the preamble after the words "sought out and trained" the words "as quickly as is reasonably possible" and the insertion after "afforded to these people" the words "with the least delay." Though the committee was satisfied with the achievements of those administering the program it was also impressed by the evidence presented by some witnesses regarding delays, obstructions, and confusion. Perfectly valid explanations may be provided and the instances may well be the isolated cases to be expected in a new program. Nevertheless, the change will serve as a reminder of the intention of Congress that this program be given a high priority. Therefore, it is to be expected that the respective Secretaries will maintain strict overall control of the direction, guidance, and policy of the program in order to insure as rapid progress as can be provided. Finally it is the committee's strong desire that a greater need for urgency be impressed upon all personnel connected with the program.

B. Reduction in eligibility requirements

Section 3, subsection (b), provides for some modest changes in the eligibility requirements. First, the present requirement for 3 years' work experience is reduced to 2. Relatively few individuals will be affected. Second, the head of household provision is modified to the extent of permitting a member of the family, where the head is unemployed, to receive a training allowance. Only one person in the family group will be permitted to receive an allowance at any one time. Again, relatively few individuals will be affected.

C. Reports

Section 9 of the bill provides for a change in the due date of the reports to Congress by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The additional reports result from the extension of the MDTA provided by the bill. The committee believes they are essential to its continuing responsibility for appraising the results of a major new program such as this. The purpose of the change in the due date, by 1 month, is to prevent repetition of the experience wherein there is conflict in date between the preparation of the required report to the President and subsequent report of the President to Congress and the entirely different reports required of the Secretaries.

D. Private training institutions

Section 6(b) of the bill liberalizes the provision relating to the use of private training institutions. It should be noted that there are many private institutions with excellent reputations that have stood the test of time. With facilities in being and trained personnel on hand most are in a position to provide immediate training of the type required by the program. Yet, despite congressional expectations, they have not been used widely. Two factors produced this result. The present language read literally appears to exclude their use except in the extremity of absence or inadequacy of public facilities. Hence, many private institutions have not offered the use of their facilities. Second, many States have reinforced this literal impression of the language thereby further discouraging the use of private institutions.

To remedy this situation the bill substitutes for the present language criteria to govern the use of private institutions. Specifically, States are authorized to contract with private institutions whenever "such institutions can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures."

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare retains overall supervisorial responsibilities and can be expected to prevent any abuses in the exercise of this added authority. Thus the present MDTA provides in section 231 among other things for "continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement (with the State) to insure the quality of an 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." Under this authority the Secretary can develop further the principle of cost competitiveness between public and private institutions provided by the bill and develop the controls required to insure compliance with the criterion of comparable quality.

COSTS

Section 7, subsection (b), provides for increased authorizations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 and new authorization for the extension of the MDTA through fiscal year 1967. To expand the program along the lines suggested by the President and to provide thereby for the training of an additional 93,000 youths and adults, additional annual authorizations of $100 million is provided. Since full utilization of this new authority cannot be reached in the current fiscal year only one-half of this amount or $50 million is authorized.

The increase in the training allowance, in the event the full program contemplated by the MDTA is reached, is estimated to involve costs of from $35 to $40 million. The committee does not believe it is necessary to increase the authorization to provide for these costs and expects that this amount can be absorbed within the existing authorization. Moreover, other additional changes provided by the bill will either involve no costs or be so modest as to be readily absorbed within the existing authorization.

For fiscal year 1965, as previously noted, an increase in the authorization of $161 million is required as a consequence of the postponement for State matching for 1 year. Therefore, the total authorization for fiscal year 1965 will be increased to $422 million. In the 2-year extension it is expected the program will be maintained at the level achieved in fiscal year 1965. With the new State matching provisions, however, the Federal authorization is reduced to $281 million in fiscal year 1966 and to $211 million in fiscal year 1967.

Only changes in the authorization for title II as noted above are provided. Existing annual authorizations for title I and title III are continued unchanged.

OTHER COMMITTEE FINDINGS

Various other problems were brought to the attention of the subcommittee by witnesses. None of these appeared sufficiently widespread or so severe as to require amendments to MDTA at this time in the opinion of the committee. Rather they reflected misinterpretations of MDTA or presented problems for which administrative solutions are readily available. Though legislative action is not required, in fairness to these witnesses some explanation on the following points is deemed desirable.

A. Reasonable expectations of employment

The present MDTA requires (sec. 202(d)) that this test be met before a person is

selected for training in an occupation. The principle is obviously sound as the objective of training is employment, not training. In practice, however, some problems have been encountered. Representatives of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, for example, contended local authorities were requiring employment commitments from local employers before approving a training project. To the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce this practice appears so rigid as to be self-defeating and rightly so. Here is but one instance of the effort by Congress to provide for maximum flexibility in MDTA. The term "reasonable" is nowhere defined. Yet, common usage and the deliberate choice of the word would suggest that Congress had in mind emphasizing the need for securing relevant information and the exercise of careful judgment. By no means can the word be stretched entirely from its normal meaning to imply certainty.

In addition the nature of a training program requiring leadtime and plans made months in advance must proceed at a steady pace. The valleys of the business cycle, which inevitably contract employment opportunities, must not impose short-run restrictions on training activities necessarily related to long-term considerations.

"Reasonable" must also be interpreted differently depending on the circumstances. Thus to make this determination initially for a particular occupation may require an employer survey. For subsequent projects, experience may be a sufficient guide. In other instances, a general skill survey will suffice. In still others, evidence developed from national sources or even comparable localities may be sufficient. Moreover, with developing experience, it should be possible for the Secretary to determine the kind of skill development for which training is to be provided. This will permit a partial reversal of the process, as some witnesses urged, so that the unemployed can be tested and counseled in order to determine their potential. With this information in hand those training courses best suited to their abilities and interests, but for which there is a reasonable expectation of employment, can be provided. In all cases, the wide knowledge of the informed individuals brought together on an advisory committee (otherwise provided for by H.R. 8720) can be tapped to determine information needs and to appraise the results.

Finally, we must reemphasize the role of judgment in the process. To rely on judgment, even expert judgment, requires candid recognition of possible errors. This risk can be reduced through experience but not entirely avoided. On the other hand endeavoring to reduce or eliminate the need for judgment in an effort to avoid error can only have the result of raising costs prohibitively through more and more information gathering. The resultant slowdown in the pace of the program may make it ineffectual. Obviously a balance between these risks is required and securing such a balance returns us full circle to the concept of "reasonable" once more. There can be no other test if the challenge is to be met with imagination and dispatch.

B. Occupational training

Some difficulties concerning the meaning of occupational training have been brought to the attention of the committee. Very rigid and narrow interpretations were applied in many areas during the early stages of the program. Most of these issues have now been resolved by the recent policy statement of the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It should now be clear that the training program need not be limited to the traditional curriculum developed for a particular occupational training program. Since the objective of the program is to enable the unemployed to acquire the skills and knowledge needed for available jobs, success in this effort requires a careful appraisal of their full training needs. Therefore, if some accompanying "academic" work is required as part of the skill needed to qualify for a job, then inclusion of such work in the training program is entirely in order. For the unemployed, occupational training cannot and must not be defined in such a way as to exclude such related instruction. With sufficient administrative flexibility these needs, if they cannot be met by a particular training institution, can be provided by contracts with related educational institutions.

Individual needs of trainees in a particular program may well vary. The standard program normally requires 30 hours of training a week. This can be tailor made to fit the common needs of the trainees and the occupation. With ingenuity additional individual needs may be met by utilization of existing educational programs through referral of the trainee.

While we believe "occupational training" embraces necessary related "academic" instruction, we also believe there are some limits that should be observed. Thus to take an extreme example we are convinced "occupational" does not embrace "professional" or a "pre-professional" training. Normally professional training requires college and postgraduate education. Certainly we could expect to find some valid cases of the need for and the potential of retraining at this level. Yet such needs, if they exist, lie outside the confines of the present act.

Finally it should be noted that the administration proposed to permit training programs imparting "basic work skills." These were described by Secretary Wirtz as "skills or techniques which by themselves do not qualify a person for a specific occupation but constitute integral parts of the knowledge necessary to proper performance." These were further described as "those skills that are common and necessary parts of a whole range of occupations but do not themselves constitute a specific occupation." The committee accepts and indeed urges the necessity of such training. However, in the committee's view no change in the present language is required. Within the context of the act, occupational training as noted earlier, necessarily is "tailormade" training. Specific training for a particular occupation is the central ingredient. But any additional knowledge required to make this training effective, so that employable graduates are produced, is to be encouraged. In connection with the special youth programs this broader interpretation is especially relevant.

C. Local and State priority in training

The present act (sec. 202(b)) requires that priority for training be extended to persons to be trained for skills needed, first, with the labor market area in which they reside, and second, with the State of their residence. Many witnesses contended this provision should be deleted in its entirety. It was argued this had prevented the training of persons in skills that are in short supply nationally but for which no local need could be demonstrated. Some asserted this had prevented the training of persons in an area bordering on a neighboring State for jobs available in that State.

Little of consequence would attend such a change. In practice these priorities could be expected to be observed since local agencies and advisory committees would have these preferences. More important the change is not necessary. The present language speaks only of two priorities. Other training possibilities are not thereby excluded. Thus, it is possible for a local area, unable to find job opportunities for its unemployed locally or within the State to train persons for jobs elsewhere. The only restriction would be the requirement in section 202(d) that the trainee evidence a willingness to move outside his area of residence in order to accept employment.

D. Apprenticeship needs

Some witnesses, noting the declining numbers of apprentices and the fact that a minimal amount, probably 10 percent, of our skill needs in the apprenticeable occupations are being met, urged greater attention to this area. Some promising experimental work with preapprenticeship training courses is already underway. These projects may increase the number of apprentices.

What seems to be required, however, if we are to make progress, is careful study over an extended period by all groups concerned with this area. In the opinion of the committee it would be appropriate for the National Advisory Committee to establish a representative study panel. This panel could be given the responsibility for preparing recommendations to the National Advisory Committee. This is in line with evolving practice since the National Advisory Committee has begun to establish panels with similarly assigned responsibilities for defined problem areas. The work of these study panels provides the basis for the proper exercise of the responsibility of the National Advisory Committee to "make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act."

E. On-the-job training

This phase of training received considerable attention during the hearings. In part this interest reflected the original expectations when the act was adopted envisioning mended that a subsequent manpower report a sizable role for this type of training. These hopes have not materialized. For this situation a number of explanations might be offered. Most compelling, however, is the fact that this program was delayed. The operating procedures had been announced shortly lative appraisal would not be fruitful at this before the hearings began. Without more experience to go on, it was concluded that legistime. In view of the continuing interest of so many witnesses in this subject, it is recomof the President include a thorough review of this area. Once the problems and accomplishments have been documented legislative appraisal may be in order.

F. Local and State planning needs

Universally those connected with the local operating agencies expressed concern over the present system of allocating money only after a program is approved. Exploratory investigation and other developmental work is not reimbursed unless success in the form of project approval is achieved. Knowing this, local authorities hesitate to venture too far from proven paths. Hence an unknown amount of opportunities remain untapped. The committee has been reassured that these complaints are partially groundless and that in any event budget planning has been revised so as to provide solutions. To the extent this proves to be true it will be welcome to all concerned. Nevertheless the existence of such complaints suggest that continuing attention to these matters is required if the imagination and spirit of experimentation so essential to success is not to be inhibited.

G. Administrative relationships

The complex nature of the training task required an equally complex set of administrative arrangements. Separate but interrelated responsibilities were assigned to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Operating responsibilities in turn are assigned to local and State agencies in the employment and education fields. Admittedly the task of insuring efficient and fruitful working relationships is a difficult one. Indeed it is remarkable that so few problems have arisen. Those witnesses most familiar with the actual operations were most complimentary regarding the fine working relationships that have been developed. Therefore the committee is satisfied that the complex set of governmental

relationships provided in the act is a workable one. And the committee is convinced that the approach followed by Congress in providing for maximum flexibility to these agencies in the operation of the program remains a sound one.

Section 303 of the act sets forth in positive terms the requirements for full use of available services or facilities of other agencies so as to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions. The language of this section makes these obligations clear. Despite this, some examples have been brought to the attention of the committee suggesting the requirements are honored in the breach. This reminder, that the intent of Congress, as set forth in this section, cannot be avoided, may be sufficient.

However, the severity of complaints regarding the counseling and selection functions requires some additional comment. Counseling of the unemployed and prospective trainee is assigned to the Secretary of Labor. This activity in the field is usually carried by the Employment Service. Yet there are many instances where this counseling might be provided, with improved results and at a lower cost, by utilization of available counselors within the educational system. In such instances cooperative use is to be encouraged, in keeping with the general instructions of Congress, rather than obstructed. Since these problems were brought to the attention of the committee we urge that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare investigate this further so that abuses, if any, can be promptly eliminated.

In this connection it should be noted there is wide recognition of deficiencies in the present performance of the counseling and guidance functions. Some witnesses have brought these to the attention of the committee. The National Advisory Committee was already aware of the need for improvement and responded quickly by establishing an expert panel to review and make recommendations concerning counseling, guidance, and testing activities. The committee shares this concern. We recognize the prospects for success of the entire training effort can be affected critically by the quality of the counseling provided the unemployed worker. We are confident administrators will be alert to the possibilities for administrative implementation of the suggestions of the study panel. To some extent, however, further legislation may be needed and the committe expects to undertake a full review following the completion of the work of the study panel.

II. The role of special or demonstration projects

The most encouraging findings of the committee relate to the unique and critically important contributions being made to the program by these projects. These pioneering programs embrace both youth and adults. Through them research is undertaken and new techniques developed. Results of this research may open up promising new avenues of approach to the training problems of the disadvantaged groups in the work force. Since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare carries the responsibility for training it should develop more fully, than it has, its participation in this research.

Among the most promising efforts have been those that provide training components to programs utilizing a wide variety of public and private groups in a combined attack on a group of related problems. That these have been successful was abundantly demonstrated during the hearings. In fact evidence from these projects provided the most convincing proof of the need for and the feasibility of making the changes provided in H.R. 8720. Throughout, the committee was impressed with the inventiveness, the scope, and the promise evident in these projects. Since increased knowledge and experience is our most critical need at this juncture in the development of a major new program, the committee urges that the present role assigned to these special projects be continued, and if possible, expanded.

I. Toward a positive labor market policy

The urgent need for the development of what is becoming known as a "positive labor market policy" is now becoming widely recognized. Much more is required if this concept is to become a reality. To this achievement the MDTA program makes important contributions. The training program is an important element. On this E. Wright Bakke in his recent book "A Positive Labor Market Policy" included in his summary the following:

"4. The bringing into the foreground of public, particularly legislative, consciousness of a positive approach to unemployed manpower resources more conducive to economic health and growth than the relief approach. For example, the transformation of underutilized to fully utilized manpower, the transformation of idle to active labor reserves, the transformation of redundant to available workers."

Also in title I of MDTA Congress specifically assigned a broader responsibility by describing the purpose of the act as requiring the "Federal Government to appraise the manpower requirements and resources of the Nation." To implement this and other objectives the Secretary of Labor is given broad authority to undertake studies, appraise our manpower development efforts, and to make reports and recommendations to the President. Similarly, the annual report of the President to Congress is expected to embrace the full range of manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training. The opportunity and responsibility provided by this title is such that we can expect among other things to see emerging the outlines of an active and positive labor market policy.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, H.R. 8720, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED (PUBLIC LAWS 87-415 AND 87-729)

(An act 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 assembled, 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 find 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 *as quickly as is reasonably possible,* 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 development, 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 *with the least delay* 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) Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling, selection, and referral of youths, sixteen years of age or older, for occupational training and further schooling, who because of inadequate educational background and work preparation are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without such training and schooling.

[(b)] (c) 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)] (d) 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)] (e) Before selecting a person for training (*other than for training under subsection* (i)), 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)] (f) 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)] (g) 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)] (h) 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.

(i) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the attainment of basic education skills those eligible persons who indicate their intention to, and will thereby be able to, pursue courses of occupational training of a type for which there appears to be reasonable expectation of employment. Such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks.

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 payments shall be made for a period not exceeding fifty-two weeks (*except where authorized for individuals referred for training under section 202*(i)), and the amounts of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed *$10 more than* the amount of the average weekly 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 *$10 more 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 supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation *$10 more than* 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.

The training allowance of a person engaged in full-time training under section 231 shall not be reduced on account of his part-time employment which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week.

(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 are either heads of families, or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except that he may pay training allowances at a rate not exceeding $20 a week to youths over nineteen but under twenty-two years of age where such allowances are necessary to provide them occupational training, but not more than 5 per centum of the estimated total training allowances paid annually under this section may be paid to such youths.] The Secretary of Labor shall pay training allowances only to unemployed persons who have had not less than two years of experience in gainful employment and who are either heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or who are members of a household in which the head of the household or the head of the family is unemployed: *Provided,* That not more than one person in any one household may be receiving training allowances under this Act at any particular time. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may pay training allowances at a rate not in excess of $20 a week to youths seventeen years of age or older who require such training allowance in order to undertake training, who are referred for training in accordance with section 202(b), and who are not entitled to allowances under the preceding sentence, except that no such training allowance shall be paid to any such youth who has not graduated from high school, unless the Secretary has satisfied himself that such youth has continuously failed to attend school for a period of not less than one year and that the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling, have concluded that further school attendance by such youth is no longer practicable under the circumstances. Not more than 25 per centum of the persons who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for receipt of unemployment compensation) may be youths under the age of twenty-two.

(d) [After June 30, 1964, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments.] *For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section,*

or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 33⅓ per centum of the amount of such payments, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments.

(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 or 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 hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of persons 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.

(h)((1) If State unemployment compensation payments are paid to a person taking training under this Act and eligible for a training allowance, 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.

(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] *July 1, 1965, for 66⅔ per centum of the amount of such benefits paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter.* 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 be placed in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

(i) A person who, in connection, with an occupational training program, has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under the provisions of this Act or any other Federal Act shall not be entitled to training allowances under this Act for one year after the completion or other termination (for other than good cause) of the training with respect to which such allowance or payment was made.

(j) 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.

ON-THE JOB TRAINING

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall encourage, develop, and secure the adoption of programs for on-the-job training needed to equip persons selected for training with the appropriate skills. The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent possible secure, the adoption by the States and by private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor organizations and other industrial 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) 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 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, and adequate 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.

(c) 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] ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary shall appoint a National Advisory Committee which 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.] *For the purpose of making expert assistance available to persons formulating and carrying on programs under this title, the Secretary shall, where appropriate, require the organization on a community, State, and/or regional basis of labor-management-public advisory committees.*

(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.

(d) Appointed members of the *National Advisory Committee* shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the work of the *National Advisory Committee*, including travel time, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b 2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem, when actually employed, basis.

(e)(1) Any member of the *National Advisory Committee* is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not extend.

(A) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(B) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

STATE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with each State, or with the appropriate agency of each 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 make payments to such State or appropriate agency for expenses incurred 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.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 207. 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.

LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. *208. During the period ending June 30, 1965, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas; pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, having bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed. Where such assistance is provided in the form of grants, such grants may not exceed 50 per centum of the expenses incurred reasonably necessary to the transportation of the person who is relocating, and his family, and their household effects. Where such assistance is provided in the form of loans, or a combination of loans and grants, the total amount thereof may not exceed 100 per centum of such expenses and shall be made subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title, not more than 2 per centum thereof, or $4,000,000, which is the lesser, may be used for the purposes of this section.*

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 needed to equip persons referred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 202, for the occupations specified in the referrals, *except that with respect to education to be provided pursuant to referrals under subsection (b) or (i) of section 202, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the education to be provided under such subsection through other appropriate education agencies.* Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public 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 *where such institutions can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures.* The State agency shall be paid 50 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, except that for the period ending June 30, [1964] *1965,* The State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed persons, *and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 66⅔ per centum of such cost.* Such agreements shall contain such other provisions as will promote effective administration (including provision (1) for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees, (2) for immediate certification to the Secretary of Labor by the responsible training agency with respect to each person referred for training who does not have a satisfactory attendance record or is not making satisfactory progress in such training absent good cause, and (3) for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted under the agreement to insure the quality and adequacy of the training provided), protect the United States against loss, and assure that the functions and duties to be carried out by such State agency are performed in such fashion as will carry out the purposes of this title. 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 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. 203. 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 Education 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 as 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] *and each of the three succeeding fiscal years,* 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.] *$211,000,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $422,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $281,333,333 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $211,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967,* 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] *and each of the three succeeding fiscal years,* 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 establishment 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] *April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966,* 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] *April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966,* 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] *1967.*

(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] *1967.*

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

When the basic legislation which became the Manpower Development and Training Act was originally considered by the Congress, a number of the undersigned Republican members of this committee participated in the complete rewriting of the proposal. We gave our full endorsement and support to the program's objectives. In fact, Republicans proposed retraining before President Kennedy did. We believe that on the basis of the highly encouraging results achieved during the limited experience of the program that our original approval of this undertaking has been more than justified.

As a result of experience gained from the administration of the act, we are convinced that the amendments proposed in the pending legislation are sound and will lead to a more effective realization of the aims of the basic program—the return of unemployed workers to the productive mainstream of our economy.

While we may not have accorded identical treatment and emphasis to every part of this bill had we been free to write it as we saw fit, the fact remains that most legislation is a product of compromise. In the development of this bill by the full committee, a number of proposals of no mean significance—the reintroduction of and insistence upon the State matching requirements, the upward adjustment of training allowances, the careful delineation of what is encompassed by "basic education training" and the absorption of the cost of certain new undertakings within present authorizations—were advanced by us and incorporated into this legislation.

If we could put forth one word of caution it would be this: While the new programs introduced by this legislation are in every respect worth while, experience has shown that the laying out and gearing up of new administrative projects requires a considerable time, and it may well be that all of the funds authorized in this bill will not in fact be needed. Indeed, if the established programs and the newly created programs are directed with administrative prudence, we question whether the full authorizations carried in this bill can be wisely expended.

Accordingly, in endorsing this legislation, we wish to make it clear that as the program unfolds, we shall look to the administrators to fully justify the funds requested under it.

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN.
WILLIAM H. AYRES.
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.
ALBERT H. QUIE.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.
ALPHONZO BELL.
ROBERT TAFT, JR.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF ROBERT TAFT, JR.

While the committee views as prepared express generally my feelings relating to the desirability of the changes proposed by H.R. 8720, a failure to substantiate the cost figures during the hearings and since the hearings makes necessary the expression of supplemental views.

The current level of expenditures and the appropriation approved by this Congress for the manpower development and training program would not substantiate the authorizations requested in section 7 of this bill. The Appropriation Act for the year 1963 provides a total of $110 million for this program, or $51 million less than the authorization already in the law. Therefore, even taking the figure of $50 million for the additional cost estimate for the fiscal year 1964, the current authorization is sufficient to incorporate the changes which would be authorized by this bill. The current level of expenditures and those estimated for the balance of this fiscal year reflect the difficulties in initiating programs of this type without considerable lag and considerable waste. With this in mind, it would seem that for the fiscal year 1965 there will be similar delays and lags in the program, and the current authorized expenditures level of $322 million will in all probability be sufficient to continue the orderly expansion of the program and to incorporate in the program the changes that would be authorized by this bill.

It is interesting to note that in the hearings witnesses were unable to substantiate the basis of the $100 million figure proposed by the President, and inquiries into the Department of Labor since that time have produced no breakdown showing the number of additional trainees expected to be put into training during the current year or the next fiscal year. In spite of directions given by the committee, concerned with the preparation of the committee report, there has been no detailed information available or provided to substantiate the additional cost of program changes and extensions that would be authorized by this bill. In the absence of any such information, increasing the current authorizations would not be justified and should be opposed.

ROBERT TAFT, JR.,
Ohio Member at Large.

MINORITY VIEWS

We, the undersigned, are strongly opposed to the enactment of this legislation. When this program was first put before Congress, a number of us urged that it be rejected. In view of the inauspicious experience under the program since its inception, we are even more firmly persuaded that the Congress should have heeded our original advice. But far from following a course of care and prudence in this regard, the committee has now brought forth a bill designed to further expand this dubious program in a number of doubtful areas, all at a tremendous increase in costs to the American taxpayer.

STATE MATCHING

The original legislation carried a provision that beginning July 1, 1964, the States would be required to match on a 50–50 basis any Federal funds appropriated to carry out this program. So "enthusiastic" was the response of the States that of the 29 State legislatures which convened last year, only 4 of them saw fit to take the action necessary to permit them to participate further in this program. This signal lack of response on the part of the States is being met in this proposed legislation by the simple expedient of deferring the condition of State matching and requiring the Federal Government to pick up the entire tab for yet another year. State matching is then belatedly brought back into the picture on a graduated basis. And in order to permit this graduation to occur, the life of the program is being extended for an additional 2 years to June 30, 1967, instead of being brought to a halt on June 30, 1965, as Congress originally decreed. This deferral of State matching is being bought at much too great a price. This factor, together with the extended life and expanded nature of the program will cost the American taxpayer in the neighborhood of $900 million, an expenditure absolutely unjustified in light of the precarious fiscal situation presently attending the National Government.

LITERACY TRAINING

While this legislation has for its announced purpose the training of citizens in occupational fields, one of the principal amendments now being offered will authorize training in basic literacy courses. The justification for this academic importation into an occupational program is difficult to follow. If there is a need for literacy training, certainly the facilities already available in our present public school programs, night and day, full time, and part time, are sufficient to cope with the problem. This proposed program of basic educational training is but another example of compounding error and waste by authorizing new programs and new expenditures without any provision being made for the proper use and coordination of existing programs and facilities.

EXPANDED YOUTH TRAINING

The pending bill authorizes a tremendous expansion in the so-called training of youth. This proposal, too, is marked by both extravagance and danger. Under this proposal, training allowances of $20 per week will be paid to eligible young people, 17 years of age and over, who participate in this program. At a time when almost every area of the Nation is deeply concerned with the problem of school dropouts, this legislation extends to the youth of our country an engraved invitation to drop out of school and to receive Federal payments of $20 a week for up to 70 weeks for so doing. Here again is an example of a broad new Federal program being introduced without proper regard for the objective to be achieved and without any reasonable effort being made to coordinate existing programs and facilities. While it is true that the proposed legislation attempts to incorporate some standards with respect to the type and class of youth which may qualify for these training allowances, the fact is that these standards are so general as to be virtually without meaning. And it is worthy of note that up to 25 percent of those entitled to receive training allowances under this bill may be selected from among the youth of the Nation.

INCREASED TRAINING ALLOWANCES

Another disturbing feature of the pending legislation is a provision which increases by $10 per week the training allowance which may be paid to eligible persons under this act. Under the original program, this training allowance was geared to the average weekly unemployment compensation of the State concerned. This amount is now being increased by a further outright Federal grant of $10 per week for each eligible participant. It is estimated that the cost of this single additional item will cost the Federal Government in excess of $30 million a year. This is a wasteful and unnecessary frill. And it menaces the independence and integrity of the State systems of unemployment compensation.

RELOCATION OF CHRONICALLY UNEMPLOYED

The proposed bill carries an authorization of up to $4 million for the purpose of carrying on a socioeconomic experiment in the relocation of the chronically unemployed. This program, which is bound by no meaningful legislative standards, represents a new departure in social experimentation on the part of the Federal Government. This precedent-shattering experiment may very well be seized upon by the social planners to move us even closer to the all-encompassing systems of social and economic regimentation which menace the free world on every side. This type of project, if it be approved by Congress at all, should be approved only after the most detailed consideration and studied reflection. This disturbing and ill-conceived recommendation has not had that type of measured consideration which it

should command before being brought to the floor of the House.

GENERAL MATTERS

In addition to the foregoing major objections, the pending legislation contains a number of other proposed amendments designed to relax the existing program and render it more costly. In the first place the eligibility requirements have been relaxed and expanded, making many more persons eligible to receive Federal training allowances. In addition, all trainees will be permitted to work up to half time on the outside without suffering any diminution in their individual Federal payment. These changes are but symptomatic of the general tenor of the whole bill.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing shortcomings and deficiencies, it is our considered opinion that Congress should not adopt the pending proposal. It is loaded with new and untried programs of unpredictable purpose and result, some involving a degree of social and economic experimentation far more radical than anything yet undertaken in this country. These new and untried endeavors are being embarked upon at an unreasonable and unjustified cost to the American taxpayer. We firmly believe that Congress would be well advised to reject the pending proposal and thus permit the curtain to be rung down on this whole unfortunate undertaking in the year 1965, as Congress originally stipulated.

DONALD C. BRUCE.
JOHN M. ASHBROOK.
DAVE MARTIN.
M. G. SNYDER.
PAUL FINDLEY.

[House, Dec. 12, 1963]

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. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

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. 8720, with Mr. Price in the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this legislation before us, as has been indicated, has been tested and found extremely worth while. It was the first answer of this Congress to the challenge of automation. It was the brainchild of the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], the chairman of the subcommittee and the author of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and I began working on this legislation the day after the elections 3 years ago. We worked here in Washington during November and December, even prior to the committee being organized. I cannot pay too much tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and to his work in this field.

Also I would like to say that this comes from the Committee on Education and Labor with almost complete bipartisan support. I should like to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who served with me on this committee for the way in which they have cooperated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, again I come before the House asking for the passage of this legislation.

Today we have H.R. 8720—amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act—for discussion and passage.

This program has been in effect since July 1962, but in operation only since September 1962. Although there was an unavoidable delay, in initiating this program the year has seen the development of programs for approximately 100,000 unemployed workers.

Some have already completed their training, and 80 percent of those are now working. The remainder are still—or will be—attending classes.

There are, now, many more applications for training courses awaiting final approval by the Department of Labor. These will help thousands of other unemployed, but approval cannot be granted until we here in Congress pass these amendments.

This problem exists because of the delayed start of the program.

Our States were unable to estimate the amount of money they should appropriate to cover their share of the cost of future programs. Hence, partial action was taken by only four States.

This means that in 46 States any program which extends beyond next June cannot be approved by the Department of Labor.

We must remember that the procedures and methods for operating the Manpower Development and Training Act program had to be established. This was an entirely new approach to our nagging unemployment problem.

This was the first time that Congress had required two separate departments of the National Government to cooperate in the administration of a Federal program. We also required the cooperation of two departments in State government—and we carried this requirement to local government level also.

These organization problems have been solved and all the various levels of government are now in accord and operating with apparent efficiency.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program has gotten off the ground and the preliminary results are most encouraging.

Forty-nine of our States now want the Federal Government to underwrite the cost of this program for 1 more year. The Governors of those States made this request. This will give them time to prepare necessary legislation upon which their legislatures can act.

Because of this request, we are recommending the extension of Federal coverage for fiscal year 1965, the lowering of State's responsibility for fiscal year 1966 to one-third the cost, but reestablishing for fiscal 1967 the original State share of one-half the cost.

In H.R. 8720 we also recommend the training of more of our unemployed youth, the teaching of basic education for those who, without it, cannot qualify for occupational training you have provided, permitting trainees to work part time to augment their subsistence allowances, the granting of incentive payments, permitting additional use of private technical schools under certain conditions, the formation of advisory committees at State and local levels, the creation of a pilot program for the mobility of workers, and some minor word changes. Other Members will discuss these more fully.

Last year in this House I stated this program would not be the final solution to the unemployment problem. Rather, it would be the first of many steps we must take.

During 1963 we have seen an increase in the gross national product, an increase in sales and profits, an increase in productivity and output, but unemployment has not decreased. In fact, it is almost 6 percent today. Testimony has been given that we can expect thousands of jobs to evaporate.

In the past 10 days we heard that Studebaker auto division is closing. Five thousand jobs are eliminated. The Defense Department is cutting 25,000 jobs. Steel is laying off additional workers. Office jobs are being eliminated by the closing of district offices of United States Steel. Railroad workers write me that maintenance shops are being closed. In fact, official reports show that unemployment increased by 500,000 in November. What will December's figures show?

The New York Times said the first week of December should be known as computer week, for IBM, Minneapolis-Honeywell, General Telephone & Electronics, and General Electric all announced "newer, faster, smaller, and more versatile data systems are going on the market."

We can guess the results.

This is not the time to let the manpower training slow down—let alone stop.

We know we cannot help everyone who is unemployed, but we must help those we can.

We expect that from 1962 to 1967 over a million unemployed can be helped through the Manpower Development and Training Act. However, that leaves quite a few more million for local, State, and private groups to assist.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program will act as an example for these groups to supplement. The magnitude of this problem requires the cooperation of all America, for no one separate group can do this alone.

Do you realize that for 1962 over $4 billion was spent by public and private funds just to pay the direct costs of unemployment? We have no record of the indirect costs. Nor do we have a record of the public assistance money used for those unemployed, whose benefits expired and they were forced on relief. The States handle this with no report to the Federal Government.

Briefly, here are the known costs: Unemployment compensation, $3 billion; aid to dependent children whose parents are unemployed, $100 million; extension of surplus food program, $140 million; State employment offices, in handling claims, over $400 million; railroad insurance for unemployment, $100 million; State unemployment benefit payments in certain industries, over $100 million; social security pensions for those who cannot secure work, $880 million.

Shall we continue to waste money—both public and private—just to feed, house, and clothe our people? Or are you willing to invest less than 10 percent of that $4.7 billion and educate and train our unemployed workers?

Do we want to see our relief rolls increase or do we want our people to become self-sustaining?

I feel—and I am sure you agree—that the future of this Nation depends upon the intelligence and capability of its citizens. Our manpower is our most precious natural resource.

Therefore I ask you to help our people, our economy, and our Nation by supporting this bill.

The majority of the Members—on both sides of this House—supported this program last year.

This was a bipartisan effort to solve a bipartisan problem.

Machines and computers are not interested in whether the worker is Democrat or Republican. Our unemployed want us—who represent them now—to help them help themselves now.

Machines move in, the workers move out.

Let us think of the Nation today, not party politics.

Let us conquer unemployment together.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee, I wish to make clear at the outset my general approval of, and support for, the pending bill.

When the original proposals authorizing a manpower training program were submitted to the previous Congress, the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee worked diligently to bring to fruition a sound and workable program. Actually Republicans advocated the principle and importance of retraining before President Ken-

nedy did. The bill as finally approved had strong bipartisan support.

Experience has demonstrated the basic soundness of this approach in identifying and coping with a number of the more difficult facets of our continuing unemployment problem. Notwithstanding the basic soundness and effectiveness of the original act, experience has brought to light a number of areas in which that act left something to be desired. We recognize now a number of areas in which minor adjustments can bring about improved results.

The bill before the House is, of course, fully explained in the report which has been submitted by our committee. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to those areas of the bill which I deem to be the most significant and the most necessary.

BASIC EDUCATION TRAINING

Very early in the retraining program, it became apparent that great numbers of our chronically unemployed citizens did not possess even that modicum of literacy necessary to permit them to acquire and hold a routine job in our modern economy. Due to the changing times and the upgrading of the economy generally, almost all gainful employment today requires at least some mastery of the common skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The old-type jobs that require only physical endurance are fast fading from the scene. As the machine continues to move to a position of greater and greater prominence in almost every area of endeavor, it goes without saying that those who undertake to work in this new environment must be equipped to function effectively within it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, whether we like to admit it or not, hundreds of thousands of our people, young and old, do not possess the basic learning necessary to permit them to survive and go forward in this new and ever-changing economy. If they are ever to be retrained, if they are ever to be returned to the productive work force, they must be given supporting or concomitant training in basic literacy—in the three R's. if you will.

This bill seeks to meet that problem to the extent it can be met in this type of program. It authorizes basic education training when it is needed, and extends the period during which training allowances may be paid to trainees in order to encourage and facilitate such training. In my opinion this provision of the bill is absolutely essential if we are effectively to meet and overcome persistent hardcore unemployment.

EXPANDED YOUTH TRAINING

Another important and worthwhile feature of this bill is that which provides for a substantially increased training program for the youth of our Nation. One of the most tenacious, and at the same time appalling, aspects of the American unemployment problem is that it engulfs and stifles such great numbers of our young people. Above all else, we as a nation must find an effective method to deal with this problem at this level. We simply cannot let it be said that we are unable to create an opportunity for this generation of youth to move forward and play a full, effective, and self-sustaining role in our society. Yet the facts are alarming: While youth between the ages of 16 and 21—out of school—comprise only 7 percent of the available labor force, this same group accounts for upward of 20 percent of the unemployed. And the projected trend for future years serves only to indicate that the employment outlook for this age group will become even less inviting in the years immediately ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that we in this Chamber feel, and feel strongly, that every boy and girl in America should complete at least a high school education. We cannot, however, ignore the fact that, notwithstanding the best efforts of all concerned, millions of our young people have abandoned formal educational pursuits without completing high school, and that millions more are destined to do so.

Those who drop out of school are for the most part the least employable, and the most in need of training. This legislation faces up to this problem. While making every reasonable provision to see to it that these young people do not needlessly drop out of school, this legislation nevertheless undertakes to provide training for these young people, in order to equip them for employment and for a productive economic life. This effort simply must be made, if the Nation is to be spared a veritable generation born in poverty, reared on charity, and sustained on welfare. We have no choice but to make this investment in the future of America.

STATE MATCHING

I shall conclude my comments by discussing the principle of the State matching of funds which is carried in this proposal. At the time the original act was adopted, it contained a provision that, beginning with the fiscal year 1965, the funds to sustain this program were to be provided equally by the States and the Federal Government. However, due to the delays in appropriations and the inevitable administrative delays in getting the program underway, most States had little or no opportunity to appraise the program nor could they make the legislative and budgetary preparations necessary to meet the 1965 matching requirements.

In recognition of this fact, the pending bill does not require the States to put forth any funds for fiscal 1965. This fact, however, should not be taken to indicate any abandonment by this committee of the State matching principle. Indeed, the bill specifically requires that the States must provide one-third of the funds for this program in the 1966 fiscal year and one-half the funds in each fiscal year thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I are strongly of the opinion that State matching is a sine qua non of this program. Every State and every community has an undeniable interest in, and an unavoidable responsibility for, meeting and resolving the grave problems at which this legislation is directed. Each and every State must contribute its utmost in these endeavors. The entire responsibility cannot and should not be left to the Federal Government alone. I am confident that the States will respond to this legislation. I know they will meet their responsibilities in full measure, for upon that response the fate of this entire program will undoubtedly depend.

CONCLUSION

As I have indicated, much worthwhile progress has been realized under this program. I should like to recount only a few of the facts and figures. They indicate not only what this program has done, but the great promise which this program holds for the future.

In the brief 15-month period since this operation began, training programs for more than 100,000 persons have been established, and another 30,000 persons have been approved for training. Training is now being offered in more than 300 different occupations, at least half of which are in white-collar and so-called skilled jobs. More than one-half of those engaged in these training programs have been drawn from the hardcore, long-term unemployed—the area in which continuing and effective work must be done if the problem of unemployment is to be successfully overcome.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. Its purposes are worthwhile; its objectives mandatory. During the course of this discussion, however, a number of amendments will be offered, particularly in the area of the authorization of funds.

I should like to say that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expressed the belief that any effort to stop Federal expenditures is what he describes as an exercise in futility. I agree strongly that we must use restraint. However, in this retraining area I think it essential that we do not stop spending money, because I think it is money well spent. Of course, however, we should be wise in how rapidly we expand. We should hold down these proposed expenditures as much as seems consistent with what we are trying to attain.

Such amendments should be considered on their merits. We should support amendments which will protect the interests of the public while at the same time assuring the proper administration of the essential programs which this legislation embodies.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize my interest in the Manpower Act. The single most significant, concerted, and broad step taken to combat unemployment has been taken under this act. In little more than 1 short year of operation, training Projects involving almost 90,000 trainees have been approved. Many thousands have already completed training and have been placed in training-related jobs. They have been able to complete training by having the assurance of a steady but modest income. For thousands of people it has meant renewed hope, renewed opportunity, and renewed dignity; and our Nation is that much richer in its human values.

In my own State of Kentucky this act has been significant. The amendments are essential if we will give to the program the provision necessary for it to reach the "hard core" of our unemployment. We in Kentucky have suffered from economic blight and the suffering brought in its wake. Large areas have been chronically depressed because of the automation and changed economic circumstances in the coal industry. These communities have unemployment rates far in excess of the national average, ranging as high as 20 to 30 and even at times 50 percent. Thousands of these citizens must be given an opportunity to return to productive work, and our youth must be given greater opportunities for training. Many of our people have been set adrift without skills to seek jobs in a labor market which increasingly requires high skill levels and technical know-how.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 8720, the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. May I say at the outset I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for the careful study and attention to, and the very thorough hearings that were held upon, this bill. It is designed to deal with what is certainly one of the most important single problems upon the domestic scene in the United States today. Its importance, I am sure, from the point of view of economic problems, is exceeded, if by any other problem, only by the problem of restoring fiscal responsibility, about which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia talked to the House some little time ago. Yet I feel that while I am certainly concerned with the area of fiscal responsibility and our spending and deficit levels and the amount of our national debt, I feel that this measure certainly does not run in any way in conflict with those feelings if we can keep the authorizations down to realistic figures and continue to make the very solid progress that has been made in the program in the past without a waste of Federal funds in any way. I feel it is a problem of Federal concern as well as of State concern, because unemployment is certainly a nationwide problem to a very considerable extent.

While the cost is high, running somewhere, on the basis of the present experience, between $1,200 and $1,400 per trainee, although it is aimed ultimately at getting down to somewhere around $800 and $1,000 per trainee, I think all of us should realize that the cost we have here may well be recouped, and fairly quickly be recouped, if the program is successful, not only in the reduction in unemployment compensation payments, not only in the reduction in welfare payments and in the elimination of welfare payments by making those on the welfare rolls in some instances at least gainful producers again, but also in the increased taxes that will be brought in, particularly the social security taxes, and in the general additional production that would be created by rehabilitating and putting more men to work who cannot otherwise find jobs and will not be able to find jobs.

I think we should recognize that this is a serious problem. It is a problem which is not getting any better daily. From May 1962 to May 1963 the total number of persons coming into our labor force was 1.2 million. The total number of jobs increase in that period was only 900,000, leaving a red deficit figure of 300,000 jobs. We hear varying figures on account of automation and other causes, as to the large number of jobs that we are continually losing, which is a matter that I think should be of great concern to all of us. Yet at the same time that we have over 4 million unemployed in this country today it is not certain—there are no reliable figures on which we can draw for the specific proof, but it is pretty conclusive today just from looking at the want ads around the country—that there exist somewhere between 1.5 million and 2 million job possibilities, in this country, for which there are no persons trained to fill the bill.

I think that this measure takes the right approach toward this problem. It takes the approach of pinpointing a rightful attack on the problem of the unemployed. It is not a welfare program. It was never designed to be a welfare program. Its limitation in general is to heads of families. There are other limitations on availability of the program that indicate this.

As to the specific amendments let me comment briefly upon some of them. You have heard some comments already upon them, but I think perhaps something a little more can be said with regard to them. As to the matching principle which is continued by this bill, I might say that it is not continued by the Senate bill; and perhaps before we start on these amendments we ought to call the attention of the House to the fact that the two Senate measures, S. 1716 and S. 1831, are far more limited in principle than this one. They do only four things. They extend the program for training for youth down to the age of 16. They increase the amount of the appropriation at a rate of approximately $100 million a year. They provide another year without any matching. Also they provide that the basic education courses which may be had under that authorization and also under the authorization of this bill would be limited to reading, writing, and arithmetic.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. On the question of basic education I think it should be emphasized as a matter of legislative history that we discussed the types of basic education that would conform to the standards of this bill. It is our feeling—and I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree—that reading, writing and arithmetic provided the general description. That is, basic education would be limited to the most elementary levels.

There were people who indicated that they might try to define the term basic education in a rather broad way. I think it is the disposition on both sides of the aisle to have that term narrowly confined; would not the gentleman agree?

Mr. TAFT. I certainly do agree with the gentleman. That was the understanding in the subcommittee and in the committee discussions. There was no intention that the authority to provide basic education under these circumstances would extend, for instance, into the formal professional life, or enable people to finish the last year of high school so that they might qualify for some professional requirements.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has referred to the matching principle. I would like for the record, and for the legislative history, to re-emphasize the importance of this matching principle. It is, perhaps, the most important reason why we have to enact this bill. It is because the States cannot be expected to match in the coming year.

I quote from the committee report on page 6:

"However, in the opinion of the committee, Congress should at this time clearly preserve and reinforce the principle of State matching in Manpower Development and Training Act. Therefore, simple waiver of the third year matching by States is not accepted."

"Witness after witness when questioned confirmed the necessity for State financial support. Few were prepared to argue for full Federal responsibility. To most, State support seemed essential if the program is to be both effective and efficient. The committee, therefore, reaffirms its continued adherence to the principle of State matching."

I think this sums up very emphatically the feeling of our subcommittee and our committee and the Congress, that matching is a key element in this program.

I, personally, could not support the program if matching, as a principle, were abandoned. I believe this is the feeling of the subcommittee.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity particularly to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft].

As the gentleman knows, last year in the last Congress I had the privilege of serving on this Manpower Subcommittee. I have missed it a great deal this year.

The gentleman from Ohio has done an indefatigable job. He has been conscientious and thorough in the consideration of these amendments. I think the gentleman has preserved, with the Democrats on that subcommittee, a completely bipartisan approach to this legislation.

Its conception was bipartisan in the Congress and I am happy to say that that atmosphere has been preserved. A great deal of credit belongs to the gentleman from Ohio for doing that at this session.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I would like to go on in my discussion to talk about one of the other amendments.

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment under which the Secretary of Labor is authorized in his discretion to add to the training allowances, by the amount of $10 per week. The present training allowance paid under the basic program relates to the unemployment compensation levels of the particular States involved. They are at the level of the average unemployment compensation level payments.

Mr. Chairman, we had testimony before our subcommittee as to some of the differences which are presently in existence, which indicated that there were persons who were dropping out, trainees dropping out of these programs, because they found under the level of training allowances they simply could not swing it and were not able to adequately sustain themselves and continue this training.

We felt this was uneconomical, unwise, and that something should be done about it. Therefore, we gave the discretion to the Secretary of Labor in cases where he found that the level was such that this problem existed to add to the basic training allowances by the sum of $10 a week.

Mr. Chairman, now moving to one or two of the other amendments I would like to discuss, I would like to point out that there is a private-school provision in here.

The present practices which have been in existence since the program started in operation back in 1962, have for one reason or another practically eliminated all private schools in providing this training.

It was our feeling—and there has been incorporated into this act a provision to the effect that where there will be a savings, actually, of funds by the use of private facilities already in existence to provide this training.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move on now to talk for a minute about the record of performance to date under this program.

I would like to point out to the House that the program has started somewhat more slowly than originally planned. I do not think any of us are critical of this fact. We have added the word "urgency," at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], in the preamble of the bill, in an attempt to indicate our concern for immediate action. At the same time, the practicalities of properly setting up these courses and getting them going on the basis they will be productive and do the job have to be started.

For fiscal year 1963 we find that the authorizations were $97 million, the actual appropriations were only $60 million. For the current year 1964 we find that the authorizations were $161 million, the appropriations, to date anyway, are at a level of only $110 million. I thought the House would be interested in learning the most recent figures as to the number of persons in training at the present time. So I made inquiry of the departments involved and came up with some figures I would like to call your attention to.

These are figures as of December 2, 1963. As of that date the number approved, for instructional programs actually approved, was 96,000. The number enrolled was actually 61,000. The number who had completed the courses was 28,500. As of June 30, 1963, the number that had been approved was only 60,000, and the actual number enrolled was 35,000. The number who completed their course was 7,500. There has been some lag here, and I think there is going to continue to be a lag in the original directed plans involved. So I expect to offer in this connection a reduction in the authorization which I do not believe in any way will cut into the program. This reduction in authorization will have the effect of maintaining the present total level of expenditures, the original target amount of expenditures of approximately $322 million per year in the program when it gets going in its full impact. It would continue to provide additional funds necessary to substitute for the State matching that were planned for in the year 1965, which has become impractical. I believe it is impractical. I had the privilege of serving on a finance committee in a State legislature for some 3 years, and I can assure you there has to be considerably more experience than you have had here, and considerably more understanding and ability to provide ahead the matching funds than we had under the practical operation period of this bill. It is impossible to get any legislative body to act favorably on such recommendations.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to discuss the same features that the gentleman from Ohio talked about when he touched upon the extension of the right to educators and the commissions of education in the various States to use the existing facilities of private training schools when there are not adequate public facilities avail-

able and where the private schools can be used at an equal or lesser cost to the taxpayers. By doing so, we believe we are making it possible to extend the benefits of this legislation to a greater number of students who otherwise would not be able to take the training.

One small, but very important item in the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act would clarify the role of private training institutions in the broad training program. To date, private schools have been little used because of wording in the act which suggests that they are a sort of last resort—to be used only if public institutions are "not adequate for the purpose." The amendment which I urge you to endorse would make it clear that training by private schools—many of which have long and distinguished histories as part of the training capacity of the Nation—should take its rightful place beside the herculean effort already put forth by public educational agencies in bringing about the goals of the manpower training program. The new language would encourage development of Manpower Development and Training Act courses in private institutions when equivalent schooling can be offered at a lesser cost to the taxpayer.

Accomplishments under the act are encouraging. Training opportunities have been approved, now, for over 100,000 unemployed and underemployed Americans, but we need not be satisfied with growth of the program to date when we can encourage expansion of the program into a wide range of training facilities which have been left largely untapped.

Public vocational education is not a new thing in America. Since 1917 the Federal Government has encouraged and assisted development of vocational training programs and facilities through the Smith-Hughes Act and subsequent laws. The existent public vocational facilities have proven their mettle over and over again—and most recently as they have shouldered the additional burden of the training courses which have lifted the manpower retraining program off the ground. Inevitably, though, facilities are crowded, and topflight instructional personnel is more in demand than in supply. Recognized training needs—in some areas—must await availability of schools, equipment, and instructors before program plans can be brought to completion. In other cases, approved courses have been held in abeyance while instructions were being sought. While time passes, selected trainees lose interest, and potential employers turn elsewhere for trained manpower.

If we are to meet the manpower challenge, we must mobilize all of our educational reserves, and among the readiest reserves are established private vocational and technical schools. These schools—the good ones—have space, equipment and expertise which is sorely needed in our fight against occupational obsolescence. The schools we want to work with are preeminent in their fields. Many have records of excellence which are widely recognized and appreciated by the men and women who hire skilled workers. The schools we want to work with maintain close ties with industry and commerce, and know from day to day the changing requirements of industry—the precise skills which applicants must have to compete for jobs.

Unfortunately, not every private vocational school offers the kind of service we can use. Some do not meet our standards. And I believe the amendment, as reported, assures us that we will work only with the ones that give us what we need. To participate, under the revised wording of the law, a school must offer training which compares favorably in every respect to that offered by public facilities and they must do it cheaper.

Quality of instruction would continue to be the responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the State and Federal educational experts will continue to keep an eye on the curriculum and how it is presented. All in all, the standards for participation in the manpower training program will be high, and I have confidence in them.

In summary, I submit that we would be two ways richer if we amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to clearly authorize training in private facilities where quality standards are maintained and when costs are lower. First, we would open wide the door to expanded use of a valuable source of training expertise and second, we would get more training for our program dollar. I urge you to concur.

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

Mr. Chairman, there are 4,070,000 people unemployed in America today. This is 5.6 percent of our total labor force. Of these 4 million unemployed, 1,119,000, or 27.9 percent, have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more; 580,000, or 14.6 percent, have been unemployed 27 weeks or more.

Mr. Chairman, let me show the members of the Committee what these chronically unemployed figures mean in dollars and cents to the taxpayers.

Last month the State of Illinois was able to reduce its public welfare payroll by 2,000 people through various efforts to get them a job. The savings on this has been apparent to the taxpayers of Illinois, which was $450,000 per month, or almost $6 million a year. Thus, you can see why it is important to get these people off the relief rolls and back to work.

Mr. Chairman, using this same formula and citing the figures which the gentleman from California used a moment ago, the figures of Mr. ROOSEVELT, it would appear that the State of California has saved the taxpayers more than $2 million a month, or $24 million a year by finding employment for 9,460 people that he mentioned under this program.

At the appropriate time I shall obtain permission to include a table at the conclusion of my remarks which shows what has been happening to chronic unemployment in recent years.

In 1953, 211,000 people, or 11.3 percent of the unemployed, were unemployed 15 weeks or more. In 1962 the figure rose to 1,119,000, or 27.9 percent.

In 1953, there were 79,000 people, or 4.2 percent of the unemployed, who were unemployed 27 weeks or more. In 1962 this figure jumped to 585,000, or 14.6 percent. These are people who are unfortunate and chronically unemployed, and it has cost the taxpayers of the various States of America in excess of $1.5 billion in various forms of public assistance for these chronically unemployed.

When we talk about cutting the bill, reducing the expenditures, you see what the alternative is if we do not enact this legislation.

This is a problem that is not only peculiar to the urban sections of the country, but to all of it, and I hope my colleagues from rural areas will consider these facts: While the total employment in the United States increased from 63.8 million in 1953 to 71.8 million in 1962, or an increase of 8 million people, the agricultural workers' opportunities decreased by 1.4 million in the same period.

This chronic unemployment involves a major change in manufacturing methods, a change in product demand, and a movement of industry location. Chronically depressed areas include the coal-mining communities and the older industrial centers of the East and Midwest. It was to these urban areas that marginal workers flocked after World War II, and are now not trained to take on the needs of new technological demands.

Intense competition, both foreign and domestic, insured an acceleration of that trend. Employment created by the manufacture of automated equipment and controls went largely to new manufacturing areas free of the disabilities of the older industrial centers. The latter areas received the unemployment resulting from the substitution of machines for men, and the improved methods further cut into manpower utilization, as did the competitive impact of new plants, both domestic and foreign.

Add to this the announcement today that 75,000 additional jobs will be wiped out by the budget cuts in the defense budget.

I have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] author of today's bill. We are now holding hearings on legislation to reduce the workweek from 40 to 35 hours. During these hearings it is becoming abundantly clear that a vast number of those now unemployed in America, just are not prepared to accept a position in our modern stream of technology.

This fact was repeated not only at our current hearings, but during the hearings on the manpower development amendments.

We have in this country today an estimated 11 million adults who have less than a sixth-grade education and cannot read or write.

These people constitute the largest segment of our chronically unemployed Americans. These are the people the legislation, to a great extent, hopes to reach. That is why we had to include in this bill a provision for basic literacy training under very rigid limitations.

This legislation also hopes to reach that growing army of Americans who have been displaced from skilled jobs in the advanced years of their life through automation. These middle-aged Americans have nothing but the relief lines to look forward to unless they can obtain new skills under this act.

You will notice this bill serves unequivocal notice on the States that they must begin assuming their responsibility in this entire field of retraining. Although the committee well realizes the financial crises which confront most of our States, it also directs the labor department to reduce bureaucratic delays to a minimum and incorporates a spirit of urgency into this act.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. You will note that the senior members of our committee strongly support this bill in their minority report on page 38. This bill represents a sincere bipartisan effort by our committee to help the tragic victims of chronic unemployment in America. I hope it will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I first emphasize my strong support for the Manpower Retraining Act and for the basic changes that we are making in that act in H.R. 8720. I think the experience under the manpower bill and its actual operation for just a little over a year now has been a resounding success. There have been many criticisms that have appeared in the press of late that we were not reaching the very hard, hard core. I think those criticisms ignore the problems and the requirements in getting a program of this nature underway. We have to crawl before we walk and walk before we run. I do not mean to say that we intentionally want to avoid the hard, hard core but it does take some special program and some special approach to get to these people who may have a language difficulty or who are lacking in a basic education requirement so that they cannot even undertake a job training course in the normal course of events.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been marked from the beginning by bipartisanship and I am very happy that it is continu-

ing on that basis. About half of the trainees thus far have been those in the long-term unemployed group. I emphasize that because these are very serious problems. Many of these individuals are trying to support families and find themselves forced to resort to welfare payments or unemployment insurance. Therefore, in that respect they are a drain on the resources of society. The training program has been concentrated in that area and about half of the trainees fall in the category of long-term unemployed. The program tries to get them back to work and back to earning and back to paying taxes, and in that way and many other ways to get back into the general flow of our economy. We think this is the essence of the manpower retraining program and it has demonstrated its merit thus far.

Reference has been made to the fact that only four States chose to match the funds that are put up for training allowances and for the rest of the program by the Federal Government. Let us emphasize that this act was passed in March of 1962. We did not get the funds until September of 1962. These legislative bodies in the States that we are talking about went into session in January, 4 months after the funds were first made available to start the training program. When the legislatures met in these 29 States, in many instances there were no trainees whatsoever graduated and at work as yet, and in a good share of the other States they had no training programs even started as yet. Under those circumstances, we certainly could not expect the States to set up their programs for matching without any history at all to go on. We do feel now on a completely bipartisan basis there will be a sufficient history of experience at the State level so that those legislative bodies can now meet and they will either have to put up the matching funds starting in the fiscal year 1966 with one-third of the amount, and in fiscal year 1967 on a dollar-per-dollar matching basis or the program will just grind to a halt in their State.

I would emphasize that we wrote the committee report with great care. We chose the words very carefully as a legislative history for guidance to the department in the administration of this act.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] with whom I worked so closely last year and with whom I have enjoyed working outside the subcommittee this year, if he does not agree with the legislative history that we have made here in the report and on the floor today, particularly with reference to matching and the basic education provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. I must admit that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and others of our colleagues on his side of the aisle have done a wonderful job in cooperating with us to see that everything is made as clear as possible. We have cleared up a lot of problems that arose as the result of the failure of the administration to carry out our intent in the other bill and I am glad to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman and to others of our colleagues who have cooperated with us and worked so hard to make this legislation as effective and as clear as possible.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say here that the gentleman has been very generous in his credit to the minority side for their contributions in the past, and I appreciate very much the way he proceeded as a subcommittee chairman in a bipartisan fashion, but the gentleman does agree, I take it, with the legislative history that we have here today.

Mr. HOLLAND. Absolutely.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate that, and ask the gentleman from Michigan, who is also one of the most active Members on this particular manpower bill, if he does not agree with this legislative history.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would say, if the gentleman will yield, that the committee report has been very carefully drafted to express our exact intention in the amendments before the House today.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman agreeing.

Mr. Chairman, I would emphasize here that we have in some respects made this program more conservative. We have done this with eyes wide open. The original act, for instance, provided for $20 a week training allowances to some youngsters in the 19- to 22-year-old group. We have lowered that age to 17 and required that they be out of school 1 year. We have also written very careful requirements in the act for qualification for that $20 a week payment by the students. It must go only to those who are in special youth training programs. It is defined in this bill as those who, because of inadequate educational background and work preparation, are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without special training and schooling.

Mr. Chairman, I would also emphasize the limitations we place specifically in this bill with reference to those who qualify for the basic education programs. It is limited to those who indicate an intention to, and will thereby be able to, pursue courses of occupational training of a type for which there appears to be reasonable expectation of employment. I would emphasize the words "reasonable expectation of employment." Obviously, when a person is undertaking a basic education which is necessary to qualify him to go into some sort of job or skill training, it is not possible always to have a specific job or a specific opening available at the end of the line with an offer from an employer that he will take this individual when he finishes. It is our desire and our intention that the individual with problems in his basic educational skills will qualify for the type of training in which there are openings generally in the community and in the area where he is taking that basic education and that skill.

Mr. Chairman, finally I would state that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will offer an amendment to cut the funds that are provided here. As one who believes very deeply in the manpower bill, I think there is more money provided in the authorization than is necessary. I think we can cut that authorization without damaging the program. I would hope that if the cut that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has proposed is too deep and turns out to be too deep and the Secretary comes forward with figures that demonstrate this—and he has not done that, in my opinion, thus far in our hearings and deliberations—that we can on a bipartisan basis restore what funds are necessary to keep this program operating and at full level, efficiently and effectively, to help our unemployed. Thank you.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am impressed, as I am sure other Members of the House are, by the broad agreement that has been expressed by both Democratic and Republican Members of the House both on the performance of this act since its enactment, about a year and a half ago, and upon the advisability of the amendments that we are now proposing to this act.

There seem really to be only two areas of some disagreement. The first would be whether or not there is some duplication or overlapping between the Manpower Development and Training Act youth training program and that provided under the Vocational Education Act. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER], mentioned that there are some 13 Federal education and training programs already. He then proceeded to deny he was certain about that figure. I do not know how many there are, either, Mr. Chairman; but I do know what kind of programs they are. They are not programs which meet the need this program was designed to meet.

Among existing programs are vocational rehabilitation; the World War II GI bill; the Korean GI bill; the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. In other words, none of these programs to which the gentleman has referred are designed to meet the problems of the unemployed, and particularly those hard-core unemployed who need training and skill development before they can find productive employment.

It is not our intention in this manpower development program, in its youth provisions, or any other part of it, to overlap or duplicate that which is being done under any other program. Neither is it our intention to overlap or duplicate that which is being done by any private industry on its own. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] mentioned that he believes a large amount of training is already being done by private industry. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure you that to the extent private training is being done by industry we do not wish to take over any part of that training and begin to support such training with Federal funds without advancing the training of any additional workmen. If, indeed, private industry is doing it, then it adds nothing to the total effort if we take over the cost of that effort.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if one of the chief reasons why the manpower program has not moved faster is because of lack of adequate vocational facilities throughout the country?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is correct. That has been one of the problems under the program. We do not want to set up a duplicate set of vocational training institutions to train manpower trainees. This bill operates through the State vocational education agencies and through the State employment offices. It uses the facilities and personnel and services of those two State agencies.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to be sure that I have been clear on this subject. I said in context let us remember that probably for every dollar spent here $10 was spent in the private section. I did not want to imply that I did not feel that this was being carefully done in the Federal sector. Indeed, I think it has been, and I think it is a part which the Federal Government can play in it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I did not mean to imply that he had said so. I just want to call attention to the fact that there is an intention in this program only to supply a need that is not presently being met.

If it is being met by private training or, indeed, if it is in an area which requires such a minor skill that heretofore employees have not thought prior training to be a requisite to employment, we do not want to undertake training programs. We want to provide training only in those areas where it can be of real assistance to the manpower development program.

In some situations, such as the apparel industry, skill and training are not and never have been a precondition of employment because of the nature of its labor requirements and its hiring and training practices. When training assistance is granted to such industries in any area of the country, particularly if the industries are as mobile and highly competitive as the apparel industry, it has the effect of adding to unemployment elsewhere in the country. I am advised, for

example, that the existing labor supply in the apparel industry is more than ample to meet the Nation's needs.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. In talking about the distinction between vocational education and the manpower bill, the gentleman will recall that it was our intention and desire in writing the original act that, to the extent possible, the manpower setups that we have around the country that are handled primarily by the State and local authorities.

I think this has been done and is being done today.

I would like to commend the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, in his administration of this act. I think he has been very wise and very restrained in the way he has approached this act and has been very assiduous in trying to adhere to our intention in the original act. I have great confidence that he will continue to apply himself and to see that his department employees will apply themselves to following the legislative history and the intentions which we have.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further point: There has been some question about whether or not the authorizations contained in this act are needed. It has been pointed out that the authorizations in the last fiscal year and in the current fiscal year were not met by the amount which was appropriated, and that this is some evidence of the fact that we do not need additional authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out here repeatedly in the debate this afternoon, the program was undertaken by the Department of Labor and by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in a very cautious way. They did not want to move ahead into a large-scale program before they knew what they were doing.

Mr. Chairman, we have this program underway and we are now ready to expand it. The State agencies have told the Department of Labor that they are ready now to proceed this year, if they can secure the funds, with the training of 134,000 trainees.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we were very cautious about the on-the-job training program which we wrote into this bill a year and a half ago. The Department wanted to move cautiously in this area. In the first year of this program there were no on-the-job trainees because the Department was setting up its procedures and regulations.

However, we believe we are now ready to move in this area as well.

We would hope that we can have somewhere in the neigborhood of 35,000 on-the-job trainees in the next fiscal year, if we get the money.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that under the beefed-up youth program provided by these amendments and under the various other provisions of this bill before us, we would hope, if the funds were available, to train in the neighborhood of 93,000 additional trainees per year.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are going to need some money to do that. I very much fear the cuts in the authorizations which have been suggested and the manner in which they may take effect would very much hamper the program, and I am sure we do not want to hamper the program.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to urge that the Members of this House consider this bill as our committee considered it; that is, with an eye not toward partisanship but with an eye toward what we can do in a constructive way for the unemployed of this country.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, the announcement this week by officials of the Studebaker Corp. of the termination of production of automobiles and trucks at the Studebaker plant in South Bend, Ind., means immediate unemployment for thousands of workers.

The unemployment situation at the Studebaker plant is further evidence of the importance of favorable action on the legislation we are today considering, amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. I say this because the programs of training and retraining which have been and will be established under this act represents one, and only one, but an important one, of the several weapons we must have in our arsenal of attack on unemployment.

I am pleased to say that we have already undertaken training programs under the Manpower Act in South Bend, Ind., and that our community, with wide support from leaders of business, labor, education, and local government, is ready to make further use of Manpower Act programs in an effort to help meet some of the extremely serious problems caused by this unhappy development at the Studebaker plant.

Let me speak for a moment in support of one particular amendment to the Manpower Act which is of special interest to us in South Bend. I refer to the amendment which will enable eligible trainees who need literacy training in order to qualify for occupation training to receive such training.

South Bend was one of the first cities in the United States to start a training program under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Mr. Schurz testified on August 15, 1963, before Congressman Holland's Select Subcommittee on Labor and described some of the problems which had been encountered in South Bend in carrying out an effective program.

In particular, Mr. Schurz pointed to the importance of broadening the act to, in his words, "permit more prevocational or academic training in such subjects as reading, writing, and arithmetic."

Again, to quote Mr. Schurz's testimony:

"Unfortunately, most of the hard-core unemployed do not have a sufficient educational background to succeed in vocational training for higher skilled work. Their great need is for academic training."

Mr. Schurz also urged that—

"To provide adequately for both academic and vocational training, the allowable training period should be extended up to an additional 52 weeks."

It is, therefore, from the experience of my own home community that I rise in support of this amendment to permit eligible trainees who require literacy courses to receive them if they are going to be able to qualify for vocational training.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to reassure the Members of this body that the observations of Mr. O'Hara regarding the intent of the program are correct. We recognized from the beginning that existing public and private training efforts should be maintained. In fact, special attention is given to this principle in the act.

Therefore, Mr. O'Hara is correct when he states there are some situations such as the apparel and garment industries where it would not be appropriate to use the manpower development program. In these instances it has been traditional for the employer to provide training on the job and prejob training has never been a precondition of employment. Moreover firms in these industries are highly mobile and compete vigorously with one another in a nationwide market. Training assistance to new firms, for example, in such an industry can have the effect of disrupting competitive relationships and end by forcing other firms to seek similar assistance. If assistance is not extended then unemployment may be created in one area offsetting employment being created elsewhere. And if training assistance is extended then the result can only be a shift in the training function from the industry to the Government. Certainly we want to avoid these possibilities since either would be contrary to the purposes of the act. This is an important matter and I am delighted that Mr. O'Hara has brought this to our attention. I think he should be complimented for the admirable clarification he has provided.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. Taft: Section 7(b) is amended as follows:

"Strike the figure '$211,000,000' in lines 20–21 and insert in lieu thereof, '$161,000,000'.

"Strike the figure '$442,000,000' in lines 21–22 and insert in lieu thereof, '$322,000,000'.

"Strike the figure '$281,333,333' in line 22 and insert in lieu thereof, '$214,666,667'.

"Strike the figure '$211,000,000' in line 23 and insert in lieu thereof, '$161,000,000'."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, as explained during the discussion on this bill, I offer this amendment because it is my feeling that the level of authorizations included in the bill is excessive. The original plan involved in this measure when enacted in 1962 called for an expenditure in the first year of around $97 million. Then it moved up to $161 million in the next year and went finally with State matching coming in in the year 1965 to a level of $322 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, the subject of the cost of this program has been brought into this discussion. This is perfectly normal and as it should be.

However, in our debate the question has been raised whether or not the Government can afford to administer such a program. I think we should also consider whether or not the Government can afford not to undertake this task.

With unemployment in the Nation again on the climb, are we going to stand here and tell those displaced workers, "All we can do for you is let the State in which you live place you on the relief rolls"?

If we do, then we are breaking a law that this Congress passed in 1946, the Full Employment Act, as it states "The Government," that is, Congress, "is responsible to promote and insure maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

We know every Member in this House is concerned about the plight of the unemployed. We have heard speech after speech on the need for action to secure the solution to their problem. Yet when the opportunity presents itself to help some of them we hear the cry, "The Nation cannot afford to do this."

We are aware that these amendments will incur additional expenditures. However, we are also aware that this is the wisest investment this Nation could make.

We have faith in our unemployed and we feel that, if given the chance, they will have the ability to pull themselves out of the rut of despair and the Nation will benefit from the returns it receives from this additional "investment."

In all the testimony we heard, during our hearings on this legislation this summer, representatives of industry, management, labor, education, and all levels of government testified that "Basic education is necessary if we are to get our unemployed into occupational training," and "More of our unemployed youth must be trained if we do not want to develop tomorrow's hard-core unemployed group." And all the witnesses knew more money would be required to do this.

The majority of Congressmen agree with the need for the amendments. However, some are reluctant to pay for them.

Mr. Chairman, if the need is there, and it is, then we must buy it. We cannot have one without the other.

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

Mr. Chairman, if you were to project the program as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has done on the scale on which it has been operated during its first and experimental year, you would reach the same conclusion he has reached. But as has been pointed out repeatedly, two changes have taken place. First, this program, a new and experimental program, has made such progress that the department is ready to move ahead with it at the rate which the Congress had originally contemplated.

Second, the amendments made by this bill before us today, with respect to a stepped up youth program and, further with respect to taking on additional trainees who would go into combined basic education and skill courses, envisions an additional 93,000 trainees per year in those courses.

Finally, the on-the-job training program, one of those provisions of the bill in which the Members of the House who voted for this bill a year and a half ago put the most hope, did not cost a nickel for training in the last fiscal year. Very wisely the Department was moving slowly in setting up the procedures under which such a program would operate, and they are now ready to go. So we expect an expansion of this program. We would naturally and normally expect an expansion of this program. If we did not have one, we would be disappointed in the outcome of the legislation we enacted.

Very frankly, Mr. Chairman, if I had thought a year and one-half ago, that this program would never get any further off the ground than it did in its opening phases, I would never have come down here to vote for its enactment.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, we are ready to move at an accelerated rate. There are unemployed who qualify for training; who can take such training; and who can enter jobs. We want to help them and we are not going to be able to do so unless we have the money to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio although I agree with his analysis of the rest of the bill. I am sorry we have to disagree on this, but I am particularly opposed to his amendment as it affects not the current fiscal year but the next 2 fiscal years following this current fiscal year when we could expect some expansion and improvement in the program. So I would ask the House to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

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

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman then if he does not agree that for this fiscal year at any rate, there is no need for any additional authorization? Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that; and is it not true that the Department of Labor for all practical purposes has so stated?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman, there is some room for a difference of opinion as to what is needed. I have not thought that the Department needed perhaps as much as it asked for the current fiscal year. But I think it could use some money in this current fiscal year. The Department probably will not need as much as we provided when we wrote the amount in the bill for the current fiscal year. But so far as the 2 subsequent fiscal years are concerned, I am really very much concerned.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out lines 17 through 24, and insert the following:

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $407,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $281,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966'."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment that I have offered for Mr. Taft's amendment simply does this: It provides for a different redistribution of the funds authorized by this bill. In actual dollars and cents it amounts to a $9.5 million, or a little more than that, savings on Mr. Taft's amendment. It is $276 million under the committee bill, and it would shorten the program. This is a brand new program and is certainly needed. I know it is needed in my community.

Last year because of a national policy change placing an embargo on Cuban tobacco the cigar industry in my district was greatly curtailed, and where that industry had at one time employed 10,000 people, it is now employing about 2,000 people. We have a vast retraining problem there.

This is a new and very rapidly expanding program. I think that the Congress should reserve to itself the right to come back and reexamine the program, see how the administration is carrying it out. I believe that the redistribution of funds, as I have proposed in my amendment, is a more equitable distribution than that proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft]. I think it would allow the orderly expansion of the program under the administration and also allow Congress to rework the program in the light of the experience that we have had. Let us realize that this is a new program and one that Congress should exercise its responsibility on, to reexamine and rework it as we learn from experience.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on his substitute. Although it does end up $9 million less than the Taft amendment it does give us an opportunity at an earlier date to review this program again. I would like to support the substitute.

Mr. GIBBONS. This amendment saves money. It will quicken the congressional review of the problem and it will certainly provide that there be no lag in this very well needed program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be deluded by this amendment as an amendment which cuts back the total authorization by more than $9 million over the cut that I suggested in the authorization. It does that by the very simple expedient of cutting out the last year, the fiscal year 1967, from the program entirely and picking up the $161 million which my amendment had for that fiscal year. The bill actually had $211 million for the 1967 authorization and spread that back over the other 3 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gibbons) there were—ayes 102, noes 105.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Gibbons and Mr. Taft.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 137, noes 121.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDRUM: Page 4, beginning in line 24, strike out "have concluded that further school attendance by such youth is no longer practicable under the circumstances" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "have concluded, after considering any assistance available (under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963), that further school atendance by such youth in any regular academic or vocational program is no longer practicable under the circumstances."

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, considerable discussion has been had here today about the possibility of conflict between this program, as it relates to the training of youths between the ages of 17 and 22, and the program contemplated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. While it is true that various members of the committee have stated there is no intention on the part of the sponsors of this legislation, and certainly I believe there is no intention on the part of the agency of Government which will be charged with its administration to interfere with the vocational education program as contemplated in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, I believe that in order to allay these fears and to remove any question about whether the two programs may come into conflict that this amendment is necessary.

I do not see that it does any violence or harm whatever to the overall program contemplated in this legislation, and I do believe it clarifies the question of whether we will have under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act the work-study program, an opportunity for a conflict to develop and actual competition to arise between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I just want to say it was our intention all along to avoid such conflict and the gentleman's amendment would clarify that point. I think the amendment the gentleman has offered is a good amendment.

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

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very worthwhile contribution to this bill, and I would like to accept the amendment.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, close at 5 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS:

Page 8, line 16, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 3, strike out "three" and insert "two".

Page 9, line 12, strike out "1967" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, so that the Members will understand exactly what is in this bill, if they will just take the bill and look at page 5, line 12, and read it, they will find it is still in there. Lines 12, 13, and 14 are still in there and lines 20 and 21 are still in there. I admit there is no authorization for the money for those years, but the 50-percent matching provision is still in here. It has not been stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated on the floor

that it is my intention to preserve the 50-percent matching formula, if I ever get to it.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not believe we are establishing firmly a 50-percent ratio, unless we authorize funds for the year in question. The gentleman's amendment stops the program at the end of the fourth year. So, anything we say about the fifth year is merely an expression of our desire and we cannot bind a future Congress.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is the way I understand it anyway. You cannot bind a future Congress anyway. We are just expressing our opinion here.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, 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. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, pursuant to House Resolution 583, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[For text, see P.L. 88-214, below.]

[Senate, Dec. 13, 1963]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H.R. 8720, so that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may explain the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which was read twice by its title.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill is the House version of an amendment to increase authorizations for the Manpower Development and Training Act. Senators may recall that earlier this session the Senate passed S. 1716 and S. 1831, bills which deal in general with the training of school dropouts and the percentage of the total training allowance which could be used for youth training and the matching requirements which were imposed on the States under the original act, and which the Senate decided to waive until June 30, 1965.

The Senate bills also added 52 weeks of literacy training.

Instead of acting on the Senate bill, the House passed its own bill. I now ask the Senate to accept the House bill. This request is made at the suggestion of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. The bill has been cleared with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the chairman and all the other members, Republican as well as Democratic, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I pay particular tribute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has been a source of great strength to the committee and to the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower throughout the passage of the Senate bills, and who is quite content to have the Senate act now on the substitute, the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the accolade bestowed by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania upon my compatriot the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. He has done yeoman work in this field. He introduced substitute legislation in connection with the Youth Conservation Corps and other matters, some of which has found its way into an improved manpower training bill. So I salute him for the great work which he has done.

Mr. CLARK. I concur in the statement just made by the minority leader.

The differences between the House bill and the Senate bill are relatively minor. The House bill is a little more extensive than the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a compilation showing the differences between the House and Senate versions.

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

HOUSE VERSION

1. Lowers the age of youths eligible for training allowances from 19, as in existing act, to 17. The 17-year-olds would have to have been out of school at least a year.

2. Permits up to 25 percent of the persons receiving training allowances to be youths under 22 years of age. (Present law limits youth training allowances to 5 percent of the total training allowances.)

3. Postpones all matching until July 1, 1965. (Present law requires such matching begin July 1, 1964.) The amendment would require one-third matching in fiscal year 1966.

4. Adds 20 weeks of basic education in reading and writing to training allowance period for those trainees receiving training.

5. Permits increases in the weekly training allowance to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This provision is designed as an incentive to get unemployed workers to seek training rather than draw unemployment pay.

6. Permits trainees to work up to 20 hours part time without any loss in training allowances.

7. Reduces to 2 years the prior work experience required for trainees to be eligible. (Present law requires 3 years.)

8. Permits a member of the family, where the head is unemployed, to receive a training allowance. Only one person in the family group is eligible at any one time. (Present law limits training to heads of household.)

9. Provides, through demonstration projects, grants and/or loans to unemployed workers to help finance their relocation expenses.

10. Title II: Authorizes $161 million for fiscal year 1964, $407 million for fiscal year 1965, and $281 million for fiscal year 1966 for the training programs. (Present law authorizes $161 million for each of fiscal years 1964 and 1965.)

SENATE VERSION

1. Lowers the age to 16. Youth would have to have been out of school 6 months. (S. 1831.)

2. Permits up to 15 percent of the total training allowances to be used for youth training allowances. (S. 1831.)

3. Eliminates 50-50 match requirement for the duration of the program—that is, June 30, 1965 (S. 1716.)

4. Adds 52 weeks of literacy training. (S. 1831.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the differences in the authorizations in the two bills.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS UNDER TITLE II, COMBINING S. 1716 AND S. 1831 FOR COMPARISON WITH H.R. 8720

Senate bill	
Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	$100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Total	261,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	100,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	422,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1966	0
House bill	
Fiscal year June 30, 1964:	
New programs	0
Old programs	161,000,000
Fiscal year June 30, 1965:	
New programs	85,000,000
Old programs	161,000,000
Pick up State tab	161,000,000
Total	407,000,000

Fiscal year June 30, 1966: $281 million, which with State matching of one-third ($140 million) brings program level to $422 million.

The bill (H.R. 8720) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC LAW 88-214

An Act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended by inserting after "sought out and trained" the following: "as quickly as is reasonably possible", and by inserting after "afforded to these people" the following: "with the least delay".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 202 of the Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

(b) Section 202 of the Act is amended by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Whenever appropriate the Secretary shall provide a special program for the testing, counseling, selection, and referral of youths, sixteen years of age or older, for occupational training and further schooling, who because of inadequate educational background and work preparation are unable to qualify for and obtain employment without such training and schooling."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section (as so designated prior to the redesignation provided for in subsection (b) is amended by inserting after "training" in the first sentence thereof the following: "(other than for training under subsection (i))".

(d) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Whenever appropriate, the Secretary of Labor may also refer for the attainment of basic education skills those eligible persons who indicate their intention to, and will thereby be able to, pursue courses of occupational training of a type for which there appears to be reasonable expectation of employment. Such referrals shall be considered a referral for training within the meaning of this Act, and such persons shall be eligible

for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 203 of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting in the second sentence of the first paragraph after "fifty-two weeks" the following: "(except where authorized for individuals referred for training under section 202(1)",

(2) by inserting in such sentence after "not exceed" the following: "$10 or more than",

(3) by inserting in the first sentence of the second paragraph after "less than" the following: "$10 more than",

(4) by inserting in the second sentence of the second paragraph after "compensation and" the following: "$10 more than", and

(5) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in full-time training under section 231 shall not be reduced on account of his part-time employment which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary of Labor shall pay training allowances only to unemployed persons who have had not less than two years of experience in gainful employment and who are either heads of families or heads of households as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or who are members of a household in which the head of the household or the head of the family is unemployed: *Provided*, That not more than one person in any one household may be receiving training allowances under this Act at any particular time. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may pay training allowances at a rate not in excess of $20 a week to youths seventeen years of age or older who require such training allowance in order to undertake training, who are referred for training in accordance with section 202(b), and who are not entitled to allowances under the preceding sentence, except that no such training allowance shall be paid to any such youth who has not graduated from high school, unless the Secretary has satisfied himself that such youth has continuously failed to attend school for a period of not less than one year and that the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling, have concluded, after considering any assistance available under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, that further school attendance by such youth in any regular academic or vocational program is no longer practicable under the circumstances. Not more than 25 percentum of the persons who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for receipt of unemployment compensation) may be youths under the age of twenty-two."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, any amount paid to a State for training allowances under this section, or as reimbursement for unemployment compensation under subsection (h), shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 33⅓ per centum of the amount of such payments, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts shall be paid on condition that such State shall bear 50 per centum of the amount of such payments."

(d) Paragraph (2) of subsection (h) of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1964, and for 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid on or after that date" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "July 1, 1965, for 66⅔ per centum of the amount of such benefits paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and 50 per centum of the amount of such benefits paid thereafter".

SEC. 4. (a) The center heading of section 205 of the Act is amended to read as follows: "ADVISORY COMMITTEES".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of making expert assistance available to persons formulating and carrying on programs under this title, the Secretary shall, where appropriate, require the organization on a community, State, and/or regional basis of labor-management-public advisory committees."

(c) Subsections (d) and (e) of such section are amended by inserting "National Advisory" immediately before "Committee" each place it appears.

SEC. 5. Part A of title II of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS"

"SEC. 208. During the period ending June 30, 1965, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed. Where such assistance is provided in the form of grants, such grants may not exceed 50 per centum of the expenses incurred reasonably necessary to the transportation of the person who is relocating, and his family, and their household effects. Where such assistance is provided in the form of loans, or a combination of loans and grants, the total amount thereof may not exceed 100 per centum of such expenses and shall be made subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this title, not more than 2 per centum thereof, or $4,000,000, whichever is the lesser, may be used for the purposes of this section."

SEC. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 231 of the Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that with respect to education to be provided pursuant to referrals under subsection (b) or (i) of section 202, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make arrangements for the provision of the education to be provided under such subsection through other appropriate education agencies".

(b) The second sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended by striking out ", if facilities or services of such agencies or institutions are not adequate for the purpose," and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence the following: "where such institutions can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures".

(c) The third sentence of section 231 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The State agency shall be paid 50 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, except that for the period ending June 30, 1965, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed persons, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 66⅔ per centum of such cost."

SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Act is amended by striking out "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "$161,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $407,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $281,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966".

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "and a like amount for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years".

SEC. 8. Section 305 of the Act is amended by striking out "vocational".

SEC. 9. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 309 of the Act are each amended by striking out "March 1, 1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966".

SEC. 10. Section 310 of the Act is amended by striking out "1965" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

Approved December 19, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 861 (Comm. on Education & Labor).

Senate Reports: No. 458 accompanying S. 1716 and No. 480 accompanying S. 1831 (Comm. on Labor & Public Welfare).

Congressional Record, Vol. 109 (1963):

Dec. 12: Considered and passed House.

Dec. 12: Considered and passed Senate.

RED CHINA AND NARCOTICS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I had brought to my attention a very interesting and really startling radio broadcast on the program entitled "Spectrum" delivered on the CBS radio network on February 23, 1972, by Jeffrey St. John:

SPECTRUM: VARYING SHADES OF PERSONAL OPINION ON CURRENT ISSUES

I'm Jeffrey St. John with my personal viewpoint.

George Washington observed in his famous Farewell Address that, "History and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

This Washington observation has special significance, as we stated in an earlier commentary, in view of President Nixon's Peking journey. First because of the growth of Red Chinese espionage activities in this country, and, second, Peking's use of hard drugs as a source of revenue to support such subversive activities.

The use of narcotics for ideological ends by the Chinese is not some political pipedream thought up by those disgruntled at the President's new diplomatic overtures. Ever since the establishment of the Reds on the China mainland they have been actively involved in drugs. However, it has only been in recent years that narcotics have served a specific ideological end, coinciding with the mushrooming of the drug problem in Western nations like the United States.

A confirmation of this fact is found in the political biography of the late Egyptian President, Nasser. In a 1965 meeting with

Nasser in Cairo, China's Chou En-lai is reported to have told Nasser that one of Peking's goals was the demoralization of GIs in Vietnam by drugs. "Some are trying opium," Chou stated. "We are helping them. We are planting the best kind of opium, and we are going to fight them with their own weapons . . . we want to demoralize them."

Everyone knows by now the impact drugs have had on GIs in Vietnam. Dr. Robert Baird, a New York drug expert with 24 years in the field of drug addiction, contends that the Chinese are now preparing to use drugs to demoralize the American populace, especially young people, and for ideological purposes. Dr. Baird contends, moreover, that our nation is being misled that Turkey is the major source of hard narcotics. Dr. Baird estimates Red China produces 55 to 60 percent of the world's hard drugs. He contends that because of the Administration's new China policy this harsh fact is being played down.

Dr. Baird in the past has been right while the government experts and officials have been dead wrong. And Washington was right: "History and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government."

I'm Jeffrey St. John for Spectrum.

ETHNIC SYMPOSIUM IN NEW YORK

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, at a time when tensions are great between groups within our society it is encouraging to see a group of men and women, leaders and representatives of a broad range of ethnic groups in New York City, get together for a frank and candid dicusssion of the issues between them and possible means for reconciling differences.

I have long believed that the very survival of New York as a great city lay in the ability of its leaders to form coalition of the diverse elements which make up New York—coalitions based on the very and vital goals they hold in common and which must take precedence over the differences.

A week ago, 300 ethnic leaders came together at the Statler Hilton Hotel. Mention of but a few of those 300 serves to illustrate the diversity represented at the symposium: Bayard Rustin, the black civil rights leader; Msgr. Geno Baroni, a Roman Catholic priest who serves as the director of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs; Jule M. Sugarman, the city's Human Resources Administrator; Luis Quero Chiesa, chairman of the board of higher education: Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers.

Last week's symposium will, I sincerely hope, lead to an even broader dialog aimed at reconciling the tensions which threaten our city and our Nation. Because I believe what happened in New York has important implications for every area of our Nation, I present for inclusion in the RECORD the New York Times report on the symposium and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1972]

ETHNIC LEADERS DISCUSS THE ASSETS OF DIVERSITY

(By Peter Kihss)

Ciao is Italian for "Hi!" and CIAO is the short name for the five-year-old Congress of Italian-American Organizations.

Yesterday CIAO brought together more than 300 ethnic leaders—Italians, blacks, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and others—in a symposium at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

They heard Bayard Rustin, the Negro civil rights leader, propose a "consultative council for exploring creative ways out of problems which pose inter-ethnic conflicts."

A Roman Catholic priest, Msgr. Geno Baroni, director of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, delivered a keynote appeal for a "new American dream—the urban ethnic pluralistic society"—to enable "diversity to become an asset instead of a liability."

"There never was a melting pot," Mr. Rustin declared. "There never will be a melting pot. If there ever were, it would be such a tasteless soup that we would have to go and start all over."

Later, Ralph J. Perrotta, director of the New York Project of the National Urban Coalition, said a New York Center for Ethnic Affairs was being put together.

He forecast a start in the next few weeks with support from CIAO, the American Italian Coalition, the Hellenic American Council, the American Jewish Committee, black and Puerto Rican groups, the city administration and others.

In the wide-ranging discussion yesterday, Jule M. Sugarman, the city's Human Resources Administrator, said his chief desire would be "a job for everybody—then other problems would disappear."

Started by Mrs. Mary Sansone, now full-time executive director, to help the Italian-American poor, CIAO now has city funds to start three day-care centers and to establish services for the elderly.

In a discussion of ethnic groups' common problems, Mr. Rustin said:

"I urge Italians not to make the mistake many black people have made—that soul food, long hair, black poetry, black music and black drama are the way out for the masses of black people who do not have the things they need."

"The most serious problem facing America today is the economic situation," Mr. Rustin said.

"Everywhere in the world," he went on," people are substituting ethnicity for the solution of problems." Mr. Rustin called instead for rallying together for political power.

AGENDA FOR THE SEVENTIES

Monsignor Baroni declared that "just as blacks and browns" had led causes in the last decade, "white, middle-America ethnics will set the agenda for the nineteen-seventies." Such whites, he said, are "economically, culturally, socially and politically alienated" and disillusioned.

The question, he said, is: "Can we develop a political majority—whites, ethnics, browns, blacks—to reorder the priorities?" He added "We don't need a shuttle to the moon."

Calling for new leadership "for real equality and justice" and "a quality life," Monsignor Baroni said his mother used to offer a proverb, "life is like two loaves of bread—one to eat for the body, one to sell and buy flowers with."

During the discussions, Hulbert James, director of the National Council of Churches' antihunger program, charged that the city's school system was failing for blacks and that preschool Head Start programs were defined in white middle-class terms. He favored community control.

A Puerto Rican leader, Luis Quero Chiesa, chairman of the Board of Higher Education, said communities should organize to get ethnic study programs—"the more a migrant knows about himself, the clearer he will see his contribution to America."

One panelist was Mrs. Sansone's son, Ralph, a senior at Bishop Ford High School in Brooklyn. Mr. Sansone appealed for time for students to learn about their schools so that they could be involved in changes, and he favored ethnic studies that would go out into the community.

"I know Michelangelo was a great guy," he said, "but I find it hard to relate to him. If I can go into the community, I can relate to a lawyer or a garbage man."

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, many of our smaller American communities are facing constant crises relating to necessary community services. While the Federal and State governments offer assistance in many areas, communities are often left to their own resources and devices to provide essential services.

The town of Vinton, in Benton County, Iowa, provides an excellent example of local concern and initiative. When ambulance service was brought to a halt 2 years ago, the residents responded by forming the North Benton Ambulance Service. A fund-raising drive produced $25,000, $5,000 above its goal. Volunteers were recruited to drive the ambulances.

The ambulance service, now in its third year, has become a profitmaking enterprise. David M. Edgar, director of the ambulance service, said that—

The people showed their dedication, interest and community pride, and that really made the difference.

At a time when adequate medical care is a unique problem in our rural areas, it is encouraging to find such programs. Recently, Picture Magazine of the Des Moines Register noted the outstanding achievement of Vinton and her citizens. I would like to share this story with you.

The article follows:

DO-IT-YOURSELF AMBULANCE PROJECT—VINTON VOLUNTEERS MEET EMERGENCIES

(By Nick Lamberto)

Two years ago Vinton, the Benton County seat, a city of 4,845 residents, responded to a crisis by forming the North Benton Ambulance Service after two funeral homes decided to quit such operations because of rising costs. Dozens of volunteers participated in the do-it-yourself project, principally in the opening fund drive in which the goal of $20,000 was exceeded by $5,000. It was a great example of a community picking itself up by its own bootstraps.

"It shows what citizens can do when they get together on something," says Bill Monroe, editor of the Cedar Valley Times.

"And it was done without help from the federal government."

The donated $25,000 was used to buy a new ambulance for $15,000 and a second-hand one for $3,000. The city furnished a two-stall heated garage next to City Hall, where a fire station once was housed.

IN ITS SECOND YEAR, SERVICE SHOWS PROFIT

The first year (1970) the city subsidized the program with $5,000 in funds; the

county, through the board of supervisors, furnished $4,000. In 1971, the city added $2,500, which was put aside toward eventual purchase of a new ambulance.

Nine volunteers drive the ambulances. They are scheduled so all time periods are covered. All are trained in first aid. Their only pay is on a per call basis.

But the most gratifying news about the home-cooked project is that in its second year of operation (1971) it not only was self-supporting, but showed a profit.

David M. Edgar, 29, the ambulance service director and its only full-time employee, says a net profit of $1,407.99 was realized in 1971. Total income was $14,009.89; costs, $12,601.90. Assets, including some of the originally-donated money, include $7,500 in interest-bearing time certificates, $2,552.93 in savings, $2,453.78 in the operating account and $890 in accounts outstanding.

Edgar took over as manager in 1971. At the time, outstanding unpaid accounts totaled about $3,000. "I worked at this part of it," Edgar says. "I sent bills out every month and also made personal calls. I tried not to let them slide by. People in the county realize if the ambulance bills aren't paid tax money will probably have to be used, so they pay up."

The service charges $25 for any call made in Vinton, $35 for any in the county that brings the patient to the city's Virginia Gay Hospital. Transfers to Cedar Rapids, Waterloo or Independence cost $55, trips to Iowa City $75.

The nine ambulance operators are paid by the call—$5 for trips to Virginia Gay Hospital, $7 for runs to Cedar Rapids, Waterloo or Independence and $10 for trips to Iowa City.

"BASICALLY, WE COVER AREA OF 20-MILE RADIUS

"We serve anywhere we're called," Edgar says. "But basically we cover a 20-mile radius from Vinton, including Brandon, Dysart, south of La Porte City, Newhall and Urbana.

"We averaged about 30 calls a month last year, or a total of 360, with only 11 in December, an all-time low. The first year (1970) we had about 250 calls. There have been several instances where I think our presence has been the difference between life and death—in accidents and heart cases, in particular. Last year, people knew about us more and we got more calls."

Edgar became director last year after serving 10 months as night manager. "It was an ideal situation for me because I've always been involved in emergency work and it gave me time to continue my schooling," he says.

Edgar, born and reared in Ottumwa and a 1960 high school graduate there, was an air policeman for four years, serving the Air Force in Idaho, Alaska, Korea and Newfoundland. He was married in 1964 to the former Marilyn Jo Carroll of Ottumwa. They have a son, David, jr., 3, and a daughter, Christina Lynn, 7.

After attending William Penn College at Oskaloosa for a year, Edgar served as an Iowa highway patrolman for 3½ years before resigning to join the ambulance service at Vinton and to continue his schooling at the University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Now in his senior year in college, Edgar drives a 90-mile round-trip on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays to attend classes and conduct practice teaching sessions. He's majoring in safety education and minoring in speech.

For his job as ambulance service director, Edgar receives $400 a month. He also earned about $2,200 in 1971 by serving as a justice of peace.

"Before an ambulance driver can turn a wheel he must take a standard first-aid course," Edgar says. "Then the drivers continue training by taking advanced first-aid courses."

The ambulance drivers include a banker, two service station operators, an assistant publisher, the owner of an advertising circular, a car salesman, a plumber, a postoffice employe and a barber. All are in their 30s or early 40s.

The drivers include David Henkel, Vernon Geiger, Rolland Dudden, Darrell Kenney, Dick Hogan, Ron Clemens, Jerry Michaels, Gene Relf and Dale Druschel. Four men being trained as drivers are Jim Henkle, Doug Conyers, David Edwards and Howard Edgar, 55, school custodian and father of David Edgar.

"We're constantly up-grading our equipment," says Director Edgar.

Is this the answer to the ambulance problem many cities face when funeral directors stop the service because the operation is not economical?

"It sure worked for us," Edgar says. "But to make it, you have to start out in the black so you don't have to struggle to make ends meet at first, and you need the personnel and the equipment. The people showed their dedication, interest and community pride and that really made the difference."

Dick Hogan, 37, assistant publisher of The Cedar Valley Times, serves as ambulance driver three or four days a month. "It's a rewarding experience," he says.

The list of those responsible for the success of the ambulance service probably would stretch beyond the horizon but in the tough early going back in late 1969, the Kiwanis Club committee and its chairman Galen Grote, the city council, county board of supervisors, hospital officials and Gary Thudium were mentioned in news stories about the crisis.

Says Editor Bill Monroe:

"It sure was the answer here. Our community is proud of the service and the way it was organized and originally funded. In a time when so many communities are faced with an ambulance service shortage, Vinton has established one that not only works, but works economically.

And that's what community pride and interest can do for cities such as Vinton when they won't take "no" for an answer.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging to note the progress that the vast majority of our young people are making in preparing themselves for positions of responsibility and leadership.

We have a special opportunity this week to recognize the achievements of a large segment of our youth—more than a half million girls and boys in all parts of the country—who are students of home economics and related courses in junior and senior high schools.

The week of March 19–25 has been designated National Future Homemakers of America Week to honor these students who are members of 11,000 FHA and Hero-FHA chapters throughout the United States.

Most of us are familiar with the constructive work of this organization. For those who are not, let me say that the Future Homemakers of America is a vocational youth organization whose purpose is to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living, with the emphasis on career education. It was founded in 1945 and is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

There are two types of chapters. FHA chapters are for students in consumer education, homemaking and family life education courses while Hero-FHA chapters are for students in home economics related occupations courses.

The 441 FHA and Hero-FHA chapters in Illinois have a total of 19,000 members and I am proud of the fact that their state president is a resident of the new 21st Congressional District, Miss Lee Ann Rust of Heyworth.

"Profiles of Youth" is the theme of National Future Homemakers Week. The young people are putting on programs and carrying out special activities to focus attention on their constructive efforts toward the goal of building a better life for themselves and for society.

They deserve our congratulations and our support.

BRAVE FIREFIGHTERS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a most enlightening summary of what is takes to be a fireman, which appeared in the Bronx Press Review.

In recognition of these brave firefighters, I have introduced legislation which would provide a $50,000 death benefit to the families of firemen, policemen, and correction officers killed in the line of duty. It also would provide a benefit to those permanently disabled in the line of duty.

We call upon our policemen and firemen to put their lives on the line every day; the least we can do is see that their families are provided for should they be killed or disabled.

I believe that this article will provide a better understanding of what kind of man becomes a fireman.

The article follows:

WHAT IS A FIREMAN?

He's the guy next door.

He's a man with the sharp memory of a little boy who never got over the excitement of engines and sirens and smoke and danger.

He's a guy like you and me, with warts and worries and unfilled dreams.

Yet he stands taller than most of us all.

He's a Fireman.

He puts it all on the line when the bell rings. A Fireman is at once the most fortunate and the least fortunate of men.

He's a man who savors life because he has seen too much death.

He's a gentle man because he has seen too much of the awesome power of violent forces out of control.

He's a man responsive to a child's laughter

because his arms have held too many small bodies that will never laugh again.

He's a man who appreciates the simple pleasures of life . . . hot coffee held in numbed, unbending fingers . . . the flush of fresh air pumping through smoke and fire convulsed lungs . . . a warm bed for bone and muscle compelled beyond feeling . . . the comradeship of selfless service and a job well done in the name of all men.

He doesn't wear buttons or wave flags or shout obscenities and when he marches, it is to honor a fallen comrade.

He doesn't preach the brotherhood of man. He lives it.

NEWSPAPERS COMMENT ON PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, millions of citizens saw and heard the President's speech to the Nation last Thursday evening. The following editorials from the two major newspapers in my district, each of which identifies itself with a different political party, comment on the President's remarks. I believe my colleagues will find these observations of interest.

The comments follow:

[From the Dayton Daily News, Mar. 19, 1972]

NIXON REVIVES DOCTRINE OF "SEPARATE BUT EQUAL"

President Nixon has asked Congress to adopt the discredited separate-but-equal doctrine and to elevate it from a regional eccentricity to national policy. In the process, he is urging Congress to join him in a dangerous confrontation among the executive, legislative and judicial branches, potentially the most serious constitutional crisis this nation has suffered in modern times and one it certainly doesn't need.

Mr. Nixon's proposals are morally craven and scientifically perverse.

While swearing he remains committed to school integration, the President wants Congress to legislate against additional busing. Mr. Nixon and the antibusing hysterics to whom he is pandering know that busing is the only practical means to school integration currently. Mr. Nixon did not offer an alternative—and, in fact, has opposed programs to encourage residential integration, the only real (and even then far off) method.

If Congress accepts the President's proposals, as it seems likely to, it will march up to a battle with the judiciary. Mere legislation can't relieve the courts of their higher duty to the Constitution. Jurists who consider segregation unconstitutional must continue to rule so.

The crunch then will come to Mr. Nixon. Having proclaimed and even worked to legislate against busing, will the President enforce court rulings that countermand his policy? Or will he, as President Andrew Jackson did when the Supreme Court proved contrary, abuse the Constitution by refusing to act?

That apparent irresolution is typical of the contortions that were the sole constant in the President's antibusing message.

The President—well, say he misstated the facts when he held that busing has proved to be "a very bad" way to school integration. On the contrary, while most of us have heard overwhelmingly of the few places where busing has been traumatic, busing has worked well most places. It is a "very bad way" to the degrees that Mr. Nixon and others in power permit incomprehension and overaction to make it untenable.

Mr. Nixon's proffered sop—to blacks in cash, to whites as a balm for their consciences—is to waste some $2.5 billion in schools attended by the children of poor families in order to achieve "quality" education for all.

That has been proved not to work. Many communities have tried it.

The results have been uniformly disappointing. The plain fact is this: the mere change to school integration has improved the educational performances of more pupils, and improved them more substantially and lastingly, than have the much more costly attempts at compensatory education.

Mr. Nixon has declined the role of leadership in the nation's complex, urgent challenge of achieving racial justice. He has accepted the role of chief follower and has predicated it on a misappreciation of "democracy."

His basic point is that busing is wrong because most Americans think it is wrong, but the option of majority rule in this country always has stopped short of majority tyranny, short of the lynch-mob psychology in which, too, the majority claims its privilege.

Mr. Nixon is saying that the basic rights of blacks exist at the convenience of whites, because whites outnumber blacks. Imagine the reaction if he were to say, as by the same logic he could, that the basic religious freedom of Catholics is subject to the majority rule of Protestants!

The President is moving us—or more accurately, helping us move ourselves—into precisely the entrenched, segregated society that the Kerner commission feared and warned against as the most serious internal peril facing the United States.

[From the Journal Herald, Mar. 18, 1972]

MR. NIXON'S PLAN—THE POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF ANTIBUSING

President Nixon's attack Thursday night on court-ordered busing of public school pupils for racial integration was a disheartening reminder of the enormous impact this issue will have on the national election this year. He commandeered the television time as our President; he spoke to us as a political candidate. A President assumes the sworn obligation to defend the Constitution. Mere candidates have no such duty.

The President could have saved time by saying forthrightly that all the polls—and more recently the Florida primary—show that a large majority of both blacks and whites want good schools without busing, and that a President with Mr. Nixon's tenuous and shifting majority dare not fly in the face that sentiment. That, coupled with his reminder that he has "spoken out against busing scores and scores of times over many years" are both realities.

But the rather tortuous exposition he gave of his views, sprinkled with hints of personal discovery of absolute truth and the expounding of ex cathedra dogma as to what the courts can and should do and what they have no right doing, gave him the image of a Wall Street George Wallace rather than a moderating national leader operating within the framework of separation of powers.

The President's approach was multi-faceted. He intimated that he liked the certainty of a constitutional amendment and that the busing issue warranted such action, but he sidestepped a firm position by saying the amendment process would take too long. The fact that he declined to deal with the many perils in the constitutional amendment approach was to us a disquieting evasion of a basic issue and almost invites ill-considered action if someone other than the President wants to initiate it.

The President's promise that the Justice Dept. would "intervene in selected cases where the lower courts have gone beyond the Supreme Court's requirements in ordering busing" creates the misleading impression that the Justice Dept. can pre-empt the role of the judiciary in determining the law of the land. That procedure may work in corporate law with something like the ITT case, but matters of civil rights aren't that facilely disposed of by the executive branch. The Justice Dept. can enter cases as a prosecutor or advocate but no more, and the President leaves himself open to charges of demagoguery by hinting at a more decisive role for the department in cases already in litigation.

Nor is it appropriate for a President to set himself up as judge and jury before the courts have acted. Mr. Nixon has done this repeatedly—in the Manson case, in the My Lai court martials and now in the busing issue. But he grossly exceeds both his power and propriety in so doing. The Supreme Court, in fact, has yet to establish requirements on busing, as Mr. Nixon surely must know, and his public judgments—or prejudgments—make him a ringleader in undermining respect for the court if the justices should not comply with Mr. Nixon's findings.

As an "action" remedy, the President proposes, first, legislation that would "call an immediate halt to all new busing orders by the federal courts, a moratorium on new busing." In other words, since it takes too long to amend the Constitution, we had better pass un-constitutional legislation. The legislation is of such doubtful constitutionality that it could well be tied up in the courts for years, but that eventuality might not be clear to most persons until after the presidential election in November, and we suspect therein lies its efficacy.

The second aspect of the President's program is to launch a massive program of federal aid to upgrade schools in minority areas. This is an attractive theory, one this newspaper advocated for many years, but it has proved both politically and educationally unworkable. Right here in Dayton attempts to channel additional monies into ghetto schools have brought cries from other areas of the city that this was discrimination in reverse, and that cry has had a substantial role in bringing down several tax levies. And without the substantial infusion of money needed for compensatory education it becomes an educational flop. And such a judgment does not get into the statistical data that reflect other difficulties growing out of isolating the lower economic classes, particularly blacks. To be sure, the compensatory programs have not been as thoroughly or systematically researched and evaluated as have the integrated programs, but that leaves their workability in doubt, not discredited, as the President would have us believe.

Finally, the prospect of federal aid to help communities upgrade their lagging schools seems to us a Trojan horse. The current scale of aid gives the federal government considerable leverage in determining local school policy. Hardly any school system is in a position to renounce federal aid. While the bait of additional substantial aid to head off busing may be attractive to many at first glance, citizens would do well to remember that as they dilute their equity in their own schools they also dilute control. We do not oppose federal aid where needed to achieve minimum standards in districts which lack the resources themselves, but districts that can support themselves are better off to do so than to be conned into accepting increased federal encroachment under the cloak of a popular political issue.

Moreover, there is no assurance that added federal aid for minority school areas will not increase resistance to increasing local support for schools and render the passage of levies even more difficult than in the past. We trust this federal bribery will be closely

scrutinized by all voters, regardless of their views on busing.

For one of the few times in his tenure, Mr. Nixon has in a major address failed to confront an issue candidly. We have disagreed with his conclusions on some previous policy statements, but his presentations have always been thorough and methodical, whatever might have been one's reaction to some of his rhetoric. We feel the President has not measured up in this presentation, and the nation is the poorer for it.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Greek Independence Day, Saturday, March 25, it is appropriate that we reflect upon the priceless contributions Americans of Greek extraction and the country from which they came have made upon the American system and way of life.

The word democracy is derived from the Greek words, demos, meaning the people, and kratos, authority.

Even as the ancient Greeks held that authority should come from the people, the Greeks who have emigrated to the United States have demonstrated to their fellow Americans that they hold this concept dear.

As we approach our bicentennial celebration of the American Revolution, I am reminded of the carving on the Archives Building here in the Capital which says "What Is Past Is Prologue."

When we consider America's heritage of individual liberties and freedom, we would do well to remember the origins of ideals and ideals embodied in our system of government.

Inevitably, we trace these origins to the birthplace of logic, the city-States of Hellene.

There, men became concerned with causes and effects, with abstract ideals of justice and with practical concepts of equitable government with human dignity.

Our Founding Fathers were thoroughly familiar with such philosophers as Plato and Aristotle. They avidly read the works of such historians as Thucydides and Herodotus. They knew the writings of Homer and Plutarch.

Our founders emulated the oratory of Demosthenes and the statesmanship of Pericles. Thus, ideas and goals upon which America was founded came, in large part, from Hellenistic culture as did the words which describe them.

I find it interesting that a contingent of soldiers from Zante, Greece, sailed to the new world to assist colonists during our War of Independence. Among these was Maj. Michael Vourtzis who served as an aide to General Lafayette in the Continental Army.

Now making his home in New York is Brig. Gen. Pericles Count Voultsos Vourtzis who is Prince Grand Master of the Sovereign Greek Order of St. Dennis of Zante, one of the more ancient, if not the most ancient chivalric group in world history.

Homer tells us that descendants of the first grand master, Laertes of 1200 B.C., aided Ulysses in the Trojan War. The order fought in the first crusade. In the 19th century, Knights of the Order proclaimed love of fellow man, battling want, alleviating misery, and mitigating need as formal teachings.

Among American leaders decorated with the order are President Nixon, Vice President AGNEW, and former President Truman. Others honored were Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Kennedy along with many Senators, Congressmen, Governors, generals, and admirals.

Mr. Speaker, this ancient order; the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association which has 415 local chapters, including chapter 91 in Buffalo, and many other Greek organizations with thousands upon thousands of members are contributing to the enrichment of our communities, our States, and our country, even as their forebears did in antiquity.

As these Greek-Americans observe Greece's liberation from the Ottoman Turks, as they offer thanks for Greek independence in Buffalo's Annunciation Hellenic Orthodox Church and other places of worship throughout our Nation, it is fitting that we—who owe so much to the ancient Greeks and their ancestors who carry the torch of enlightenment and freedom—salute them on this historic occasion.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS' WEEK

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Future Homemakers of America is an organization founded almost 27 years ago to help young people improve their personal, family, and community ways of life.

This year's National Future Homemakers' Week, March 19 through 25, has as its theme "Profiles of Youth." As the leaders of the National FHA have emphasized:

> This week gives us an opportunity to make the Future Homemakers' organization a familiar profile of leadership among our schools, community, and nation.

The young men and women who make up the FHA, interested as they are in planning and carrying out the numerous roles involved in being a homemaker and a wage earner, are active in individual and group activities designed to teach leadership, build character, and encourage community participation.

There are some 65,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America, organized into 1,600 chapters in Texas alone. To me this represents a most inspiring figure, for these young men and women will be parents and breadwinners in the not-too-distant future. That future cannot help but be a bright one when consideration is given to the efforts of these young people who have taken to heart the lessons taught in their home economics classes. But they have not let their education stop at the classroom door. These young FHA members are out actively working to improve the environment, with continuing efforts at cleaning up and preserving our natural surroundings.

I extend congratulations to all the chapters of the National Future Homemakers of America in the State of Texas, as well as to other chapters of the FHA throughout the country, as they strive to attain their vitally important objectives.

POLLUTION CONTROL: THE MISSING DATA

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller testified before our House Public Works Committee that zero discharge would cost $2 to $3 trillion, and still not get the job done. Faced with these uncertainties as to cost and feasibility our committee has recommended a 2-year study by the institution with the highest possible professional expertise and integrity, the Natinoal Academy of Sciences. I commend to my colleagues and my fellow Americans the following splendid address by Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of North American Rockwell Corp., superbly pointing out the cost of zero discharge:

POLLUTION CONTROL: THE MISSING DATA

(By Willard F. Rockwell, Jr.)

Gentlemen, possibly you're familiar with that saying of Georges Clemenceau, "War is much too important to be left to the generals."

Sometimes in the midst of all this uproar over pollution control, I feel the need for a reverse twist to that saying: "Pollution control is much too important to be left to the dreamers."

Just two months ago the United States Senate passed a water pollution control bill whose ultimate cost, according to the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, could be $317 billion.

That's enough to shake the economic foundations of this country.

And that's what I want to talk about tonight—the economic challenge to this nation that exists because those with the power to impose such bills chose to ignore fundamental principles of science and engineering.

No one denies the existence of pollution.

I think we all agree: Mother Nature is in poor environmental health.

All of us have shared in some ways in creating this condition. And when I say all, I mean all—

from the industrialist who's years late eliminating pollutants from plant discharge;

to the municipalities who dump their sewage problems in the nation's rivers;

to the individual who throws the beer can

along the highway or the empty cigarette pack on the sidewalk.

I believe it's to the credit of all Americans that we do recognize our shortcomings; that we do recognize our responsibilities; and that individually and collectively we are doing a great deal about pollution control.

This nation is embarked on what may be the greatest research and development program in the history of the world. We're making the first tentative steps toward a national goal—the remaking of our total environment.

The cost of the task will be enormous.

The Apollo moon landing program, from the moment President Kennedy announced the objective until Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon, cost $24 billion.

In contrast, the cost of pollution control may be four, ten, even thirteen times as much.

In August 1970 the magazine *U.S. News and World Report* estimated the national pollution control price tag would be $71 billion.

The Wall Street Journal has forecast that $85 to $95 billion will be needed in the next five years to deal with pollution problems.

Just recently, William Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, spelled out his projection—a phenomenal $105 billion over a five-year period, with $25 billion of that sum coming from private sector investment.

We were just beginning to assimilate that figure when the Senate passed, 86 to 0, Bill 2770, the so-called Zero Discharge Bill. House Resolutions 11895 and 11896 deal with the same basic issues.

Zero discharge, the elimination of all pollutants, no matter what the discharge outlet, is a commendable concept.

The aims of the bill are good—but the lack of realism is appalling. Straining for absolutely pure water for universal usage adds astronomically to the cost.

The first 85–90 percent of water pollutants can be removed at a twenty-year cost, nationally, of just over $60 billion.

To remove approximately 9 percent more would cost a total of $119 billion!

To raise the removal level to 100 percent would cost a total of $317 billion!

Or put it this way: the first 85–90 percent involve outlays of $0.7 billion per percentage point of removal.

To eliminate approximately 7 additional points requires outlays of $6 billion per point

But to raise the level from there to 100 percent requires outlays of something like $66 billion per remaining point of removal!

Let me emphasize that this is just an estimate. It's difficult to be specific about cost because of the lack of data. But it's estimated that achieving the goal of pure discharge water from the 14 trillion gallons of industrial water alone could range anywhere from $7 billion per year to $7 trillion per year. The wide spread depends on the acceptable level of parts per million of total dissolved solids.

If we could put money considerations aside—and frankly, that's impossible, for it's going to have an economic impact on every man, woman, and child in this country—how would we, as engineers, approach this situation?

We may as well get used to this type of contemplation, because eventually the job is going to fall on engineers and scientists. Folk singers aren't going to be much help when it comes down to the nitty gritty. Pollution may bring about a whole new generation of folk songs, but even those people must realize that technology, and only technology, is going to bring about the pure air, the pure water all of us want so desperately.

And, legislators, as much as we will need their unflagging support, of necessity must fall back when the nitty gets gritty. Money is no substitute for technical skill. You engineers are the ones who'll be called upon to solve the problems connected with reshaping the world's environment.

When that job is handed to you—how are you going to go about it? What are the parameters of the problem?

Most of you have been involved, at some time in your careers, with major research and development programs.

You know that first you must have firm guidelines and a clear picture of the ultimate goal. Then you sketch on paper your ideas as to how that goal can be reached. Afterward you build a pilot plant, or a model, and you test your theories under every conceivable condition.

You furnish to the customer paying the bill a full report not only on the operation and efficiency of the proposed project, but every possible side effect.

There are hundreds, even thousands of questions that must be answered before any responsible engineer or scientist will move from R and D into the operating phase.

In seeking an example, my thoughts turn naturally to aerospace.

Many of you are familiar with the big research wind tunnels and know how they operate in development testing.

As a rule there's an area where tremendous amounts of compressed air are stored. A one-second valve swings open and the air rushes past the suspended aircraft model.

Very detailed instrumentation, including Schlieren optical systems, gives the engineers excellent readings on the exact behavior of the model—all the way from touchdown speeds to trisonic.

Frankly, no manufacturer would dare build an advanced aircraft without thousands of hours of these tunnel tests. The B–1 aircraft we're building, for example, involves 22,000 hours of testing in the tunnel.

And it's that kind of preparation we must have in pollution control.

We must place the national goal of clean air and clean water in a hypothetical research tunnel.

We haven't compiled the necessary data. A lot of serious research *has* been done in this area, but we haven't determined the total impacts of the program on our national economic plans.

And gentlemen, there will be total impacts. If Senate bill 2770 stands as written, the economic lives of 200,000,000 Americans may never again be exactly the same.

Paul McCracken, former chairman of the President's Economic Advisers, said just last month, "An overly ambitious pollution control program could paradoxically contribute to enlarged structural unemployment. Its adverse impacts would probably turn out to be disproportionately heavy on industries and products that are important to our foreign trades."

Harold Scott, the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of Commerce, is even more blunt in his appraisal. "You begin to cost our environmental solutions," Scott said recently in a *Forbes Magazine* interview, "and you find that theoretically many of our industries are going to be priced out of world markets."

Technology gets transferred in a hurry these days, and I don't think for one minute that our foreign competitors are going through the same multi-billion dollar development cycle we'll be facing here at home.

And yet some equalizing measures must be adopted, otherwise we must be prepared for foreign competitors to literally steal away some of our industries rendered non-competitive by pollution control costs.

It's a very real threat, one that has been recognized by the White House, where a special task force is studying industries whose world market position is weakened by U.S. pollution control regulations.

The National Industrial Pollution Control Council has set up a special International Environment Advisory Committee which is making a world-wide survey of possible cooperative efforts.

We're working jointly with Canada, for example, to restore the quality of the Great Lakes. We're developing bilateral relations in environmental matters with Mexico, Spain, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Rumania.

Even if we had no worries about our friends abroad, we have ample worries about the economic impact at home.

I'm convinced that this country has the technical capability to achieve success in this environmental clean-up.

I believe these essential technical aspects, the total and indispensable involvement of science and engineering, are being recognized by the people. Just the other day, the nation was told of a space satellite that will be used, starting this year, to monitor secondary pollution from strip mining operations in eastern Ohio.

And David Templeton, dean of Chemistry at the University of California in Berkeley, revealed how elemental is the need for technical awareness. Commenting on the heightened student interest in science this semester he said: "If you want to do something about pollution then you immediately get involved in chemistry."

Of course, that's what we've been saying, in a different manner, for years.

Chemistry, for example, is the key discipline in a major air study North American Rockwell's Science Center will perform for the California Air Resources Board.

That study involves scientists from Cal Tech, the University of Minnesota, and the University of California, who'll sample the air in the Los Angeles Basin, the San Francisco Bay area, and the San Joaquin Valley. They'll develop techniques and test instruments to measure and monitor the polluting aerosols.

Chemistry, too, will play a major role in eliminating sulphur dioxide from electricity-generating facilities. That'll be a billion dollar effort alone. And that cost will be on top of another billion dollars needed each year to remove fly ash from the same stacks.

However, it's not the technical problems that worry me. This country can solve them, just as we overcame those facing us when we set out for the moon.

It's the economic aspects that give me concern.

There are limits to how far and fast pollution abatement controls can be implemented without jeopardizing a national economic performance.

Just what does a $300,000,000,000 expenditure in a non-productive area mean to this country?

For one think it could mean a slowing in the vitally needed annual increase in our gross national product, an increase that hopefully takes care of the million and more people who come on the payrolls for the first time each year.

It was less than two decades ago that someone laughed at a presidential candidate when he predicted that some day 60 million Americans would need jobs.

Today there are 80 million Americans at work.

So if I say 100 million Americans will be at work within the next twenty years—I don't think I'll be laughed out of the hall—especially if it's your sons and daughters who will be numbered among those filling the new jobs.

Against that certainty, I find this interesting:

Andrew F. Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, said, "There is a fundamental conflict between our efforts to maximize the growth of our gross national product as traditionally defined, and our efforts to devote a substantial share of our real resources to pollution control."

If I may take the liberty of paraphrasing Mr. Brimmer he's saying we can't have our cake and eat it, too.

The growth of real output in the United States depends heavily on the pace of investment in plant and equipment to expand productive capacity. Mark those words, *To expand productive capacity.*

The $20 million Bethlehem Steel spent last year on pollution abatement facilities didn't contribute to productivity, according to the chairman of the board, Stewart Cort.

Productivity is an essential ingredient of growth, and growth means jobs.

The American economy can't stand still.

It can't idle its engines overlong, or pull over to the side of the road for a year-long nap. Were we to do this, the resulting national retrogression would profoundly affect not only our daily lives but our destiny as a nation.

We can't tolerate anything that will slow the increase of our gross national product.

And here I part company with William Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, Ruckelshaus, in a TV interview, questioned the need for the growth of the GP and he introduced a new term, I believe it was net national product, NNP.

Whatever the term, I believe the concept must stand two tests: What does it do to the economic health of the country? Does it create new jobs?

And jobs *are* at stake.

Plants are being shut down.

The *Christian Science Monitor* recently reported, "Businesses falling victim to tough new state and federal standards number in the hundreds, according to a count being kept by the federal Environmental Protection Agency."

"Everybody," according to Ted Rajda, director of review and coordination in EPA's office of enforcement, "is being hit—both municipalities and industry."

That's happening, and yet we're lacking important data, not only on plants that have already been shut down, but on the fate of those being debated daily as industries weigh the impact of these new costs and lost jobs.

President Nixon recognizes the challenge to jobs. A few months ago he said, "We have to realize that when the Congress, or the Administration carrying out the will of the Congress, sets certain standards to clean up the air or clean up the water, we must weigh against that how many jobs it's going to cost. If it's going to cost a disproportionate number we must reevaluate the decision.

So I don t think we're about to do as one of the environmentalists suggested offhandedly. He said: "We simple set up a Federal subsidy program for those whose jobs are lost."

I believe this country has learned some bitter lessons about swapping subsidies for jobs—and we're not about to go that route again.

However, as I mentioned, data on potential job loss is another vital input which we must have for our research and development in the environmental program.

Mr. Brimmer points out that from 1971 through 1975 it's going ot take about 10 percent of the cumulative increase of the gross national product to finance the capital investment to check pollution.

That may seem a bit remote, a bit difficult to grasp. Let's bring it down to something easier to visualize, corporate profits. Let's talk about steel.

Ed Gott, Chairman of the Board of U.S. Steel, reecntly said that more than $350 million have been authorized by the steel industry for pollution control facilities scheduled to go into operation this year. Total spending by the steel industry is approaching the $2 billion mark.

And that, according to Gott, is just the beginning. Future capital costs of air and water pollution controls in the steel industry are projected at $4.5 billion—a sum that is greater than the total profits of the American steel industry during the past five years!

Zero growth and zero profits may delight some of the environmentalists, but I don't believe our productive, intelligent citizens are going to allow this nation to commit financial suicide.

American industry will, of necessity, shoulder a great portion of the cost.

In the year just completed, investment in pollution control activities by American companies increased 46 percent over that of the previous year to a total of $3.6 billion.

That's 4.4 percent of their total capital investment.

This year it's estimated to rise to 7.6 percent, and within a year or two, 10 percent of all capital investment will be for pollution control equipment.

Various other industries are confronted by demands that will be a tremendous strain on their economic resources.

The electric utilities are going to be faced with a $3.2 billion cleanup bill. Six other basic industries will spend more than a billion dollars apiece.

James McSwiney, president of the Mead Corporation, has given us the impact on the paper industry of the so-called Zero Discharge bill.

Under present conditions, the American paper industry is spending $1 billion, 116 million to meet primary and secondary treatment standards for its present capacity of 170,000 tons per day by 1974–1975.

At that rate, according to Mead, the annual operating costs for pollution control equal 17 percent of the capital investment.

Now, to meet the proposed zero discharge requirement, the percentage of capital investment devoted to water pollution in the paper industry will increase drastically, jumping to 30 and even to 40 percent of capital investment.

The annual operating costs, which now range from two to four percent of manufacturing costs, will fluctuate in a wide range from 20 to 60 percent.

And selling price of paper will have to increase anywhere from 25 to 65 percent just to maintain the present unsatisfactory low return on invested assets in the paper industry.

This is the kind of data we need for *all* industries, for *all* affected companies, for *all* affected states, counties and municipalities. Because in a different form, we're going to experience this rippling effect of pollution-control costs nationwide.

Let me be precise about that impact.

The 1969 municipal per capita expenditures for welfare were $18.

For police they were $22.

For waste treatment they were about $22 per person served.

For education they were $34.

Zero discharge will take that last $22 figure and balloon it to $52.

Let me cite as a geographical and demographic example the proposed total water clean-up of the lower Delaware River. The activity and the costs will involve 3 states. 11 counties, and 377 municipalities. No one is going to escape that cost-net.

And perhaps no one want to escape. But let's insist on precise, detailed data before we get deeper into this gigantic program.

Only then can we make the critical judgments and hard choices which seek a reasonable balance between our national hopes and our national capabilities.

It may be that we will be forced to leave some things undone.

It may be that some goals must remain beyond our grasp—at least for the time being.

We *can* achieve our national pollution control goals.

But first, let's read all the data.

And if something is missing, if something is out of line, let's have the courage to call a halt, to demand more information before a commitment is made.

FORTY-THREE DAYS, AND STILL NO WORD FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON TAX REFORM

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, 43 days have elapsed since House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS wrote to President Nixon requesting the tax reform proposals the President promised in September 1971. In his letter, Chairman MILLS stated that such proposals should be submitted by March 15 in order for Congress to have time to act on them this year. It is now March 22, and the President's silence on the subject of tax reform continues to be deafening.

There is much evidence that the Members of this House are eager to abolish the notorious abuses of the tax system. Last week, the House Democratic Caucus resolved by an overwhelming vote that passage of legislation further increasing the Federal debt ceiling "will be jeopardized" unless the President supports substantial revenue-raising tax reform proposals. More than 100 Members of Congress have sponsored legislation recently proposed by Congressmen JIM CORMAN and HENRY REUSS to reform the tax laws. Many other Members eagerly await the opportunity to cast their votes on the side of a progressive, equitable tax system.

The current tax laws are so riddled with loop-holes that almost any wealthy individual can, if he works at it, avoid paying thousands of dollars in Federal taxes. Many deductions—including, for example, those which involve interest on State and municipal bonds, investment in railroad cars, and residential rental housing—are, as a practical matter available only to the rich.

Other special tax advantages worth millions and even billions of dollars to their beneficiaries are alleged to have a rational basis when in fact they are merely handouts to those who have more influence in the Congress and in the White House than the poor and middle-class citizens of our country.

The people are fed up with a Government which gives special advantages to huge corporations but which is insensitive to the problems of poverty, unemployment, inferior education, inadequate housing, unavailable medical care, and outrageously high taxes.

In 1970, the 19 largest oil companies in the country had net income before taxes of $8,857,753,000 but paid Federal taxes at the deplorably low average rate of only 8.7 percent. In 1970, Standard Oil of California had net income before taxes of $589.6 million but paid Federal income tax at the astonishingly low rate of 5 percent.

If President Nixon continues to refuse to support tax reform, I would like him to justify to my constituents why Standard Oil of California is entitled to pay Federal taxes at the rate of 5 percent when they are required to pay taxes at much higher rates.

I would like the President to explain to the people of this country the basis upon which 19 enormous corporations with an aggregate net income before taxes of $8.857 billion paid Federal taxes at the rate of 8.7 percent at a time when the Nixon administration has incurred a cumulative deficit in excess of $90 billion.

If the President believes that the present tax system is equitable. I would like him to explain to the citizens of this country why, in the 1970 taxable year, 2,817 individuals who earned between $20,000 and $25,000 paid not one penny in Federal taxes. I would like him to attempt to defend a tax system whereby 1,766 individuals who earned between $25,000 and $30,000 paid no Federal taxes. I would be grateful for his explanation of why 1,976 individuals who earned between $30,000 and $50,000 escaped paying even $1 in Federal taxes. I would also be grateful for his explanation of why 1,338 individuals who earned more than $50,000 in 1970 paid no Federal taxes whatever.

Tax reform is an idea whose time has come.

COMMENDATION OF AMBASSADORS RUSH, WATSON, AND INGERSOLL

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, much has been said about political appointees in ambassadorial positions abroad. They have frequently been criticized. They have sometimes been praised. It is my own belief that, with proper selection, noncareer diplomats drawn from leadership positions in other phases of American life can infuse new blood and thinking into the Foreign Service. The selection process is all-important, however, just as it is the most important consideration, more important certainly than seniority, in selecting outstanding men and women from the Foreign Service to serve as ambassadors abroad.

I was pleased to note in the Washington Post of March 19, 1972, an excellent article about Ambassador Kenneth Rush, former chief executive officer of Union Carbide, a man whom I have enjoyed knowing in his business and diplomatic roles and whom I have greatly admired in both.

The Washington Post article to which I refer was written by John M. Goshko from Bonn. As Ambassador Rush was leaving to take his new job as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Goshko reports that:

> Mr. Rush had earned a prominent niche in the galaxy of high-powered diplomatic talent that Washington has had here during the post-war period.

Goshko believes "the landmark of his—Rush's—tenure was the four-power Berlin agreement." He states that:

> Rush was the principal ball-carrier for the Western allies during the 17 months of arduous negotiation leading to the agreement.

According to Goshko, French Ambassador Jean Sauvagnargues, one of the other Berlin negotiators, summed up Rush's performance by remarking:

> He's a big-league talent.

Another diplomat said:

> The Berlin agreement is Rush's monument. More than anyone else, he's the man who did it.

I also was pleased to note a substantive article in the Washington Post of March 17, 1972, by a very knowledgeable reporter, Jonathan C. Randal, about the outstanding work that Ambassador Arthur K. Watson, former president of IBM World Trade Corp., has done as Ambassador to France on one of the most difficult and challenging problems, the problem of drug abuse, which has disrupted family and ruined innumerable lives in our country. It also is an aspect of American life heavily responsible for crime, termed "America's No. 1 domestic problem" by the President earlier this week.

Randal reported that:

> Ever since Arthur K. Watson took over as ambassador 2 years ago, he has "made it his No. 1 priority to lunch regularly with the French customs and police inspectors assigned to smash the traffic which has made Marseilles the major way station for drugs smuggled into the U.S.

Randal said that:

> When Watson made his maiden speech to a French group—and concentrated on drugs—the reaction was frankly one of horror. American ambassadors were expected to allude to the Lafayette connection in Franco-American relations, not the drug connection.

The Post report said that:

> Thanks to Watson's interest, the French government and public have stopped thinking that heroin is a peculiarly American problem and recognized its terrifying, if still limited, inroads on French society.

According to Randal:

> Such concentration on drugs—and on Marseilles' key role in harboring clandestine laboratories which refine heroin—is typical of Watson's results-oriented outlook.

Randal notes that:

> Seizures of heroin and morphine base in France have more than doubled from 1,015 pounds in 1970 to 2,950 pounds in 1971. Current seizures so far this year are for the first time running at an annual rate roughly equal to estimated heroin consumption in the U.S.

I have had the opportunity over a period, two decades to observe first hand Author Watson's great contribution to American industry, and since his appointment as Ambassador to France, his great contribution to this and other aspects of American diplomacy.

Another noncareer diplomat who deserves mention as this time is Robert Ingersoll, former chairman of the board of Borg-Warner Corp., who is about to leave to take up his duties as Ambassador to Japan. Japanese press reaction to Mr. Ingersoll's appointment has been very favorable and augurs well for him in a challenging assignment which can have important results on the level of economic activity and employment in this country for many years to come.

John M. Lee, reporting from Tokyo in the New York Times of February 6, 1972, said:

> All Tokyo newspapers have published detailed biographies of Mr. Ingersoll, and the Japan Broadcasting Corporation has televised an interview with him . . . The affiliations of Borg-Warner Corporation with leading Japanese companies . . . have been favorably commented on . . . Japanese businessmen who met him have welcomed the appointment of a business colleague.

Mainichi Shimbun of January 29, 1972, commented on the "warm, charming personality of Mr. Ingersoll" and the "careful and prudent way he answers reporters' questions." A headline in Sekai Shuho—economic weekly—on February 22, 1972, reads "Newly Appointed U.S. Ambassador to Japan a Businessman Full of International Sense." Zakai—economic magazine—in its March 1972 issue, says:

> Mr. Ingersoll is well versed in Japan's economic affairs just like Dr. Edwin O. Reischauer, former ambassador to Tokyo, was an authority on things Japanese.

As Mr. Ingersoll leaves for Japan, I know we all wish him well. I have every confidence that vast experience in domestic and international business and his knowledge of the Japanese economy will be very helpful in working on the Japanese-American trade relationship. He will carry on the tradition of another distinguished Chicago businessman, R. Douglas Stuart, who was one of our Nation's most successful and effective envoys when he served as Ambassador to Canada.

The accomplishment of Ambassador Watson in seeking curbs on the illegal drug traffic, the achievement of Ambassador Rush in negotiating the Berlin agreement, and the promise of Ambassador Ingersoll on the eve of his departure for Japan, give me a great deal of satisfaction, which I know is shared by many Members of the Senate.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM—PATRICIA WALSH

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Miss Patricia Walsh, a very charming young lady and one of my constituents from Scottsdale, Ariz., was the winner of the Arizona Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. This year the contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom."

When you read Pat's speech, you will readily understand why this honor came to her—it speaks for itself with words that need no additions or explanations.

I hope my colleagues will take a few minutes to give themselves the pleasure of reading her delightful and excellent presentation.

The speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBLITY TO FREEDOM

(By Patricia Walsh)

My responsibility to freedom is something that I am not the first to encounter. On the contrary, this facet of life has been around since the first parents and the first politics. It is rather a confusing concept, since the two main words actually contradict each other. To me, responsibility means rolling up your shirt sleeves to do some work; holding yourself to promises; generally doing what you should when you're supposed to. Now, freedom on the other hand, is laying face up on a bed of green grass, watching big white clouds sail by on an eternal blue sea of sky. Quite two different pictures wouldn't you say? But perhaps I should refer back to a previous statement of mine concerning "parents and politics".

In this country, politics is a fairly confusing game, and to be truthful, I don't understand too much of it, but I would like to relate a little story to you concerning myself and our government. I will confess that for the past 15 years I have said the pledge of allegiance with little more ferverence than I would have recited a nursery rhyme. But that changed, I was at a footgall game, and as I stood watching the flag raising, something hit me and I knew; I understood. If it wasn't for this country, how could I have the plans I have (and they are rather scrambled). But even if I don't succeed, I'm being given the opportunity and isn't that in itself a fantastic advantage? I can love my own God and preach his teachings without fear. I can develop myself into the individual I want to be. I can be me, and that is the best gift you can offer anyone. My country has offered me this. Should I not offer to it the me it has helped to build? Responsibility, in return for freedom.

Now, to the more personal side of this topic—parents. My parents trust me—a fact I'm proud of, and because of this, they don't begrudge me my freedom; freedom for extra-curriculum activities, freedom of opinion, freedom of speech and so on. But there are two categories of freedom, foolish and reasonable. Foolish freedom is that which basks in its own existence. In other words, going to extremes when given the chance and then regretting it later. The best kind of freedom is the type in which responsibility is employed. Now that statement sounds stuffy and the first thought to enter many a mind is "What kind of freedom is that?" And yet, if you've ever experienced it, you know, and, what it's really like. It's going out on a date, having a good time, but not doing anything unlawful, immoral, or against your own principles. It's feeling completely happy without any momentary tinges of guilt. And so, the responsibility of freedom: the responsibility to yourself; to live a full satisfying life. And here the connection with politics is obvious. If in your personal life, you feel and exercise the responsibility of your freedom, it will carry over in your view of the government, leaving you with a well rounded life and a light, peaceful heart.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 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?

SUPPORT FOR COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE SERVICES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have repeatedly expressed my strong concern for making available, to all who wish to use them, comprehensive and developmental child care services. When both bodies last year agreed on what I thought was an excellent program, I hoped that perhaps we could at last offer meaningful progress in this area to our Nation's children. The President's veto shattered that hope, of course. Since then, both the House and the Senate have been working hard to establish meaningful services for the children of our Nation in the face of continued administration opposition to such programs.

I am pleased, of course, with the increased Headstart provisions of H.R. 12350, the economic opportunity amendments recently passed by the House. However, I do believe that we must go beyond them in our commitment to the many youngsters who need comprehensive, developmental services. For this reason, I introduced on March 6 H.R. 13602 here in the House. I am pleased that 22 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring this measure. For the information of my colleagues, I insert here their names in the RECORD:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

CALIFORNIA

James C. Corman.
Ronald V. Dellums.
Don Edwards.

ILLINOIS

George W. Collins.
Abner J. Mikva.

MAINE

William D. Hathaway.

MASSACHUSETTS

Michael Harrington.
Louise Day Hicks.

MICHIGAN

John Conyers, Jr.

MISSOURI

James W. Symington.

NEW YORK

Joseph P. Addabbo.
Jonathan B. Bingham.
John G. Dow.
Seymour Halpern.
Edward I. Koch.
Charles B. Rangel.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
William F. Ryan.

OHIO

John F. Seiberling.
Louis Stokes.

PENNSYLVANIA

William S. Moorhead.

WISCONSIN

Robert W. Kastenmeier.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—VI

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am presently circulating for cosponsorship the Telephone Privacy Act, H.R. 1326, 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 phonebook who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates and organizations and opinion 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 on March 9, I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a fifth 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:

GRAND PRAIRIE, TEX.,
March 9, 1972.

RIGHT—ON

Only no exceptions, please.

CHARLES F. LEAR.

ORMOND BEACH, FLA.,
March 1, 1972.

Hon. LESTER ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Congratulations for introducing legislation to end telephone sales solicitations! Telephone subscribers should not be subjected to this type of annoyance by an ever-increasing number of business organizations, over an instrument for which we pay a high price for service. The worst offenders are Arthur Murray Studios, photographers, and home repair or remodeling companies, with a few poll-takers who ask impertinent questions.

If you succeed in putting an end to this nuisance, you will have the gratitude of thousands of people all over the country.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
February 29, 1972.

Re Telephone Privacy Act.
Representative LES ASPIN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was happy to see that you had introduced the above legislation. There was a short item in the Kansas City Star concerning this.

Because of my profession, it is necessary that I have a published telephone number and that I be available to answer my telephone during evening hours and on holidays.

Telephone solicitors are extremely disturbing to me, and our area has a large number of these. In fact, our only newspaper, the Kansas City Star, has recently called my home twice in the evening hours to ask whether or not I subscribe. This seems to be a flagrant invasion of my privacy in view of the fact that their records or those of their distributors reveal the information that I am a subscriber. We have recently had a number of magazine sales solicitations which have extended to telephoning business numbers during business hours to solicit subscriptions.

We will be interested in the outcome of your legislation.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

SHARON, WIS.
February 29, 1972.

Representative LES ASPIN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: You are doing the public a great service with the Telephone Privacy Act. We have long considered phone calls soliciting sales an invasion of privacy but felt that the telephone company, like other large companies, would effectively bar any restrictions that might limit their business in any way.

For years family, friends, relatives and I have complained about nuisance calls from salespeople selling magazines, roofing, siding and you-name-it. They always call when a person is in the middle of something involved, when someone is ill or taking a nap, and worst of all, when those who work third shift are sleeping.

The only way people have been able to get away from these pestering calls has been to obtain an unlisted or unpublished number which caused much trouble when those outside the realm of family and friends needed the phone number urgently. It seems strange that the public should only have a choice of two evils as part of the telephone company's "service".

We're behind you all the way in the enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM LIVES IN BYELORUSSIA

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on March 25, 1918, the people of Byelorussia proclaimed their national independence and their determination to govern themselves in a democratic manner. However, their national independence was short lived—Soviet troops conquered the free state of Byelorussia within a year.

Nevertheless, through the long night of Soviet domination the people of Byelorussia have maintained their culture and identity. They have continued to express their firm determination to live in freedom and to govern themselves.

Accordingly we too express our belief in the sanctity of their cause and affirm our hope that the people of Byelorussia will again know freedom.

On this day we are united in spirit with those who desire freedom in Byelorussia. We can take heart from the fact that the spirit of freedom lives in Byelorussia, and we pray for the ultimate victory of freedom everywhere in the world.

THE ISSUE IS NOT BUSING—THE ISSUE IS INTEGRATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the President's most recent recommendations on how and when to integrate schools have thrown this Congress once again back into the thorny thicket of schoolbusing. Last fall after extensive debate the House of Representatives dealt with the busing issue, at least temporarily, in a series of amendments to the Higher Education Act amendments bill. Understanding what we have already done may help throw some light on what we are about to do. To that end, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the thoughtful and intelligent interpretation of those busing amendments by my good friend Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, in his column in the March 19, 1972 New York Times:

WHERE WE STAND

(By Albert Shanker)

THE ISSUE IS NOT BUSING . . .

[NOTE.—This statement by Mr. Shanker on the busing issue was written before President Nixon's address to the nation on Thursday night, March 16.]

There can be no question that the so-called busing issue will continue to be a major one in the months—and perhaps years—to come. The Florida referendum may well set off similar balloting in other states. President Nixon is about to issue his own proposals, while members of Congress seek to resolve the issue through legislation and/or constitutional amendments. Various black groups are on opposite sides of the issue, their position depending upon whether their philosophy is "integrationist" or "separatist."

As the debate continues, it becomes increasingly clear that the issue actually *is not* busing. Millions of children are now bussed. The issue hinges on the difference between *desegration* and *integration*, between government action to eliminate *de jure* segregation and action to eliminate *de facto* segregation. The 1954 Supreme Court decision—and many others following it—declared that government agencies may not use the law to enforce segregation. (Such laws prevented white and black children from attending the same neighborhood school.) Recent court decisions, however, have gone far beyond the initial ruling in stating that the mere elimination of racial barriers is not enough; that government has a duty to bring together white and black children, in certain proportions, in all schools within a given geographic area.

All indications are that there is, at the present time, widespread opposition among whites and blacks to the recent decisions. But there is also overwhelming evidence of preponderant acceptance of the earlier decisions. The same Florida electorate which rejected "busing" by a 71% vote also rejected any return to dual segregated school systems and supported quality education for all children by a 79% vote. Tragically, the strong sentiment against "busing" is being cleverly manipulated to effect the undoing of nearly twenty years of desegregation efforts.

On March 8, the House of Representatives instructed the House conferees to demand that the Houes anti-busing amendments be included in the Higher Education and Emergency School Aid Bill. The three House amendments sponsored by Congressmen Ashbrook and Broomfield and Congresswoman Green go far beyond busing. In essence, they constitute the greatest threat to school desegregation in all the years since the 1954 Supreme Court prohibition against "separate but equal" schools.

The Ashbrook amendment provides that federal funds administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education may not be used for the transportation of teachers or pupils or for the purchase of transportation equipment to overcome racial imbalance *or to carry out a plan of racial desegregation.*

The Green amendment provides that federal officials may not order or encourage state and local officials to use state and local funds for purposes for which federal funds could not be used under the Ashbrook amendment.

. . . THE ISSUE IS SEGREGATION

The intent of these amendments is clear. What sounds like a prohibition against busing is in fact a death blow to any plan to desegregate schools whether or not busing is involved. The language of the Ashbrook amendment is plain enough. "Or to carry out a plan of racial desegregation" would prohibit the use of federal funds for desegregation and would also prevent the federal government from requiring that federal funds given to school districts be used in a non-discriminatory manner.

The Broomfield amendment allows an automatic stay on any court order requiring desegregation, *whether or not that order requires busing,* until the order is appealed to the Supreme Court. Furthermore, the amendment is retroactive and would allow even those districts practising *de jure* segregation, even if such efforts have been under way for years and require no busing. Southern districts now integrated without busing could restore segregation, institute busing to keep white and black children separate, and shop around for a friendly judge before whom to begin the appeals process. With hearings and rehearings, it might take years before students could return to their integrated neighborhood schools.

If there was any doubt about this interpretation of the Broomfield amendment, it was dispelled by its author, in a colloquy on the floor of the House with minority leader Gerald R. Ford during the debate on the amendment:

"Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would like to ask the gentleman several questions. First, is the Broomfield amendment retroactive?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Yes, it is.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it retroactive in its entirety?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. In its entirety.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The second question is this: Your amendment states that the effectiveness of 'any order' to achieve a racial balance of students 'shall be postponed.' Now, does that mean that it would affect orders which have already been put into effect or put into partial effect? In other words, all would be suspended pending final appeal?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. That is correct . . .

Mr. GERALD R. FORD . . . is it the intent of the author of the amendment that this stay of any order during an appeal shall be equally applicable not only to orders involving forced busing but to desegregation cases generally?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Yes, it would be, in both cases."

The conclusion to be drawn from this exchange in the House is inescapable. Whether

or not busing is favored to promote school integration, these amendments, aimed at ending all federal enforcement of desegregation, even those without busing, must not become law.

JOSEPH S. EGER—MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Junior Chamber of Commerce in the city of McKeesport, Pa., has made it a practice each year to single out for public recognition an individual who "most typifies" the high standards of civic service established by this fine organization.

This year I was pleased to learn the recipient of the "1972 Man of the Year Award" was a man I have known for many years; one who has given unselfishly of himself in order to better the lives of his fellow citizens—Mr. Joseph S. Eger.

Mr. Eger has been a leader in the struggle to help McKeesport, an industrial center, overcome the many problems which today face our Nation's urban communities. He has played leading roles in numerous community and civic projects and programs, the latest and most notable of which is to serve as chairman for a $2 million fund raising campaign for the expansion of McKeesport Hospital. This campaign is extremely vital, for the hospital serves not only the citizens of McKeesport but those of the entire Mon-Yough Valley area as well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the McKeesport Jaycees upon their selection of this year's award winner and I join with Mr. Eger's many, many friends in applauding the recognition of an outstanding citizen. It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I insert into the RECORD an article from the Daily News of McKeesport, which describes the award dinner and Mr. Eger's service to his community:

JOSEPH S. EGER CITED AS '72 "MAN OF YEAR"

City businessman and civic leader Joseph S. Eger last night was honored as the 1972 Man of the Year by the McKeesport Jaycees.

More than 200 persons attended the Jaycees' 11th annual dinner at the Youghiogheny Country Club where Mr. Eger received a plaque and accepted a $500 initial contribution to the McKeesport Hospital Expansion Fund, which he heads.

In making the award Jaycees' President John Ryan praised Mr. Eger as "a man who most typifies the Jaycee creed as a fine example to the community."

Guest speaker at the event was John M. Wunderley, a member of the McKeesport Hospital Board of Trustees, chairman of the hospital's building committee, and a longtime friend of Mr. Eger.

Tracing Mr. Eger's rise from a part-time employee in his family's food market to his present post as chairman of the board of the Eger Motors Inc., Mr. Wunderley cited the award winner's community spirit.

He recalled Mr. Eger's participation in various community and civic projects and said this activity made him an obvious choice not only for the Jaycee award but also for the chairmanship of the $2 million McKeesport Hospital Expansion Fund.

"Joe Eger has always had a place in his heart for McKeesport. That's one of the big reasons he's being honored here tonight by the Jaycees," Mr. Wunderley concluded.

Responding, Mr. Eger said, "I have looked forward to receiving this fine honor. . . . I credit my success to the people.

"We must begin to generate enthusiasm to put McKeesport back on top. . . . This is a unique area, a center for a lot of communities and a vibrant shopping center.

"It gives me extreme pleasure to be a part of this, a part of something great."

Master of ceremonies for the dinner was Donald Henninger, manager of Bell Telephone Co.'s operations in McKeesport.

Previous winners of the Man of the Year award include J. Charles Peterson, M. A. Cancelliere, C. E. Palmer, John L. Laughlin, Robert M. Cox, William Hatcher, the late Cornelius (Neenie) P. Campbell, the late Dr. J. C. Kelly, the late Thomas A. Wilson and the late James S. Mack.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I was concerned to learn yesterday that the distinguished chairman of the House Immigration Subcommittee intends to hold additional hearings into the question of illegal aliens. As I have already mentioned to my good friend, Mr. RODINO, I do not believe enough substantive facts as to the nature and extent of an illegal alien situation are available on which to proceed with hearings. I feel it would have been more suitable to have either the staff of Judiciary Subcommittee No. 1 and/or some outside organization or agency conduct an exhaustive, independent investigation into any real or imagined problem of illegal aliens. If the findings of such a study warranted full-scale hearings, they could then be held.

The whole issue of illegal aliens has generated a great deal of controversy, particularly among Spanish-speaking persons in this country. Regardless of statements to the contrary, the term "illegal alien" has become a code word for Mexican Americans in the Southwest and Spanish-speaking persons from Latin American nations and the Caribbean on the east coast. Many of the charges which have been made about illegal aliens are irresponsible and, in many instances, are unproven and unfounded. Although I do not know what purposes they aim to serve, some individuals have presented distorted claims and figures on the number of persons living and working in the United States illegally.

In considering the issue of illegal aliens the Congress must realize that it shares the blame for any problem which may exist by having created the highly discriminatory annual limitation on the number of persons permitted to emigrate to the United States from Latin America. Not only our own Spanish-speaking citizens but our Western Hemisphere neighbors to the south deeply resent this ill-conceived artificial barrier. Also, they are interpreting the whole inquiry into the illegal alien question as an attempt to further restrict the entry of their families and friends into this country.

One of my greatest concerns about these hearings is that, irrespective of the fair and open manner in which they are conducted, I am fearful that the unfounded charges made at them will simply serve to fan the flames of prejudice and misunderstanding and that the inquiry will unnecessarily exacerbate tensions which already exist within the community. Spanish-speaking persons are bearing the brunt of this campaign and, as a result of half-truths and innuendos, they are being defamed and degraded. We have only to recall the humiliation heaped upon Mrs. Romana Bañuelos—a distinguished Mexican American from southern California—last year.

Earlier this month, on March 10 and 11, the Immigration Subcommittee conducted hearings in New York City. One of the witnesses was Mr. Rene Anselmo, executive vice president of Spanish International Network and a person intimately familiar with the Spanish-speaking community, not only in New York but throughout the country. Mr. Anselmo's testimony was very forceful and described many of the abuses and problems suffered by the Spanish-speaking alien. I must say that I do not subscribe to all of Mr. Anselmo's views and particularly do not believe the problem of employers recruiting Spanish-speaking workers from overseas is a realistic one, especially in light of the large number of Puerto Ricans anxious and able to fill the jobs for which they are brought to this country. Nevertheless, I do feel that Mr. Anselmo's comments warrant our colleagues' full and careful consideration and I am pleased to present his statement herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF RENE ANSELMO, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, SPANISH INTERNATIONAL NETWORK

My name is Rene Anselmo. I am an Executive Vice President of Spanish International Network, a group of Spanish language television stations: KMEX–TV, Los Angeles; KWEX–TV, San Antonio; WLTV, Miami and WXTV, New York.

Since whatever this Subcommittee does is going to effect the Spanish-speaking community, perhaps more than any other group in the country, we are grateful for this opportunity to speak out on their behalf.

We find ourselves at this point of time seeking to avert passage of legislation supported by organized labor which would make it a criminal offense for an employer to knowingly hire an illegal alien.

Since the term "illegal alien" is a code word for Mexicans in the Southwest and Spanish-speaking people from the Caribbean and South America in this part of the country, the bills pending before Congress to control their entry are all basically an attempt to further restrict the entry of Spanish-speaking people into the United States.

The effects of this legislation, if passed, will not only have a profound affect on our relations and national image in Mexico and Latin America; it will create a group permanent Second Class citizens in this country, who because they are brown or black or look foreign, will forever have to walk around with internal passports to prove that

even though they don't look "American," they were indeed born here or are citizens.

Some of the people who have testified before this Subcommittee in other cities find nothing wrong with this. We do, and the community we serve does.

The current illegal alien problem was created in great part by the very forces who are here today seeking passage of this obnoxious legislation.

We think there are simpler solutions to control the influx of illegal aliens. Not new solutions, but simpler and certainly less burdensome, not only for the Spanish-speaking, but for society at large.

It is unfortunate that the issues involved in these hearings have been clouded by a well-planned campaign to create nation-wide hysteria being conducted by the American Federal Government Employees Union, in conjunction with vigilantes of yellow journalism.

You will recall the now famous "Tortilla Factory" Raids which were designed to gain nation-wide publicity for the union's cause by impugning the character of Mrs. Romana Banuelos, then a nominee for Treasurer of the United States.

Coincidentally members of the New York Local obliged the reporters of the Daily News and other newspapers with invitations to staged raids at factories around New York, at West Point and at the Maritime Academy.

We are told of how many illegal aliens were rounded up by these posses . . . we are not told of how many American citizens of Latin extraction who look just like an illegal alien, were subjected to the embarrassment and indignity of being rounded up and forced to prove their right to be here.

Indeed, some proponents of this legislation, such as State Senator Dickson Arnett, of California, cannot comprehend the protest and outrage of the Mexican-American community when subjected to Gestapo-like raids conducted by Immigration and Police officers who pull people out of their beds at 4:00 A.M., and haul them off to the station. He cannot comprehend why a citizen of Mexican-American descent should be so outraged, when the Officers are only performing their duty.

The American Federal Government Employees Unions have been seeking two objectives:

First, an increase in money and personnel for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, so it can step up the raids, which are already terrorizing Spanish communities.

The second, is to give support for more restrictive legislation, such as that being proposed here today, which given time, could turn this country into a nightmare police state.

Throughout all of this, both the unions and some of the press have used incredible, unsubstantiated charges to color and smear the illegal alien problem.

We called Mr. Richard Cull the Information Officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and asked him if the numbers and accusations Mr. Ed Kavazanjian had fed the Daily News were correct.

Mr. Cull replied that the Department had no information that backed up the characterization of aliens made by the Daily News.

Mr. Sol Marks, New York District Director, said he was not at all sure about the accuracy of those articles.

Yet, the Immigration Employees Union and certain members of the press continue characterizing this entire class of people as being dope pushers, welfare racketeers, Communists, carriers of disease, criminals and the cause of our high rate of unemployment.

This campaign and its reporting is blatantly racist. We have not read about forays of Immigration Officers rounding up British Secretaries along Madison Avenue. We have yet to see in any newspaper headline the alleged sins of the Canadian, or German, or French illegal alien population, characterized by the press, as they have headlined those of the Spanish and Chinese here in New York.

Two things stand out when it comes to aliens, legal or illegal. First, the subject of immigration and all legislation affecting it has been based on fear, bigotry and the preservation of vested interests. Second, that in all these hearings and discussions over the years, the roles remain the same—only the actors change. Every argument you have heard and will hear from the Restrictionists regarding today's illegal alien problem has been used by their predecessors who labored so long to stem the flow of immigrants into this country and were responsible for the first restrictive immigration act of 1924 and its revision in 1965. Then, as now, these forces have fought the entry of foreigners into this country on the pretext that they:

(1) Take jobs away from American citizens.

(2) Lower the standard of living and depress wages.

(3) Carry communicable diseases.

(4) Drink alcoholic beverages (today they are accused of trafficking in drugs).

(5) Swell our welfare rolls.

(6) Constitute a burden on our public schools and services.

(7) They are subversives or anarchists (today they are communists).

(8) That we must protect these unfortunate people from the abuses of unscrupulous employers.

All these charges have been part and parcel of the verbal arsenal of restrictionists and racial purists for the past hundred years. It is ironic that the parents and grandparents of some of the people making these charges today were characterized in this same fashion. We have an illegal alien problem today because the proponents of the legislation before you were successful in establishing, for the first time in 1965, a quota system on legal immigration from the Western Hemisphere nations. They were successful in closing down the Bracero program in the Southwest and severely limiting the importation of temporary workers into other parts of the country. They have turned, and here I quote Mr. Delfino Varela who testified before this committee in Los Angeles, "They have turned the labor certification procedures into a farce."

These recent restrictions may have created a tighter labor market, and it may have protected the country from some of the undesirable traits foreign workers bring in with them, but it hasn't done much for our society at large, and it certainly didn't irradicate the work that had to be done nor the jobs that were available.

So, instead of a sensibly administered program to handle legal immigration on the basis of what is good for *all* of the people of this country and not just some of the people in this country . . . instead of a sensible and non-discriminatory system to administer the importation of temporary workers to perform the tasks most American citizens no longer want to perform . . . we are on the verge of creating a society where none but the Super Rich will be able to enjoy even the most modest amenities of life. We must endure poor service, ill treatment, shoddy workmanship, dirty streets, higher prices and tasteless, chemically grown and mechanically harvested foods.

We are forcing small farmers and small businessmen off the land and out of business by the millions. Our high-priced products can not compete in world markets, and we force our industry overseas to find the labor supply no longer available in this country.

At the same time, we oblige hundreds of thousands of decent human beings who need, and are willing to perform this work, to enter the country like criminals or vermin, or to be smuggled in like cheap cargo.

The Restrictionists will tell you here today that we must keep foreigners out because of our high unemployment rate and our swelling welfare rolls. There no longer seems, however, to be very much of a correlation between unemployment, welfare, and work that is available.

There is, on the other hand, high unemployment amongst skilled and highly trained workers—the very class of immigrant our laws encourage to enter legally here, while we perversely keep out seed immigrants who are so badly needed.

You have heard testimony around the country that the majority of these illegal aliens, strangers to the land, people who cannot speak English, are able to find work within 24 to 48 hours after entering this country. Not only that, they pay hundreds and sometimes thousands of dollars to buy forged papers or to be smuggled in to perform the jobs we are told do not exist, or are no longer needed in our economy.

Further, as you know from testimony before this subcommittee, most of these illegal aliens are working in jobs that pay minimum wage scales or far better.

We are asked by the Restrictionists to keep out foreigners so they will not be exploited by greedy employers. They gloss over the fact that a greedy employer is a greedy employer, whether he deals with a citizen or an alien and that we have the laws and the machinery to enforce or to establish wage scales and working conditions where they do not exist. We do not need to turn the country into a police state to remedy that situation.

The unions who are backing this legislation, despite their previous record in this area, would have us believe they only fought to protect the minority worker by demanding this action against illegal aliens. How can they protect minority workers when they engage in a publicity campaign which raises prejudice against all Spanish, Blacks from the Caribbean, Chinese and other groups whether they be citizens or non-citizens? How can they avoid these charges of racism when they seem to have little objection to white Canadians working here?

In 1970 the Immigration & Naturalization Service certified 26,862 Canadians as temporary workers in the United States. It admitted only 1,625 Mexicans. Yet, the Canadians with their superior education and knowledge of English, undoubtedly are better qualified to occupy the kind of jobs that Americans would want. There are currently 4,000 Canadians who have construction jobs in the United States. How is it that they have these jobs when our black and Puerto Rican citizens are pleading to be admitted to the construction unions. I am not by any means making a statement against Canadians, I am only pointing out that the call for criminal penalties and police state legislation is not necessarily directed against all aliens, it is skewed more heavily in the direction of certain nationalities. Certainly American labor should be protected from unfair competition. As I have already said, these illegal aliens rarely constitute "unfair competition" since they are doing jobs that no one else wants to perform.

We understand that this subcommittee feels a responsibility to make certain that Americans know their rights are being protected. It appears that the present threat from aliens to American workers, at this point, stems more from their being here in an illegal status. We feel that justice would prevail for all concerned if the use of alien labor were legalized—thus ending its blackmail status.

Industrialized nations of northern Europe who compete so successfully with us in overseas markets employ some six million aliens from their Southern neighbours. Such a program, properly organized as it seems to be, has enabled European manufacturers to lower their costs considerably and free their

own citizens for more interesting and rewarding jobs. It has had the further benefit of spreading prosperity and raising these countries' standard of living. Therefore, we propose that aliens be legally admitted into the United States as temporary workers to perform the jobs and services American citizens no longer want to perform. Perhaps what we are talking about is an administrative setup patterned on the procedures currently being employed by European nations, a system which granted temporary work permits on the basis of our country's needs and not on any national or racial basis, a first come, first served most qualified basis. This program would be outside the quota restrictions for permanent residence and would not include any citizenship rights. Foreign workers could receive a work certificate for a stated period of time, six months, a year, two years, whatever. The Department of Labor would publish job lists as it does now. The temporary alien worker would be required to pay an admittance tax to handle the cost of processing his papers, he would post a bond to insure that he would leave or be required to deposit a return trip airline ticket. If his job were unionized, he would join the union. He would pay taxes while he is here. Most important, he would not be entitled to unemployment or welfare benefits.

We know from past experience that the majority of alien workers, if assured that they will be able to come back again, prefer to return home to their families. There has always been a direct correlation between restrictiveness of our visa policies and apprehension of illegal aliens in this country. Nowadays, since we have practically cut off the legal flow of temporary works, many don't dare return for fear they won't find the means of getting in again. Further, we believe the government should offer an amnesty to the illegal aliens and allow them to get their papers and residence normalized, provided they are people of good character and are residing and working in this country today.

Lastly, and we cast no aspersions on any member of this Committee, it might not be a bad idea for a member of Congress of Spanish descent, be named to the House Committee of Immigration and Naturalization Service.

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND MATERNAL AND INFANT CARE PROJECT UNDER TITLE V OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to extend the Federal funding for the Children and Youth and Maternal and Infant Care projects for an additional 5 years as these special project grants under title V of the Social Security Act are scheduled to terminate on July 30, 1972, under current law.

This bill is cosponsored by 86 Members of the House and has been introduced in the Senate by Senators GAYLORD NELSON and EDWARD KENNEDY with 15 other sponsors. This week, the Senate Finance Committee has added an amendment to House Resolution 1 providing for a 2-year extension of these project grants.

These projects render quality medical care at low cost to mothers and children in low-income families within medically deprived communities. One such project specifically for teenagers was recently discussed in the American Medical News. I am appending a copy of that article for the interest of our colleagues.

The article follows:

PROGRAMS MEET SPECIAL NEEDS OF ADOLESCENTS

Thirteen-year-old Donald is subject to epileptic seizures. His parents are divorced and he lives with an over-protective mother who worries about him being away from home and tries to restrict his participation in sports and other school activities.

Donald's classmates occasionally make fun of him when he tells them about his "handicap." He becomes angry and a fight usually results.

Recently, Donald visited a special clinic for teenagers at Columbus (Ohio) Children's Hospital. He had been there before and received medication and advice on how to handle his situation.

On this occasion, Donald met for an hour with Thomas E. Shaffer, MD, the clinic's director. Dr. Shaffer had a frank discussion with Donald, told him a stronger medication might be necessary, and indicated that he would speak again with Donald's mother in an effort to provide him with more liberties away from home. Dr. Shaffer advised Donald to tell inquiring friends that he has a "special problem" instead of a "handicap" and make a greater effort to control his temper.

Another visitor to the Columbus teenage clinic was 12-year-old Becky, who doesn't want to be treated like a child, but is fearful of what becoming a teenager may mean. Her parents separated about a year ago and since then she has been resentful of her mother and younger brothers and sisters.

Becky believes most people are against her. In an effort to remain home from school, she complains of imaginary ailments. Recently she was hospitalized for emotional problems.

Alice Dawson, a social worker at the clinic, spoke separately with Becky and her mother, who accompanied Becky on this visit. Miss Dawson tried to make both Becky and her mother more understanding of each other.

Becky said she likes to see Miss Dawson because she is "good" as opposed to her mother who is "bad." The social worker tried to impress on Becky that no one is either "all good" or "all bad."

Donald and Becky are typical of the more than 100 inner-city teenagers who visit the outpatient clinic at Columbus Children's hospital each week. They are also typical of those who visit the more than 60 other adolescent outpatient clinics or wards at other hospitals and medical centers throughout the country.

Like Donald and Becky, most teenagers seen in these clinics have emotional, social, and behavioral problems in addition to medical problems.

Irene M. Josselyn, MD, author of *Adolescence*, wrote, "Adolescents are not reworking past problems, they are living through new and strange ones, and they need all the support they can get."

In recent years, pediatricians, family practitioners, and other health professionals have been paying more attention to the special problems of teenagers who find themselves at an awkward age. The problem, according to health officials, is that adolescents are at the far end of the pediatricians' field of interest and have not really been picked up by the internists and family physicians.

Now that the special needs of teenagers are beginning to be realized, there emerges a new problem: How can those needs be most successfully handled?

The American Medical Association, for one, has seen the need for improved health care for all children and young adults. Major emphasis will be given to this group during the AMA's National Congress on the Quality of Life, March 22–25, in Chicago.

Many health leaders have attributed the growing awareness of adolescent problems to J. Roswell Gallagher, MD, who is often referred to as the "father of adolescent medicine." Dr. Gallagher established the first special clinic devoted to teenage health in 1951 at Boston Children's Hospital. Just 10 years ago, there were still only a handful of these clinics, but the number has been growing rapidly since then.

Many of these outpatient clinics are university-based and part of teaching hospitals, like the one at Columbus Children's Hospital which is used by Ohio State U. as one of its teaching facilities.

The teenage clinic in Columbus opened in 1958 and operated for a half day twice a week in a portion of the hopsital's regular outpatient clinics. Now, it operates from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday in a separate clinic area some distance from the general outpatient clinics where younger children are seen.

Those needing care on evenings or weekends are seen either in the hospital's emergency room or in an evening clinic set up to handle trauma and other acute problems.

Although the age of patients is in the 12–19 range, the average age is about 15 or 16. Most are members of families that are on some type of welfare program. Approximately half of the teenagers originally came to the hospital's emergency room for primary care and then began to be seen in the clinic. The other half were referred by schools, other physicians, public health nurses and departments, and other agencies in the city.

Nearly 60% of the patients at Dr. Shaffer's clinic are girls, because of the heavy pediatrician, obstetrician-gynecologist influence among the staff and the emphasis on such programs as venereal disease, pregnancy prevention, and menstrual problems. The clinic operates primarily by appointments, of which 50–60% are kept. This is a good percentage, according to the staff, because teenagers make their own appointments and generally come alone after their first visit.

Dr. Shaffer said that 10 years ago his clinic in Columbus was relatively unknown. "Now people know about it wherever you go."

He defines the clinic as "a facility for providing comprehensive health services for youth." Included in comprehensive care, he lists the clinic's preventive, social, psychological, diagnostic, treatment, educational, and rehabilitative services.

"Teenagers are the last group whose problems have come to the surface," said Dr. Shaffer. "Many thought they had no real needs of their own."

According to Dr. Shaffer, nearly all the teenagers visiting the clinic are experiencing a crisis. "It may not be a crisis that threatens life. It may have resulted from family discord or a death in the family.

"We must look at this crisis and ask these young people how they look at themselves. We don't just take care of their shots and vitamins. We ask such questions as how are things at home or school, and if they are going steady. Teenagers must be with people they trust, and we try to get them to bring their problems out into the open," said Dr. Shaffer, who is vice president of the Society for Adolescent Medicine.

John Stephenson, MD, another pediatrician on the clinic staff, said that an attempt is made to reach out to all teenagers "whether their problem is a broken arm or a broken heart."

He added, "We're also trying to teach them how to use a physician in the future and such things as what a good physician does."

Dr. Stephenson said a major goal of the teenage clinic is its attempt to teach the con-

cept of adolescence to medical students and house staff at Children's Hospital.

"The problems of teenagers could be emotional or organic and it is a real challenge to get this point across to others who will be giving care across the country."

At various times each month, Dr. Shaffer and other members of his clinic staff conduct sessions with other disciplines throughout the hospital, including those who serve inpatients. Drs. Shaffer, Stephenson, and others at the teenage clinic are available as consultants to other youth-oriented programs in Columbus and also help staff a satellite clinic in another section of the city that is part of the hospital's children and youth programs.

Because the hospital is affiliated with Ohio State U. (Dr. Shaffer is also a professor in the department of pediatrics at OSU), all first-year residents spend one month in training at the teenage clinic and others further serve the clinic by taking an elective in adolescent medicine.

In addition to Drs. Shaffer and Stephenson, the permanent clinic staff includes another pediatrician who is on a fellowship in the department of pediatrics at OSU, the one rotating resident per month, three social workers, a registered nurse, a practical nurse, a receptionist, and a secretary.

A consulting psychiatrist and a consulting psychologist also serve the clinic. In addition, a gynecologist and dermatologist hold weekly clinics and an endocrinologist visits once a month.

Audrey Kalafatich, RN, is a volunteer nursing consultant to the clinic. She is in charge of the masters program in child health care at OSU.

"I try to help the kids get together with the medical treatment," Miss Kalafatich said. Last summer she conducted an eight-week group session on obesity for girls 13–16. This is a common problem among those seen at the clinic.

Mrs. Nancy Bruce, another social worker, believes the work the clinic does in prevention and early intervention is among its greatest values.

"We see problems from the very beginning and have a chance to do something before there is a major breakdown," Mrs. Bruce said. "We see a child, for example, who has a physical complaint and is missing school. This could be related to family problems."

A big problem in Columbus, she said, is that there are no social workers in the school system where many teenage problems could be spotted.

Mrs. Bruce indicated a big need for the teenage clinic is to develop more comprehensive services for unwed mothers and for adolescent mothers after delivery.

Some 80 pregnant teenagers come through the clinic each year. They are referred to the hospital's social services department. The role of the teenage clinic is to examine their problems and see that they are referred to prenatal clinics and receive followup services.

An extensive pregnancy prevention program is also conducted in the teenage clinic.

The clinic handles virtually all teenage problems. It doesn't deal with severe psychiatric problems but does have a consulting psychiatrist in Gene Arnold, MD. "Probably one-third of those who come to the teenage clinic could use some type of consulting or psychotherapy help," he said.

Basic drug detoxification programs are conducted in the stimulant and depressant areas, but the clinic doesn't get involved with hard drug users.

Like many other hospital-based outpatient clinics for teenagers, the Columbus clinic has financial problems. It has been receiving about $100,000 annually in state and federal funds as part of the federal special projects grant for children and youth and maternal and infant care given to the hospital five years ago.

Extension of authorizing legislation currently is needed so that these projects may continue without direct federal support after June 30. There has been considerable speculation on whether the programs will be extended.

In addition to visiting the Columbus, Ohio, clinic, *American Medical News* also spoke with other physicians concerned with adolescent medicine to learn more of the problems and needs of teenagers.

There was consensus that pediatricians, family practitioners, and other health professionals should get more involved in examining the behavioral, emotional, and social problems of teenagers in addition to treating their medical needs. Teenagers, it was pointed out, cause some unique problems for physicians and many physicians do not have the expertise or willingness to deal with these special problems.

Others indicated that teenagers may be reluctant to reach out to these hospital-based, "establishment-type" clinics. Instead, they may choose to go to a free clinic where more confidentiality and simplification of services may exist (AMN, Feb. 21, 1972).

Sprague Hazard, MD, chairman of the American Academy of Pediatrics committee on youth, said major emphasis of his committee is being given to examining alternative arrangements like the free clinics and trying to determine if the pediatric community should take a position on alternative arrangements.

His committee, Dr. Hazard said, also supports legislation on uniform consent for minors to allow teenagers to receive health care in a private and confidential as adults do.

Dr. Hazard, who is director of health services at Brandeis U., Waltham, Mass., said the committee also is concerned with health care of youths who are in detention. "We will take a strong position on this and plan to mount a national conference in this regard," he said.

He added, "Young people are human beings. They require dignified, compassionate, and nonjudgmental care. Moralizing over some of the unattractive behavioral patterns of the young is not the way to care for them. They must be treated as individuals."

V. Robert Allen, MD, a member of the AAP's committee on youth, said that "the teenager is not so much forgotten as he is ignored. We haven't concentrated specifically on their problems. Now that we're doing more of this, we must find out how to treat them more effectively."

Dr. Allen, director of student health services and assistant clinical professor of pediatrics at the U. of California at San Diego, said that in dealing with a teenager, a physician must realize what that teenager may consider to be his rights.

These rights, he said, include where to go for his needs, such as the hospital or free clinics; the right to confidentiality in discussing problems with physicians; and the right to have a voice in his own government.

"The young need as much legal and legislative help as they do medical help," Dr. Allen said, "and physicians must recognize this."

"Is all this concern over the young necessary? Yes it is. The survival of the human species may depend on it."

Although there needs to be greater awareness that teenagers have special problems, Dr. Allen said, "We don't need to create another group of specialists to care for them."

Robert Deisher, MD, is chairman of the recently-established committee on adolescence of the American Public Health Assn.

The committee, he said, will look into the need for more preventive services. He added that little concern or involvement in the problems of adolescents has been shown to date by local and state public health departments.

He called the minimal amount of financing for adolescent medicine a "national scandal."

Natalia Tanner, MD, a Detroit pediatrician, describes herself as a "crib-to-college doctor" since most of the teenagers she serves have been seeing her since infancy. This is not the case with some pediatricians who lose many of their patients when they reach their early teens.

Dr. Tanner, a former chairman of the pediatric section of the National Medical Assn. and member of several committees of the American Academy of Pediatrics, said that 75% of her office time is spent talking with teenagers about problems not directly related to their health needs. She discusses such subjects as their academic achievements, community activities, and employment needs.

"The key to success is relating to these patients and hearing what the kids have to say," Dr. Tanner said.

Finally, there is Felix Heald, MD, president of the Society for Adolescent Medicine, who believes that more innovative programs are needed for teenagers. Dr. Heald is also director of the division of adolescent medicine at the U. of Maryland Hospital and professor of pediatrics at the university's school of medicine. He suggested that comprehensive youth health centers are one model that could be established to provide medicine, mental health, and vocational and rehabilitative programs under one roof.

"Practicing pediatricians are unique because they have been sensitive to the social and medical needs of youth and have been very responsive in meeting these needs," said Dr. Heald.

Although there is disagreement on how adolescents should be treated, it is generally agreed by physicians that teenagers have unique problems and needs and should be managed differently from younger children and adults.

J. Roswell Gallagher, MD, once suggested, "If you don't like adolescents, don't treat 'em." But he added, "You don't have to be for sin or against parents, and you don't always have to agree with adolescents—but you should be on their side."

MORE FREE ENTERPRISE, LESS SOCIAL PLANNING NEEDED FOR TRUE PROGRESS IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat dismayed on hearing on several different occasions recently the opinion expressed that the increasing population necessitates more Government control and regulation of our lives or that the increasing complexity of life requires that we give up some of our individual freedoms.

It appears to me, to the contrary, that as the population and the complexity of problems increase, the solutions to the problems call for more individual responsibility and free enterprise. The social planners and the social engineers are simply unqualified and unable to cope with the situation.

In an informative and thought provoking article entitled "Social Planners Have Stifled True Progress in America," Editor Ned Touchstone of the Councilor contends that energies of this great Nation

are being wasted on social agitation and upon protection of entrenched international interests while inventive minds are being kept from technological progress which could benefit mankind.

I insert Mr. Touchstone's excellent article in the RECORD at this point and recommend it to our colleagues as containing ideas which if developed and implemented would lead to true progress in America:

[From the Shreveport (La.) Councilor, Feb. 22, 1972]

SOCIAL PLANNERS HAVE STIFLED TRUE PROGRESS IN AMERICA

(By Ned Touchstone)

America in 1972 has momentarily turned its back on great riches and prosperity to search diligently for a dime's worth of nightmare.

Think with me for a moment of what we could be doing with America's manpower instead of wasting it upon the futility of social revolution.

(1) Automobiles are badly needed which can be operated by electricity, by solar power or other forms of energy easily attainable by the genius of great men in our midst. There is a limit to our known petroleum reserves but there is virtually no limit to other forms of power which would already be in use if we were not busy with social revolution.

Meanwhile the same powerful forces in America who are involved in oil deals with the Red Chinese are working to PREVENT the development of new fuel sources. When an inventor such as Gene Irwin produces a simple device to cut the gas consumption in a car he is either bought out or persecuted. He mysteriously becomes the target of every conceivable federal agency and pressure group in the country if he refuses to sell out. Lurking in the background are people who claim to be "progressive" but who are actually anti-progress.

(2) Thousands of college students are needed to be the technological leaders of the next generation. Brains are the nation's scarcest commodity.

Meanwhile on campus confused professors are telling ycungsters to "get involved" in two silly social experiments long ago discredited by history: Race-mixing and Socialism. Race-mixing has brought the downfall of every nation that ever tried it. Socialism has been tried since the dawn of history and has always failed.

(3) Rapid trains are badly needed in America to whisk travelers across the nation at 300 to 500 mph speeds. We know how to build such trains but private enterprise is paying such high taxes to support a space program that there isn't enough venture capital for needed earthbound systems! There will be plenty of time to develop the moon and far-off Mars long after passenger trains start to roll again.

(4) For prosperity, America will desperately need more people in the next generation, not fewer people. We especially need more of the kind of people who made America great.

Meanwhile the so-called "progressives" and disciples of doom have convinced the white people of America that they should reduce their birth rate. These propagandists haven't done a very good job of convincing colored people to slow down in this category. Result: A time-bomb has been set to destroy the nation and it can only be defused in the bedrooms of suburbia.

(5) The moaners and groaners about the non-existent "population explosion" say that there simply will not be enough food to feed the world in the next generation.

The truth: If the last two people on Earth were lazy or morons they might have trouble finding food. At any time when morons and loafers outnumber geniuses and workers by a 10 to 1 ratio there will be a food shortage, whether there are 10 people on Earth or 10 billion.

The seas of the earth contain food treasures beyond the imagination of those who spread their genocide messages on TV and in the sick, slick magazines. Not just fish, but other substances which can be converted to food.

If America can tear itself away from Social Revolution and get down to business again, we will see giant food industries along our coastlines and on the islands of the seas.

(6) We hear the "progressives" whining about a future shortage of electrical energy. But their wails prove only that they don't have brains enough to find the front door in a slow fire drill. If falling water can turn turbines and generate electricity, why not harness the waves of the sea?

The "progressives" talk about going to the moon to find answers to some of Man's problems on Earth. But the truth is that God so arranged his universe that He sent power of the Moon to the Earth and gave us brains to use it if we will. The moon pulls at the sea day after day causing great waves to crash upon the shore. It doesn't take a great amount of intelligence to realize that here is a source of energy—virtually unlimited—just waiting for the Social Revolution to end.

(7) I heard a University professor tell his audience that the world's supplies of silver, copper and magnesium are fast being exhausted. I suspect that the gentleman is a professor because he is too stupid to learn how to plow.

There has never been a geological survey of the mineral deposits of the Earth. In fact there has been a large scale search for only one mineral: petroleum. And probably petroleum is the only mineral which is in any real danger of depletion in the centuries ahead.

But even if there were no more deposits of silver, copper and magnesium to be found near the surface of the Earth, there remain three other great sources available to men of genius:

(a) Recovery of waste or unused minerals.

(b) Extraction from the sea.

(c) Possible deposits beneath the outer crust of the Earth, too deep to be recovered by methods now known to mankind.

(8) The self-styled "progressives" have tried to cure America's economic woes with a trick device they call Paper Gold, if it's paper, it ain't gold. Not even yellow paper.

Certainly the future may produce an economic system which doesn't depend upon gold, but not in the next 10 or 20 years or maybe the next 100 years. Nations might someday trade in certificates backed up by surplus foodstuffs frozen in the polar ice-cap and transported there by methods yet to be devised.

But for the moment, we need gold. Instead of Uncle Sam standing on the corner selling pencils, he needs to entrust this matter to citizens with vision and ability—not the social planners who got us into this mess.

Instead of throwing up our hands in despair we should use our brains to devise more been mined out. Our excuse: This gold costs too much to mine.

Instead of throwing up our hands in despair we should use our brains to devise more economical methods to mine such gold. If some of the work needs to be done with hands instead of brains we could impress some of these able bodied men who draw welfare checks year after year.

(9) Our "progressives" are still planning giant airports with huge runways. Only a few of our more intelligent people seem to realize that the day is coming when aircraft will land and take off vertically. If we could harness a few more brains to the problem, the day would be just around the corner.

(10) Self-styled "progressives" have been busy trying to find new ways to build houses that will not last until the mortgage is paid off. About 1935, bricklayers quit laying bricks with a Flemish bond. Too much trouble. Next they switched from brick to brick veneer. Building materials get shoddier every year and 2x4 studs get smaller and smaller. If the trend is not reversed we will soon be living in plastic bags and paper sacks hung on a broom handle frame.

Isn't it about time that we used our brains to build houses that will stand 100 to 300 years instead of 10 to 30 years? We claim to have great builders but they have been too busy erecting 235 houses to try to unlock the stone masonry secrets of the Peruvians who built houses which lasted thousands of years. Let's forget socialism for a few years and provide free enterprise incentive for men who will use their heads.

(11) Mankind has made miserable misuse of radio for a half century. Perhaps this is because men like Sarnoff and his ilk dominated the field and they were more interested in propaganda and selling toothpaste for Lever Brothers than they were in developing radio. Despite this feet dragging, we already have the technology for using radio 10 times more effectively than it is now being used to transmit information.

Information about ever conceivable subject, from stamp-collecting to vocational training, from flower-arranging to equipment sales, can be transmitted by radio in a usable form, through 24-hour rapid transmission for recorder reception.

A radio receiver can be easily built which will record a special program or programs equipped with a pre-set timing device. For instance: Contractors could get information upon new projects on a special broadcast from 1:10 a.m. until 1:18 a.m. each day. They would merely set a timer on their receiving set to trigger a tape-recorder to operate at that time. The sending station could transmit 40 minutes of transmission in eight minutes by transmitting from a tape played at five times regular speed. The receiving set would also record on a tape operated at five times regular speed, but played back at normal speed.

One transmitting station could transmit as much information as contained in a set of encyclopediae in little more than a day's time, but the receiver would record only that information that he desired.

Why aren't things like this being done in 1972? Simply because we are too busy with our ill-fated Social Revolution to concern ourselves with progress. The entire program could be put in operation for a tiny portion of what we are now spending to subsidize "Sesame Street" to brain-wash innocent little children.

THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Monday the Interior Department issued its final environmental impact statement on the proposed Trans-Alaska pipeline, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The interior study is composed of six volumes on the environmental aspects of this pro-

posed project and the alternatives to it and three volumes on its economic aspects.

Because of the study's volume I would not want to give a definitive reaction to it at this time. However, I have looked with some depth into the study's environmental and economic comparison of the trans-Canadian pipeline alternative. The environmental analysis of the Canadian pipeline appears considerably more comprehensive, honest and accurate than the analysis contained in the draft impact statement. The economic analysis and comparison of the Canadian pipeline, which concludes that the trans-Canadian and the trans-Alaskan pipelines are "equally efficient," is inadequate and less than candid. In short, the economic analysis is a snow job. More will be said on this at a later date.

I would like to include in the RECORD today the transcript with Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton aired on the "Today Show" Tuesday morning. Many of Mr. Morton's statements contain misinformation; some of his statements are actually contradicted by his own Department's impact statement. I am sure that those of my colleagues interested in this important project will find Secretary Morton's interview quite interesting. It follows:

AN INTERVIEW WITH SECRETARY ROGERS C. B. MORTON

FRANK MCGEE. The Interior Department put out a master study yesterday on what the proposed Alaska oil pipeline might do to the environment. The report concluded that the pipeline will be the cheapest way to get the oil out, but it would have damaging effects.

We've asked the Secretary of the Interior, Rogers Morton, to talk with us about that this morning and other ecological matters, as well. And Morton's in our Washington studio with "Today" Washington editor, Bill Monroe.

BILL MONROE. Good morning, Frank.

Secretary Morton, there's been some speculation that you might not make a decision on whether to accept the application to build this Alaska pipeline until after the election. Are you going to decide before that?

Secretary ROGERS C. B. MORTON. Well, I think it would only be fair to decide before that. I would like to leave the report sort of soak for about forty-five days or so so that people will have a chance to look at it and comment on it. But I think shortly thereafter, a decision should be made one way or the other.

MONROE. Is it possible you might come out with a decision between two and three months?

Secretary MORTON. Yes, quite possible. Of course, the only thing we're able to do is to inform the court, if we decide affirmatively, that we're going to decide affirmatively, because we're under an injunction not to proceed.

MONROE. A good deal of the material in your report indicates that the Canadian route—and there's no application right now for a Canadian route—but a Canadian route would be less damaging to the environment in several ways. There would be no tankers involved, so no oil spills at sea. Since it's expected that a gas pipeline would be built through Canada, if you built an oil pipeline, the two could go in the same corridor, so you wouldn't have two different corridors. And it would also be less earthquake prone through Canada. And yet, there's an assumption that the Interior Department and you will decide in favor of the Alaskan pipe.

Secretary MORTON. Well, as you said at the beginning, Bill, there is no application before us for a pipeline other than the one through Alaska.

I think, perhaps, you should give a little closer analysis to the report, because I believe the seismic risks are just about even both ways. Of course, the tanker problem cuts two ways also. Because if the pipeline went through Canada and if it ended up in the middle of the country, you would then have to bring oil into the West Coast by tanker. So the same amount of oil would be arriving by tanker. And these tankers would be foreign flag tankers; they would be tankers over which we have no control, whereas the Valdez to West Coast tankers will be Jones Act tankers; they will be American ships; they will be of the highest standard.

So we could be—and the environmental balance could be thrown really against us, if we went through Canada. This would have to be analyzed. But the fact is that the Canadians, or any Canadian interest or Canadian oil companies, have not—or American oil companies, for that matter, have not chosen to go that route. The oil is needed in Region V, which is the West Coast. And I guess we'll have to make a decision on what we have before us.

MONROE. You concede, apparently, from what you've said, that it would be an advantage to go through Canada in the sense of having a single corridor for both gas and oil.

Secretary MORTON. Well, yes, from a single corridor point of view. But the American part of that corridor would be very small. And in the Alaskan land withdrawal, in the public interest withdrawal that we made the other day, we did set aside a corridor that would go underneath the Arctic wildlife range, just south of it, into Canada. There would be a great deal more land environment disturbed by a Canadian pipeline, a great deal more. And the cost of it would be probably over twice as much as the Alaskan concept.

And I believe that the technology for handling oil on the water—new ships, new techniques, new safety devices—will mean that we can handle oil that way probably, environmentally, more compatible than we can any other way. Because there's been a great movement, as you know, in this direction.

MCGEE. Mr. Secretary, this is Frank McGee in New York. At least three major environmental groups, I understand, are asking for further public hearings on this matter before a decision is taken by you and your department. Would you favor such hearings?

Secretary MORTON. Well, I'm going to leave the report open for comment from everybody for forty-five days. And we've circulated the report to libraries all across the country. And we're making it available at the lowest possible price to anybody who wants it. And I would like to hear from everybody who has something to say about it.

If you have a public hearing and give somebody an hour, an hour and a half, or something like that, to discuss it, it's so complicated and it's so big that I don't think we would learn anything new. I think the opportunity to get comments on which there could really be some valid evidence as to the adequacy of our report is better served by allowing, say, forty-five days. And if it takes more than that, and the public wants more time than that, I'm perfectly willing to give them more time than that to tell us what they think.

But to stand up for giving every witness an hour, say, and say there were a thousand witnesses that wanted to testify, I don't think we would learn anything, and we'd get a lot of material that we couldn't analyze and use. Whereas if the scholars will let us know what they think and these environmental groups will let us know what they think, we will incorporate these comments into the decision-making process.

MONROE. Frank or Roger.

ROGER CARAS. Mr. Secretary, is there any claim, or any truth to the claim, that the oil coming from Alaska is destined for a market in Japan and not for use in the United States?

Secretary MORTON. Well, it would seem very unlikely. In the first place, you couldn't get as much for it in Japan as you could in the United States. And the other point is that we're short of oil. And by 1980, for example, when this pipeline's just getting fully matured, I think that we'll be importing probably twenty-five to thirty percent of our oil requirement. The only possible avenue that I can see for a Japanese trade in this oil would be where we sent some oil from Valdez to Japan in exchange for oil that they had purchased, say, in Africa or in the Middle East and save some shipping thereby.

But there'd be no reason, economic reason whatsoever, to export this oil to any country.

MONROE. Mr. Secretary, do you look on the possible damage to the ocean from a pollution point of view, from the use of tankers between Alaska and the West Coast as the worst possible threat from this pipeline? The report says that accidents to tankers may cause spillage of as much as a hundred and forty thousand barrels a year. And it talks about chronic pollution in Valdez, Alaska area and the possible damage to salmon fish of about four hundred thousand dollars a year.

Secretary MORTON. Well, we think that by the kind of controls that we can install at Valdez in the terminal, in the maritime facility that such pollution could be avoided. But shipping, general shipping accounts for about—and the tankers—accounts for about sixty percent of the ocean oil pollution. About forty percent is accounted for by drainage from crankcases—from cars and buses and trucks.

MONROE. Coming into the ocean from the rivers?

Secretary MORTON. Yes, from the waterways. And there's no way you can cut it. If you bring this oil into the middle of the country, you're going to have to service the West Coast from oil that bought offshore. And then you have no control over the tankers. You'll have all kinds of convenience flags, foreign tankers, rust buckets, and everything else bringing that oil in. So you're probably going to get a lot less oil pollution in the ocean by controlling it with American ships and using this route.

That doesn't mean that I've come to the conclusion that this is what we ought to do. This is just one of the tools in the decision-making process.

CARAS. Bill, can I come in again?

MONROE. Yes.

CARAS. Mr. Secretary, this is Roger Caras again. Sir, history would seem to demonstrate that a seismic disturbance along the route of this pipeline is not a likelihood, but eventually, at least, would be a certainty. What can be done to keep the pipeline from rupturing in the event of a major seismic disturbance?

Secretary MORTON. Stipulations have been put into the design of the pipeline and agreed to by the applicants that will put the necessary loops in the pipeline to make it strong enough to withstand earthquakes. And we have learned a good deal about this over the last years, dating all the way back to the great San Francisco Earthquake. And I think combatting the seismic forces is an engineering practicality, and they can do it.

MONROE. The report indicates there might be some problems to caribou migration in terms of this pipeline presenting a barrier. Does that seem very serious to you?

Secretary MORTON. Well, this is one of the things I want to look at. I want to look at all the research that's been done. A lot of re-

search has been done in this area. And test pipelines have been constructed in the Arctic, and the caribou so far have been willing to go over them, been willing to go under them. And if they're short enough, they go around them.

MONROE. Thank you very much, Secretary of the Interior, Rogers Morton.

TEXAS OIL GATES THROWN WIDE OPEN

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a drastic and extremely dangerous slowdown in American oilfield exploration is an indisputable fact. In 1952 there were almost 9,000 crew months of geophysical activity in this country. According to the Library of Congress, by last year this figure had declined to just over 2,500 crew months. During this time the number of active drilling rigs plummeted to a level only 37 percent of a 1952 figure of 2,641 rigs.

This downward trend has been imposed by Federal law and policy. The imposition came at a time when we should have been spending more and more time and energy in finding and developing viable energy reserves. The easy-to-find reservoirs, using known technology, have already been found. The percentage of successful discoveries has grown steadily worse. In 1958, 19.82 percent of all starts were successful; in 1968 only 14.56 percent produced anything. Of equal importance is the fact that the average depth of the successful starts has increased from 4,900 to 5,800 feet during this period, making the search more expensive for each attempt that is made.

Last week the Texas Railroad Commission ordered a 100 percent market demand factor for April. For the first time in almost a quarter century, our exploration levels are such that a decision of this kind finally became necessary. Mr. Speaker, this is the result of: First, a continuing insistence upon more and more oil import quota relaxations; and second, it is the result of a congressional decision to cut the oil depletion allowance by 20 percent, a move which was included in the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, to those Members who voted for this 20 percent slash in the depletion allowance, I fervently hope the article which I am enclosing in the RECORD at this point will signal more strongly the desperate need for all possible incentives for the further development of our country's energy resources. In my opinion, the day this Congress allowed that cut to be included in a tax reform package was a very unfortunate one. If something is not done to reverse its damage, we could well be left in the lurch without our traditional energy reserves.

The recent step taken in Texas is the last step that can be made. It is an unfortunate one. But that makes it no less unavoidable. I am inserting an article from the Amarillo Daily News which describes the Texas decision. I commend it to the personal attention of every Member:

[From the Amarillo Daily News, Mar. 17, 1972]

TEXAS OIL GATES THROWN WIDE OPEN

(By Jim Walker)

EL PASO.—The Texas Railroad Commission Thursday ordered a 100 per cent market demand factor for April, the first time the gates have been totally opened for Texas oil since 1948.

Terming the El Paso meeting "historic and a rather sad one" Byron Tunnell, commission chairman, announced the 100 per cent factor after a parade of oil company executives gave their outlook on the state of the industry for the coming year.

The shortage of crude was the dominant theme of the executives. Nominations for April were up more than 157,754 barrels daily over March.

The announcement by Tunnell was made in the dramatic setting of a packed room atop the Holiday Inn Downtown in El Paso. Tunnell said he would like to be in Washington today "when the bottom doesn't drop out of the price of oil."

Tunnell's preference was obviously aimed at critics who have said market demand proration is simply a device to maintain the price of oil.

Tunnell said he was saddened because the rest of the world has always looked to Texas in the past "as that fine old warrior" who could fill in the oil needs in time of emergency. He said the "old warrior can't rise to the occasion" any longer.

Tunnell said the commission would keep a close watch on reservoir pressures and order a reduced level of production if evidence of damage to producing zones because of excessive production rates is reported.

He assailed federal policy saying, "At the very time incentives needed to be increased they were removing incentives." He alluded to a cut in the depletion rate and other tax changes which adversely affected the petroleum industry.

Tunnell said, "I'm firmly convinced the only way the industry can develop absolutely needed new reserves is to get a higher price."

He called on the federal government to "provide a profitable and stable investment climate to reverse downward trend of oil reserves."

Tunnell more than once said Alaskan North Slope oil must be brought to market "caribou notwithstanding."

Jim Langdon, commission member, questioned several executives on the possibility of synthetic crude filling some of the shortage.

W. A. Roberts, executive vice president of Phillips Petroleum Co., said synthetic fuel from shale oil will be a factor someday but noted the capital cost of development will be tremendous and predicted environmental problems for the process.

Avery Rush Jr., president of Diamond Shamrock Oil and Gas Co. of Amarillo, making his company's presentation before the commission, said the petroleum industry seems to have had some success in telling its story on the shortage of natural gas to the public. He said the industry has not had the same success in explaining the shortage of oil "and there is a crude shortage now."

He said, "The increasing import level for foreign crude oil is one of the major factors which continue to exert the wrong kind of pressure on our domestic exploration." He called for bringing in as many domestic sources as soon as possible including the Alaskan North Slope, Gulf of Alaska, Offshore Texas and Louisiana and synthetics.

He thanked the commission for "continuing to help lead the nation and our industry to a sensible balance between the demand for environmental perfection and the demand for hydrocarbons."

John K. McKinley, president of Texaco Inc., called on the commission to open the flow of Texas oil. He said, "In the present situation, in order to minimize the mounting shortages, we believe the domestic petroleum industry should produce its properties at the maximum capacity consistent with good conservation practice. Restriction of domestic production rates to lower levels does not appear justified since even at the highest anticipated production increased imports will be needed in the near future to supply the nation's energy requirements."

Wayne E. Glenn, president of Western Hemisphere Petroleum Division of Continental Oil Company, said, "Normal growth in product demand will soon absorb any surplus product stocks which may be on hand. Demand for all petroleum should increase approximately 5 per cent this year. If this estimate is accurate, then our domestic supply, in combination with import quotas already allocated, will not be adequate to meet the demand. We anticipate additional offshore and Canadian quotas will be issued this year to fill the gap."

NEW DIMENSIONS AT SBA

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Thomas Kleppe, the administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently completed a cross-country trip to promote the benefits of SBA loans among the Nation's bankers. During his visit to Houston, he was interviewed by Preston K. Kirk for the Houston Business Journal.

The article resulting from the interview demonstrates the new spirit which my good friend, Tom Kleppe, has brought to the operation of SBA. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the following article from the February 28, 1972 edition of the Houston Business Journal.

The article follows:

SBA'S KLEPPE: FARMBOY, DROPOUT, BEATEN CANDIDATE

(By Preston F. Kirk)

So what does a former North Dakota farmboy, college dropout and unsuccessful senatorial candidate know about business? Plenty, if he happens to be Thomas S. Kleppe, 52, a self-made millionaire, two-term congressman and administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Plenty more when you consider his agency made 24,000 loans totaling $1.3 billion in working capital to small firms in 1971 and lined up government procurement contracts going to small businesses to the tune of $11.5 billion.

Kleppe, armed with missionary zeal, was in Houston Feb. 24 to review operations of the local SBA office during his cross-country campaign of convincing the nation's 30,000 banks that they can benefit themselves and their communities by making SBA loans.

Small businesses are generally not prime candidates for bank loans, he reminds. "That's where we come in. We don't make the loan, but we guarantee 90% of it," up to $350,000.

So why the longstanding reluctance by bankers, especially since the SBA has been guaranteeing loans for 20 years now?

"Bureaucracy. Red tape," answers Kleppe (the name rhymes with peppy). "The negative attitude was it was not worth the time and trouble to go through the red tape provided by the federal government on a ½% or ¼% interest rate."

As a result the SBA, in the area of loans, has cut the number of government forms from 37 to 11, he stated. And along with this effort goes Kleppe's 13-month-old information campaign.

"We believe the banking community should use us as a catalyst in building the small business community," he emphasized. "After all, 95% of the nation's businesses are classified as small businesses, and these five million small businessmen, who account for about 37% of the Gross National Product, should have the same opportunity to strike it rich," Kleppe believes.

Apparently, somebody's getting the message.

"I'm very pleased with the progress coming from the banking community. Ten thousand banks have signed up in our agreements and it is growing. The desks of our loan officers are bulging."

The welcome side effect of creating new business is creating new jobs, and the SBA has the tools and resources to help Houston reach its goal of 160,000 job openings expected to be created during the next five years, Kleppe contends.

Of the Houston Chamber of Commerce projection, he said it is estimated 90,000 new jobs will be created and the remaining 70,000 will be replacements or attrition.

"SBA, obviously, can't do the job alone, but it has the resources and the expertise to help Houston reach that goal — particularly through its economic development program," he emphasized.

Since its inception, the federal agency's local development company program has helped create or save more than 6,000 jobs in Texas, with a total investment of over $25.5 million in federal and private capital, he reported.

"We believe it is important for each community to set up job goals, to publicize those goals and then institute community planning to reach them," Kleppe said.

Nationally, the administrator said the 3,532 facilities financed through SBA's local development company program have created, since the program's inception, some 119,000 jobs and saved or maintained over 50,000 more—for a total of 169,000 employment opportunities.

Estimating that 100 jobs bring about $750,000 of spendable income to a community each year, "these 169,000 jobs are providing over $1 billion in spendable income in over 3,000 communities," Kleppe said.

"Right here in Houston during the past fiscal year," Kleppe said, SBA increased its loan activity dollarwise by 90%—from $16.3 million to $31 million. "This means this great small business community of ours is alive and virile," he said.

"We are not in competition with the banks," he reminded. "SBA tries to fill that niche which is not bankable without a guarantee. We take risks that banks won't touch, and that's our job."

Tall and balding, the former president of the Gold Seal Co., a bleach and wax manufacturer, would probably admit the SBA can never hope to have the $14 billion the Federal Reserve estimates as the capital requirements of small business.

But it's not impossible. After all, Kleppe has bowled a perfect (300) game, survived the rodeo circuit, made a hole-in-one, and turned down a baseball offer by the St. Louis Cardinals!

"I will be asking for $5.8 billion next week," from Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, "and I feel we will get it. We've had tremendous support from the President and the administration," he said, denying that Nixon is partial to big business.

"The facts refute that Nixon favors big business. When our guaranteed authority of $2.2 billion was almost exhausted after seven months, I ran up to the (Capitol) Hill and asked for an increase to $3.1 billion, and we got it," he said.

If Kleppe wears on his sleeve his confidence in his former colleagues, then along beside it are his disappointments in the SBA performance.

Although 19% of the SBA-backed loans went to minorities, which compares favorably with the 16% minority population in the nation and outdistances the 3.5% minority-run businesses, many small businesses need management assistance more than they need capital.

"Management assistance is an important part of the small business' success or failure. We do not have enough manpower and I doubt we ever will have enough for a one-on-one basis," he lamented.

Kleppe said some management consultants had been hired and members of the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) had been utilized to "fill the gap, but pure volume has got us licked at this point, and we haven't got dollar power. We just haven't been given enough resources," he stressed.

Hopefully, funds going into the Commerce Dept.'s Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) will be used to address itself to management, giving the SBA some relief, Kleppe noted.

"We are not proud of our performance in the area of disaster loans," he added. The SBA made $300 million on 58,000 disaster loans in the last fiscal year, and "We're already over $300 million and only seven months into this fiscal year."

He said there have been five presidentially declared disasters and six declared by the SBA. "It is difficult because we can't project the need," he said.

Expanding on that subject, he said it is "penny wise and pound foolish" to try to collect small amounts above the built-in $2,500 forgiveness in disaster loans which victims are not required to repay. He said he is going to seek changes in that area with the intent of decreasing his agency's bookwork and required manpower to service the loans.

The other red badge of discouragement is the total cumulative loan loss, 4%, but "you can take either side of that debate," he said, "We keep working to reduce it." (The Houston region loss is about 3.5%, less than the national average.) "The highest rate of failures is in the service businesses.

"The important job is the judgment on the front end. If the judgment is bad, everybody loses: The small businessman whose pride is shattered, the SBA, the banker and the taxpayer.

Kleppe also made it clear the SBA has no prior restrictions on who it approves loans for—expect the news media, and loans handled by other agencies such as residential by FHA and farm loans by the Agriculture Dept.

Asked about SBA's position on franchised businesses, he admitted, "We've had some sad experiences."

The SBA came out this month in support of a proposed Federal Trade Commission regulation on disclosure requirements and prohibitions concerning franchising. Estimated annual sales of more than 400,000 franchise establishments now exceed $131 billion.

"We are interested in the franchisee getting what he is promised, and if it takes legislation, we'll be there!"

The SBA, variously described as a "sleeping giant" and a "resting place for jobless politicians," apparently has taken on new dimensions with Kleppe at the helm.

And he appears determined to stop the revolving door that has seen SBA administrators come and go every 14 months. He enters his 14th month in March.

EXPERIMENTAL R. & D. INCENTIVE AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there exists throughout this Nation a condition of unemployment that has heretofore reached epidemic proportions only among the culturally deprived, educationally deficient, and elderly. Today, however, we are witnessing a tragic expansion of unemployment into the ranks of the highly skilled and educated. No one group of individuals has felt the impact of this Nation's economic paucity more than those members of the scientific community previously engaged in aerospace technology. As a consequence, there is available a great abundance of talent and skill that is either being under utilized or totally ignored. When viewed in light of this country's deteriorating balance of trade and its serious domestic problems this unemployment situation becomes even more catastrophic.

Dr. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation, in testifying before the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, evidenced a recognition of the need for Federal initiatives to encourage non-Federal investment in the area of research and development. It is Dr. Bisplinghoff's intention, by proposing such a program, to restore this country to its proper position as the leading exporter of technology as well as to establish the means of satisfying the pressing needs of the country. These can be accomplished, as Dr. Bisplinghoff suggests, by a more complete implementation of our existing scientific manpower.

The significance of Dr. Bisplinghoff's statement cannot be over emphasized. It is because of the importance of his statement that I include portions herein for consideration by my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND L. BISPLINGHOFF

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. It is a pleasure to appear before you today and to have this opportunity to present two new initiatives proposed by the National Science Foundation for FY 1973—the Experimental R&D Incentives Program and the R&D Assessment Program.

Before reviewing the details of these related programs, however, I believe it is important to consider the broad context that motivated our planning within the Foundation. These considerations, which are well known to the Members of this Committee, show clearly the need for a pattern of activity that is essential to the future well-being of the Nation but which, as a coordinated effort, has been lacking.

We are all aware of the economic difficulties that have beset this Nation, and indeed much of the world, in recent years. We are faced with unacceptable levels of unemployment, inflation with a concomitant lack of adequate increases in productivity, the gradually eroding position of the United States in international technological competition and our related deteriorating trade balance, and the multitude of unsolved problems that permeate all sectors and institutions of our society. As a people, however, we are less aware of the essential role that the national R&D enterprise has and potentially must have in

ameliorating these conditions. It is to this enterprise and its role that I should like to address my remarks.

The broader process through which R&D contributes to the economy is often called innovation. As was demonstrated in Traces—the recent NSF-sponsored study of the dynamics of innovation—this process is composed of several components, each of which is coupled to the others in a symbiotic manner. These components range from basic research at one end, through the activities of applied research and development, through design, engineering and production, to the diffusion and marketing of products and services at the other end. In this total process, R&D is usually a necessary but not a sufficient condition for innovation.

Whatever categories are used, there are clearly several pieces in the innovation process, each dependent on the other. *Of fundamental importance is the recognition of the overall unity that prevails throughout the total process.* If one piece were taken away, or even minimized below an appropriate threshold, the others would ultimately suffer. I say "ultimately" for the process rarely moves in an orderly time sequence from research to development to utilization by society. Experience has shown that the process is iterative, with strong feedbacks.

The innovation process today is itself a recent "innovation." Economic progress and industrial growth have historically resulted from the search for raw materials, the empirical development of new materials and devices, maximum use of available labor, and the availability of investment capital. In recent decades, however, a new factor has been added: the disciplined use of our intellectual powers in understanding nature and finding new ways to exploit it. This new factor has two unique attributes—it is never depleted and it is available for all to use.

In a recent study of important innovations in a large number of fields, it was shown that 60% to 80% resulted from the pull of practical demands, needs, conflicts, and problems. The remainder resulted from the push of new scientific or technological advances or opportunities. There is evidently much wisdom in the old adage, "Necessity is the mother of invention."

But there is also some truth in the reverse, for invention is frequently the "mother" of necessity. We can all identify the innumerable trappings of our lives, things we would not wish to do without and which we consider to be important parts of the quality of life. These have resulted in large measure from the market and product planning activities of successful, major businesses.

I do not wish to imply that industry, both large and small, is not now making a significant and continuing effort in R&D and in the dissemination of its results in the marketplace. Indeed, industry today is the major source of funding of R&D in the private sector, even surpassing the Federal Government with its defense and space programs. There is ample evidence of a direct and positive correlation between the Nation's support of R&D, its general economic growth, productivity increases, and the creation of new products and services. Such innovations as automatic transmissions, vinyl materials, computers, semi-conductor devices, nylon, and penicillin were all made possible through organized R&D efforts, both with and without the assistance of previous or associated Federal programs. The central problem we face is one of developing recognition and capability by industry in general of the full spectrum of opportunity for the exploitation of R&D throughout the civilian economy in meeting societal needs. This lack of recognition and capability is demonstrated by the concentration of a significant fraction of industrial R&D in relatively few companies. It will be desirable to find the means to extend the advantages of modern science and technology to small and medium industries and to all others that so far have been unable to afford it.

EXPERIMENTAL R. & D. INCENTIVES PROGRAM

Although it has become increasingly clear that the Federal Government has an appropriate role in the stimulation of innovation in the civilian sector, it is less clear how this role should be implemented. We have had many years of experience in conducting R&D in areas related to high-technology goods and services required for Federal programs. In 1971, 79% of Federal R&D funds were obligated for defense and space programs. Some of this R&D has produced a useful fallout in domestic areas. There are many ways in which the Federal Government can increase its involvement in the civilian R&D arena, but it is not clear which will be the most effective. That is one of the principal reasons for the experimental programs of the National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards, both of which are proposed as new starts in the FY 1973 budget.

The goal of the National Science Foundation Experimental R&D Incentives Program is to experiment with incentives for increasing non-Federal investments in R&D and for increasing the efficiency and speed of conversion of R&D to new or improved products, processes, and services which contribute to improvements in the quality of life, employment opportunities, economic growth, productivity, and foreign trade. To achieve this goal, an experimental program is being developed which will draw on the resources of universities, trade associations, non-profit research institutes, private industry, government laboratories and State and local governments. The program will test and evaluate different incentives using selected combinations of these institutions.

The National Science Foundation and the National Bureau of Standards programs have different approaches to the same goals, yet they are complementary to each other. The National Science Foundation will rely heavily on the participation of universities working with and through industries. The National Bureau of Standards will rely heavily on the participation of industries. Past experience has shown that university faculty and students can make significant contributions to the solutions of problems if they are given a first-hand opportunity to work on them. The histories of World War II and the space, atomic energy, agriculture and health programs are full of examples of direct contributions by universities to the solution of national problems. In the TRACES study cited earlier, NSF examined the origins of five important U.S. innovations: magnetic ferrites, video tape-recorders, the oral contraceptive pill, the electron microscope, and matrix isolation. Of the key research and development events judged to be important in these innovations, nearly one-half were credited to university research.

Furthermore, the students graduated by universities involved in these problem-oriented activities have been educated in the new theoretical concepts and new technologies which industry requires for future progress. The identification of new and useful technologies for the future also requires the education of people who can practice them.

The experimental plan for the National Science Foundation program involves three considerations:

First, the problem areas within which the experiments will be performed will involve the potential for both social and private benefits. They will include the public service, private service, and manufacturing sectors.

Second, each experiment will identify one or more blockages in the innovation process and will test Federal incentives for overcoming them.

Third, each experiment will require careful evaluation to determine the degree to which the incentive mechanisms succeed. It is expected that the evaluation process will be continuous. That is, it will be carried out not only at the conclusion but also as the experiment progresses. Although valuable lessons will be learned early in many experiments, some will need to be carried on for periods of five or more years before useful and convincing results will be obtained.

Management plan—experiment R. & D. incentives program

Before describing the Experimental R&D Incentives Program in more detail, I should like to outline the management plan that we propose to follow. An awareness of this plan will be helpful in understanding the program design discussed later.

A program office reporting to the Deputy Director of the National Science Foundation will provide overall direction. Detailed project management will be carried out by the staffs of the several NSF Directorates.

An important element of the management plan will be an advisory board made up typically of representatives from universities, industry, State and local governments, labor unions, and industrial associations. This board will play a key role in assisting the Foundation in its task. We believe that advice from the performers and users of R&D, as well as those who are working in and familiar with the economics of the marketplace, should be brought to bear wherever possible in setting guidelines and selecting experiments. The staff will also work closely with the National Science Board, the NSF-Commerce Coordination Committee, and the Executive Office in designing and implementing the program.

The program will be started by the issuance of an NSF Important Notice describing it, supplying guidelines for experiments, and inviting proposals. Proposals for experiments will be evaluated by the NSF staff working with the advisory board. The board will meet as a review panel at least quarterly after the program commences. A review of proposed program elements will be conducted also by the NSF-Commerce Coordinating Committee prior to final decision. This Committee will be co-chaired by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology and the NSF Deputy Director. Since several NSF Directorates will be involved, internal coordination will be assured by the Experimental R&D Incentives Program staff and by an NSF-wide committee chaired by the Deputy Director.

Guidelines for experiments—experimental R. & D. incentives program

It was mentioned earlier under the discussion of the management plan that the program will be started by the issuance of an NSF Important Notice describing guidelines for experiments and inviting proposals. Although it is our plan to ask the advisory board to aid us in formulating the final guidelines, we have prepared the following tentative list:

Each experiment should identify the product, process, service, or other end sought.

Each experiment should have a high potential for testing a clearly stated and important hypothesis related to blockages in the innovation process together with Federal incentives for overcoming them.

Each experiment will contain a significant commitment of non-Federal resources.

Each experiment should specify the degree of private and public investment over the life of the experiment.

Participating institutions must agree to make data available to NSF for purposes of evaluation.

Experiments and results will be public, subject to protection of rights to the use of patentable inventions in appropriate instances.

Each applicant must demonstrate that:

The experiment is in the public interest.

There is a clear need for public investment.

Each experiment will generally involve more than one class of institution (e.g., industry—non-profit research institutes—university—government) and in each experiment, at least one of the participating partners should:

Have a demonstrated research capacity.

Represent the potential institutional users of the product, process, or service.

Each experiment must have a specific evaluation component built in at the beginning: some degree of success or failure of the incentive mechanism must be determinable at the close of the experiment.

Evaluation of experiments—experimental R. & D. incentives program

In designing experiments of the kind proposed in the Experimental R. & D. Incentives Program, it is of crucial importance to include an evaluation plan. The evaluation plan will be designed to test the degree of effectiveness of a particular incentive for increasing the efficiency and speed of the conversion of R. & D. and for increasing the non-Federal investment in R. & D. Two evaluations will be made of each experiment. The first will be made by the performers of the experiment according to the plan built into the original proposal. The second will be made by an NSF group, that will include members of the R. & D. Assessment Program staff, who will provide an independent evaluation.

Although the criteria may vary, it is expected that the following questions will be common to most evaluations:

What specific blockages in the innovation process were identified by the experiment?

What incentives were identified and how effective were they in overcoming the blockages?

How is the efficacy of the incentives affected by type, size, and geographic location of the institutions?

Did any new or improved products, processes, patent disclosures, or services result from the experiment and what benefits were realized as a result?

Did any new companies, institutions, or institutional arrangements result from the experiment?

Were the institutional relations formed strong enough to have a high potential for permanency?

What specific Federal policies and programs are recommended to overcome the blockages that were identified?

Program design—experimental R. & D. incentives program

Underlying the design of the Experimental R&D Incentives Program is a set of assumptions which are best stated at the outset. It is assumed that:

1. There exists the potential for spawning new innovations in the civilian sector by coupling more effectively R&D resources to needs of the private and public sectors and industrial resources to the needs of the consumer.

2. Many such potential developments are in the best interests of the Nation and the participants, and some fraction of this potential is presently going untapped.

3. The Federal Government can provide incentives which will catalyze the realization of some of this potential in a manner which is cost-effective and socially beneficial from the national viewpoint.

While the first two assumptions are probably axiomatic, quantification of the number and type of untapped potential developments is necessary in order to test the third. That is, before the costs and benefits to the Nation of Federal programs can be evaluated, it is necessary to understand the extent and nature of the untapped potential and the cost-effectiveness and social benefits of a variety of Federal incentives which can be used to realize this potential. The Experimental R&D Incentives Program is directed at establishing a data base for future policy decisions from the results of a relatively small number of highly structured experiments.

The flow of innovations may be described simply in terms of three sectors of society:

(1) The R&D centers, consisting of universities, research institutes, governmental and industrial laboratories, and R&D companies. Within the R&D centers, we can identify three resources: dormant technology, new innovations, and human resources.

(2) The industrial and service sectors, consisting of private manufacturing, private services, and public services. These sectors are characterized by the products, processes and services they offer, the degree of concentration or fragmentation of the industry, and the degree to which technology is employed.

(3) The markets, domestic and foreign, consisting of consumers, government, and industry. The markets may be well-defined, diffuse, or nonexistent.

The flow of new innovations may be thought to proceed from the R&D centers to the industrial and service sectors, provided that technical feasibility is established, and then to commercial exploitation, provided marketing is successful. To achieve maximum effectiveness, the efforts of the R&D centers should be closely coupled to the needs of the manufacturing and services sectors, which will translate these innovations into commercially viable products, processes, and services. Similarly, the industrial and service sectors must be closely coupled to the needs and requirements of the markets.

There are a number of blockages which are associated with weak or non-existent coupling of the various sectors. Our problem, then, is to identify these blockages and determine how Federal incentives can be used to alleviate them in a cost-effective and socially beneficial manner. To this end, the Experimental R&D Incentives Program has been subdivided into three classes of experiments:

(1) Cooperative Research Initiatives, which will probe potential blockages in all sectors.

(2) R&D in the Service Sector, which will focus specifically on public and private services to ensure adequate coverage of this crucial area.

(3) Human Resources for Technology Innovation, which will emphasize the human resource aspects of the innovation process.

In discussing each of these classes, I will provide examples of blockages with suggested research projects to test Federal incentives for overcoming them. It is important to emphasize that the actual research projects, within a broad experimental design, will be solicited from the Nation's universities, government laboratories, research institutes, and industry, and will be performed by selected teams of these organizations.

Cooperative Research Initiatives

In the Cooperative Research Initiatives Program, experiments will be invited which may extend over a wide range of problem areas. The following examples, while not intended to be a complete list, are stated to illustrate the general characteristics.

A. Informational Blockages

This set of experiments is aimed at establishing a basis for the need for Federal financial incentives to couple more closely the R&D centers with the manufacturing and service sectors. Many elements of these sectors have not been closely coupled in the past. In some cases, there does not exist a formal mechanism by which industry can identify appropriate R&D resources and, conversely, the R&D community can identify industrial needs. It is conceivable that there are many cases in which the blockage is informational in character, rather than financial.

The informational blockage points may be in areas which industry and R&D centers would be willing to develop jointly and without Federal financial aid, but are not doing so because they are not cognizant of each other's needs and resources. There may be dormant technology, resulting from previous research efforts, which can be applied to an industrial need, but the potential user is not aware of its existence or applicability. Alternatively, the needs and problems of a fragmented or low-technology industry may not be apparent to R&D centers. In some cases, once the potential coupling is appreciated, industry may be willing to support the development without financial incentives.

A number of experiments can be conducted in which the Federal role will be limited to stimulating a comprehensive exchange of information. For example, university-industry teams may survey all companies in an industry to identify needs, potential economic and social benefits, and potential markets. The R&D community can be surveyed to identify applicable existing technologies, the R&D costs and risks, and the reasons why these new applications are not being pursued.

Technical blockages

It is likely that many potential cooperative developments will not be undertaken by industry without Federal financial incentives to remove blockages. For example, an industry may require a directed basic and applied research effort to stimulate a continuing flow of new innovations. In many fragmented industries, the risks may be too high or the magnitude of effort too large for any one company to undertake. The risks associated with establishing the technical feasibility of new concepts and embryonic innovations may be too high for individual companies or even entire industries. Yet in many instances, it may be in the national interest for U.S. industries to foster such innovations.

There are high risks associated with incubating new innovations and establishing their technical feasibility. These risks can be reduced to a level acceptable to industry by applying Federal incentives. The question to be tested is whether such incentives are cost-effective and socially beneficial from the national viewpoint. A variety of experiments can be conducted for innovations at various levels of development: from new concepts which require basic research to establish the foundations, to laboratory processes which require piloting to establish technical feasibility.

Marketing blockages

Many new innovations prove to be technically feasible and economically sound, yet they do not reach the commercial exploitation stage due to blockages in the marketing process. Where markets are highly fragmented, the marketing risks can be too severe for a company or an entire industry to undertake. In other cases, the marketing risks may be excessive because the market is not an established one or is not well-defined. Still other cases appear to exist in which a consumer market is well-defined although no U.S. company appears willing or able to meet the public demand. In spite of these difficulties, there may be a number of products and processes which, if marketed successfully, would be in the national interest. The question is what Federal incentives are required to reduce the marketing risks to acceptable levels and are such incentives cost-effective and socially sound.

A variety of experiments can be aimed at identifying and alleviating various potential marketing blockages. In highly fragmented markets, programs may involve working with consumers of a product or process to define common problems and needs and to formulate them in terms of requirements or performance standards. Other experiments may

be aimed at assisting small companies or fragmented industries to develop more efficient approaches to the market.

R. & D. in the service sector

Although many of its features are similar to and may overlap with experiments in the Cooperative R&D Incentive Program, the R&D in the Service Sector Program is designed to ensure that this critical area receives adequate attention. As in the previous section, the following examples are intended to be illustrative and not all-inclusive of those that eventually will be supported.

A. Blockages in the Public Service Sector

Bringing forth technological innovations which can increase productivity or improve the quality of public services encompasses all of the problems described in the previous section, namely, information blockages and high risk blockages for establishing technical feasibility and markets. However, in the public service sector, these problems are sometimes aggravated by a lack of understanding—on the part of the user of new technology—of the technological concepts and the potential benefits to be derived. Even in areas where new technological advances have been demonstrated to be effective, many local and State agencies do not have adequately trained manpower to evaluate and apply the potential benefits.

A number of experiments can be conducted in efforts to couple more closely the R&D centers, the industries supplying devices and systems to the public service sector, and the State and local agencies which will employ the new developments. In service areas where high technology already exists but is only applied by a few, the Federal role may be limited to improving information transfer. In other cases, Federal aid may be required to aid State and local governments in hiring key personnel capable of assimilating the new technological innovations. Efforts would be directed at demonstrating to State and local governments the benefits to be gained from such in-house expertise.

For the service areas in which State and local governments presently maintain sufficient expertise to evaluate the potential of new innovations, there still remain problems of fragmented markets and insufficient support of R&D to foster new innovations.

As described in the previous section, a number of experiments can be sponsored to reduce the risks of researching and developing new devices and systems and of marketing those which are technically feasible.

B. Blockages in the Private Service Sector

Many of the problems associated with increasing the productivity of the private service sector are complex. There are social, economic and political factors, in addition to technological considerations. For example, while increased productivity in the private service sector may be in the best interests of the consumer, it may be counter to the best interests of the private service sector itself. Weighing these interests and formulating policy for resolving such blockages is the responsibility of our elected representatives. The R&D in the Service Sector Program will attempt to identify those technological alternatives which may result in alleviating blockages and, in this manner, provide an information base to aid future policy decisions.

A number of experiments can be conducted to identify dormant technologies and new concepts which may be applicable to the private service sector. For example, repair and maintenance of consumer durables is a large component of the total private service sector. It may be possible to reduce the total cost of purchase, repair, maintenance, and disposal of consumer durables by either modifying the original design or using more sophisticated technology in the servicing. University and industry or trade association teams can be formed under Federal sponsorship to evaluate the potential economic and social benefits by examining a selected number of consumer durable products.

Human resources for technology innovation

The objective of this portion of the program is to identify blockages and seek Federal incentives that will encourage personnel education, development, and exchange in ways that will facilitate the flow of concepts and ideas from laboratory to consumer, as well as enhance productivity. The examples that follow are illustrative of those that will be supported in this portion of the program.

Blockages in professional education and exchange

Although it is difficult to distinguish cause and effect, our incomplete knowledge of the innovation process is related to the small number of university staff and courses which focus on this total process. There is a need to provide broader opportunities for development of multi-disciplinary education in the total innovation process, including an understanding of entrepreneurship. Incentives to universities in the form of seed grants can be provided by the Federal Government to build up continuing faculty experience and student interest in this area.

It has long been recognized that the innovation process and the productivity of the various sectors of our economy depend critically on the timely interchange of people as well as their motivation and training. However, there remain many blockages in our institutional arrangements that prevent exchange of personnel. A variety of Federal incentives can be tested to alleviate this blockage. For example, they may include industry fellowships for graduate students or new graduates, exchange fellowships for university and industry employees, partial Federal support for visiting professors from institutions other than universities, and partial Federal support of faculty sabbaticals in industry and State and local governments.

Blockages to enhanced job satisfaction

The matching of human resources and job opportunities is a two-sided coin. In the past, the job market has usually been viewed in terms of adapting the labor force to the work styles required for maximum economic efficiency. However, rapidly rising educational levels of the population are creating pressures for job opportunities which are psychologically as well as financially rewarding. There is a growing unwillingness of youth to accept the character of the occupations offered by society on their present terms. In spite of the fact that the conditions of work are far better than they ever were, expectations have advanced much faster than the reality.

To the extent that greater personal fulfillment in work entails a loss of economic efficiency in a narrow sense, the collective goals of society and the personal goals of the individual may be in direct conflict in the near term. To achieve long-term harmony, more attention must be given to the conscious design of the work experience within the context of the technology of production. Thus, experiments can be conducted to explore the trade-offs between worker satisfaction and productive efficiency, and to seek new means, including technological innovations, of matching work styles to psychological needs.

NATIONAL R. & D. ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

The National Science Foundation also proposes the creation of a National R&D Assessment Program. *The goal of this proposed new program is to achieve a fuller understanding of the R&D and innovation systems and how they may better contribute to national goals and objectives, including improvements in the quality of life, employment opportunities, economic growth, productivity, and foreign trade.* It will provide a national R&D assessment capability consonant with the expressed needs of the Executive Branch and the Congress. These needs have been highlighted particularly in this Committee's hearings and symposia on science policy and on science, technology and the economy.

Although as a Nation we invested nearly $27 billion in R&D in 1971—and our economic growth and welfare depend on these investments—we have very little understanding of the details and dynamics of the process in the domestic sector. This is in contrast to a large body of information and skills in R&D systems and R&D management expertise in military and space activities. It is becoming increasingly clear that R&D is an important contributor to economic growth and productivity; but it is also clear that we understand only in the sketchiest way what its social rates of return are and how it is related to such factors as efficient use of resources, employment opportunities, and foreign trade.

THE MAN WHO BEAT ROOSEVELT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, 100 years is a long time. Not many of us are privileged to live that long. One of those who was lucky enough to make it into his 100th year is Godfrey Sperling, who is the father of Godfrey Sperling, Jr., the national political correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor.

When I first started in politics, Godfrey Sperling, Sr. was one of those who was active in politics in an indirect way. He had definite opinions and he always let people know where he stood. It was difficult to have a conversation with him without some of this independent political thought coming to the surface. But it was always a stimulating experience and to me it was especially so because I was in my twenties and he was in his seventies. Godfrey Sperling, Jr., at that time, was a reporter for one of the local newspapers in Champaign-Urbana—and a good one. In fact, he was so good, he is now the national correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor. In some ways, Godfrey, Jr. is a 1972 version of his dad at the same age. You might even use the old adage, "He's a chip off the old block." Especially, it seems to me, that Godfrey, Jr. has mellowed as time has passed and as he has covered important events in Washington. His dad is one of the old Reconstruction kind who would have loved to argue politics with my father who would also have been 100 years old on October 7, 1972.

From all I can see, Godfrey, Sr. is not slowing down any. He is just picking up speed for the second century. Not only do his friends wish him another good 100 years, but I would say that if anything happened to him, there would be a lot of disappointed and unhappy people in Champaign County, Ill.

Good luck, old timer.

I include the following article:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 18, 1972]

THE MAN WHO BEAT ROOSEVELT

(By Godfrey Sperling Jr.)

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA, ILL.—The old-timer had become a living artifact. He was now

being viewed—and relied upon—by state and university historians as a human-geological rarity, one who could provide them with authentic insights into how the West looked before the turn of the century and how this part of the Midwest looked in the 1870's.

Upon graduating from college in the mid-1890's, the old-timer had gone to Idaho, Oregon, and Wyoming as an engineer-explorer. His job was to establish state boundaries. Now his notes and memories of what he observed as he made these primary surveys are being fed into oral-history tapes.

This, of itself, seems worth noting. But there was something more. The old-timer was entering his 100th year. Furthermore—and I say this with the pride for which a son may be pardoned—he is my father.

What do you say about your father As a boy I used to hear his stories of his "close calls" in the wilds.

Of how he and his surveying party were lost in a dense thicket of forest deadfall that tore off their clothes and left them battered before they finally made their way back to camp some 12 hours later.

Of how a rancher, infuriated because of a survey that lopped off some of his land, had drawn a gun and nearly killed Dad.

Dad never told tall tales. But there was one I found hard to believe: how he and a friend of his had come out of months in the mountains in 1915—"in great physical condition"—and, decided to try their hand at bowling in an alley in Boise. And how in this, his first try at the game, my Dad picked out a small ball (he was a wiry, 5 foot 2 inches, 125 pounds, at the time) and bowled a near-perfect 300 score.

Fifteen years ago he came to visit us in Winnetka, Ill. My boy, who was a pretty fair bowler, himself, had heard about Gramps' accomplishment and wanted to see what the elderly gentleman could do at the game. My Dad was willing. He took off his suit coat, untied his tie, removed his shoes.

Then in his stocking feet and with everyone at the community center alleys watching, this little old man let fly with a ball that rolled slowly, slowly, down the boards. Almost dying before it got to the pins, it finally hit. Strike! Then, once again, Dad took careful aim and blew the pins down with a ball that almost quit, but not quite. My boy was beaming, as was our whole family. Gramps had done it. He then said he had had enough. He never bowled again.

Dad was city engineer of Boise at the turn of the century. He and Sen. William Borah had been friends when Borah was just getting a start as a young attorney. Borah was the big man in my Dad's life. Like many Westerners Dad liked Borah's support of "free silver." To both of them the gold standard meant the hated Eastern establishment.

My Dad's own idea of politics was debating the issues. He was a rugged individualist, somewhat unpredictable in his party preferences. He voted for Wilson, disliked Roosevelt—FDR, that is. He liked Teddy.

For some 30 years my Dad was county surveyor of Champaign County, Ill., right around here. He was on the ballot and had to stand for office along with all the other county officers, together with the governor and the president, every four years.

In the 1932 landslide victory of Roosevelt, this "normally" Republican county went Democratic for the first time in the memory of man. It went Democratic, that is, except for Dad. He bucked the Roosevelt tide and won by 14 votes.

In a political year my Dad would tour the county, sharing the platform in township after township with other office seekers, including those who were after seats in the state Legislature.

Those were the days when "silver-tongued oratory" was still the fashion. In those days politics was largely a show. People came out for the "speaking," not the substance.

And then my little Dad would come out and, very quietly, tell the people that he would bring accuracy and integrity to whatever surveying services he would perform for them. And then he would sit down. I was always a little disappointed.

Four years ago the old-timer was visiting Washington and, among other people he was seeing, he was calling on Vice-President Humphrey. The two men "hit it off" well right from the start. "May I call you Dad?" asked Mr. Humphrey. "Can I call you Herbert?" Dad responded. And then, agreed on this familiarity, the Vice-President showed his new friend all around his spacious Capitol office, filled with pictures and memorabilia of famous Americans.

Before long the office was packed with workers from nearby offices, attracted to this scene of a particularly keen, little old man who was swapping stories and historical references with a Vice-President who quite obviously was enjoying himself hugely.

At one point Dad said: "Why would you waste your time with an old man like me?" "Don't give me that," said the Vice-President, smiling broadly. "I see those bright little eyes of yours—you are putting me on." Then they both laughed.

At the end, we paused at the door and Mr. Humphrey talked about his own father and how he "would give my right arm" to have him alive and with him today. "You know," he said, "I grew up debating the national issues with my Dad." "That's what we did, too," Dad said, pointing to me.

Then, as we turned to leave the office, the Vice-President raised his voice and said, "Well, Dad, go charging into your second century."

"I'll be back in five years," Dad said, as he walked out the door. And you can be sure that he will.

FTC URGED TO WITHHOLD ACTION AGAINST CEREAL MANUFACTURERS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year the Federal Trade Commission announced the issuance of a proposed complaint and proposed order charging that four ready-to-eat cereal firms, the Kellogg Co. of Battle Creek, Mich.; General Mills, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn.; General Foods Corp. of White Plains, N.Y.; and the Quaker Oats Co. of Chicago, Ill., had established and maintained a noncompetitive market structure and shared monopoly power for over 30 years through proliferation of brands and trademark promotion; through artificial differentiation of products; through unfair methods of advertising and promotion; through restrictive retail shelf space control programs; and through acquisitions of competitors.

In its proposed order, the Commission signified that it might order such relief as was supported by an adjudicative record and which was necessary and appropriate, including:

First. Divestiture of assets, including plants and other facilities, for the formation of new corporate entities to engage in the manufacture, distribution, and sale;

Second. Licensing of existing brands or trademarks and future brands or trademarks on a royalty-free basis for a specified period of time;

Third. Prohibition of acquisitions of stock or assets of firms engaged in the business of manufacturing or selling RTE cereals for a specified period of time;

Fourth. Prohibition of any practices found to be anticompetitive, including but not limited to shelf space services or use of particular methods of selling or advertising, and other provisions appropriate to correct or remedy the effects of such anticompetitive practices;

Fifth. Periodic review of the provisions of any order that may be entered.

Public attention was focused upon this action by the FTC when certain members of the media reported about the existence of a staff report indicating quite accurately the nature of the proposed complaint and the proposed relief which was ultimately incorporated into the proposed order. This information about the staff report apparently had been leaked to the media even in advance of any consideration of such staff report by the members of the Federal Trade Commission.

I was quite disturbed by the fact that this information had been leaked to the media since the public reaction to same as it was reflected to me indicated that the public felt the firms to be cited had engaged in conduct of a degree of culpability which I felt I would not be established when all of the facts were in.

My subsequent review of the proposed complaint and proposed order confirmed my suspicions and when my contacts with members of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission failed to produce the kind of results I felt were required under the circumstances, I decided direct communication with the members of the Federal Trade Commission was my only appropriate course of action. Therefore, on March 1, 1972, I wrote to each member of the Federal Trade Commission explaining my position on the matter and requesting that the Commission members reexamine their thinking before proceeding to formalize the proposed complaint and proposed order.

Since this matter has ramifications far beyond the immediate firms involved and since I feel the media has inadvertently emphasized only the FTC's side of the argument, I wanted to apprise my colleagues of my activity in this matter and, hopefully, prompt some interest in assuring fair and objective treatment of the firms involved by the FTC, my especial interest, of course, being the Kellogg Co., a constituent firm. All of the foregoing is better set forth in a press release issued at the time I wrote to the Commissioners, which press release incorporates a copy of such letters. The press release reads as follows:

FTC URGED TO WITHHOLD FORMAL ACTION AGAINST KELLOGG AND OTHER READY-TO-EAT CEREAL MANUFACTURERS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Congressman Garry Brown (R-Mich.) today announced he has written to each member of the Federal Trade Commission [FTC] requesting that the Commission not proceed to formal complaint against a constituent firm, the Kellogg Company of Battle Creek, Michigan, in accordance with the proposed complaint and pro-

posed order which was issued by the FTC on January 24, 1972.

The previously issued proposed complaint alleged certain unfair and improper practices which have resulted in maintenance of a highly concentrated and noncompetitive market structure in the production and sale of ready-to-eat cereals, and the proposed order, among other things, called for a breakup of the Kellogg Company, divestiture of assets, and licensing of brands or trademarks on a royalty-free basis. It is expected formal Commission action is imminent.

In his letter to the FTC, Brown pointed out that his objection to the FTC action was not that the FTC was investigating and considering remedial proceedings against the Kellogg Company and other ready-to-eat cereal manufacturers, if such proceedings can be justified but rather, that the proposed complaint and proposed order made allegations and intended corporate structure action which was not justified by the facts and circumstances applicable to Kellogg and the industry.

In announcing his contacting of the Commission, Brown said:

"Although I have still been denied access to the staff report upon which the Commission's proposed action is based, the information which I have been able to develop regarding this matter confirms the fears I expressed back in December of last year when I first learned of the 'staff report' through leaks to the media about its existence."

At that time, I said:

"Frankly, I am very disturbed that information about the staff report was leaked to the media before it was even formally considered by the FTC. A leak of this nature prompts disproportionate and improper suspicion about such a report and prejudices a fair and objective consideration of the matter by the Commission . . . I will find it extremely disturbing if it develops that this staff report was prepared by an over-zealous staffer, or staffers, who felt leakage of the matter to the media would prompt attention and imply a degree of culpability unjustified and unwarranted by the facts, and in this way make affirmative action by the Commissioners, from a public relations standpoint, almost mandatory."

In his letter to the Commission members, Brown contended that the staff of the FTC appeared to be ambivalent with respect to the origin and underlying rationale of the proceedings being taken by the FTC against Kellogg and other ready-to-eat cereal manufacturers and that this ambivalence had promoted him to contact the Commissioners directly rather than pursue the matter further at a staff level.

Contending that the proposed complaint and proposed order went far beyond that which the facts and circumstances justified or the situation required, Brown said:

"Even any reasonable extrapolation of the substantive allegations in the complaint provides no foundation for the structural and licensing remedies incorporated in the proposed order since all of the allegations in the complaint can be remedied and corrected, if the facts justify, through exercise by the Commission of its authority to correct 'behavioral' misconduct by the offending companies."

In his letter, Brown argued that the several allegations of the proposed complaint really constituted only one basic allegation, that being, that the Kellogg Company and the other ready-to-eat cereal manufacturers have been engaging in unfair and deceptive advertising.

"Somewhat simplified, the proposed complaint makes substantive allegations of proliferation of brands and trademark promotion; artificial differentiation of products; unfair methods of competition in advertising and product promotion; and, restrictive retail shelf-space control programs.

"I submit that the complaint itself is a masterpiece of 'artificial differentiation' of allegations.

"However one views the practices or results upon which each allegation is based, it becomes apparent that each such practice or result has as its only basis for success of efficacy a behavioral matter: advertising!

"There can be no effective proliferation of brands and trademark promotion; there can be no successful artificial differentiation of products; and, there can be no unfair methods of competition and product promotion in advertising—unless there is advertising! As I understand the law, it is totally within the authority of the Federal Trade Commission, and heretofore has been more properly its role, to control, regulate, even prohibit, through cease and desist orders, those practices found to be unfair or deceptive. Resort to an unwarranted and very possibly unauthorized, action such as the structural and licensing remedies contemplated by the proposed order is unnecessary at best," Brown said.

In his letter, Brown suggested that two of the Commissioners may very well have shared his doubts about the justification for the proposed complaint and proposed order when they failed to concur in the issuance of the complaint and order. The Commission was split 3–2 regarding such action.

Brown further questioned the authority of the Commission to proceed in the manner it intends as such action has been defined in the proposed complaint and proposed order, saying:

"Congress never intended the use of formal complaint and order proceedings against anything other than identifiable and provable behavior or misbehavior. I don't think it was an accident that the statute, granting but necessarily limiting the Commission's authority, uses the words 'methods', 'acts', and 'practices'. As pointed out above, if there is anything in the conduct of their business by the cereal companies which calls for correction under the law, I would fully support your action against them as the facts may warrant. But, I am unable to understand the posture of the Commission as it is reflected in the complaint and proposed order which assumes a basis in law and Congressional intent to reorganize corporate structures through divestiture and royalty-free licensing of the cereal industry or any other industry simply on the basis of the allegations contained in the proposed complaint."

In his letter to the Commission, Brown concluded:

". . . I urge you to reject proceeding formally on the complaint as *presently proposed*, particularly as it relates to the industry structure and royalty-free licensing provisions of the proposed order. If there is to be formalization of this proceeding, there should be stricken these references in both the complaint and the proposed order."

In announcing his intercession on behalf of the Kellogg Company with the Federal Trade Commission, Brown reiterated his belief that the consumer public has a right to know about the products it purchases and to be protected against any anticompetitive conditions which may exist and which may permit some to prosper unreasonably at the consumer's expense, but that the business community should not be required to be subjected to unwarranted and unjustified harrassment by government and the regulatory authorities, especially when that harrassment seems to have as its basis only the success of the business itself.

Brown's letter to the Commissioners follows:

FEBRUARY 29, 1972.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you and each of the other members of the Federal Trade Commission since the proposed complaint against the Kellogg Company of Battle Creek, Michigan, a constituent firm, has had an extremely disturbing effect upon not only the Company, but its employees and the community itself; and, my contacts with staff members of the Commission have failed to satisfy my interest, concern, and desire for greater edification regarding the pending proceeding.

My dissatisfaction with my contacts and discussion of this matter with staff personnel stems not from any apparent lack of desire on their part to be reasonably cooperative, but rather from what appears to me to be an unyielding commitment to a conclusion reached when the rationale therefor as expressed by various staff personnel appears to be ambivalent. Let me provide an example.

When this matter first came to my attention due to the "leak" of the existence of the staff report, I sought explanation thereof from Mr. Alan Ward, Director, Bureau of Competition, who in turn referred me to your General Counsel, Mr. Ronald M. Dietrich, with whom I had a rather extensive discussion. In this discussion, I requested that I be provided with a background paper on the origin of the study of the ready-to-eat cereal industry as well as a resume of any similar actions heretofore undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission in which only a segment of an industry had been singled out for Commission investigation and action.

Pursuant to this request, I have been provided with a memo entitled, "Background of Breakfast Cereal Case" which, among other things, states that following a preliminary study performed by the Commission's Bureau of Economics, the staff was ordered by the Commission to undertake a more detailed investigation and the basis for such investigation was discussed in the Commission's proposed budget for Fiscal 1972. A portion of this discussion was incorporated in the material submitted to me relative to the origin of the study and in it appears the following:

"The breakfast cereal study provided a better understanding of the sources of high profits in a concentrated industry and the manner in which barriers to entry can be maintained through advertising. As a *pilot project* it provided experience which will be useful for study of major concentrated industries of a more complex nature, such as automobiles and steel." (Emphasis added.)

Despite this specific reference to the unique nature of the investigation and action as expressly stated by the Commission memo, an article in the *Wall Street Journal* of February 18, 1972 headlined, "FTC Aid Denies Move Against Cereal Makers Means More Attacks" reported that Mr. Lawrence G. Mayer, FTC Director of Policy Planning and Evaluation, had:

"... denied that the agency's proposed antitrust action against the Nation's four largest breakfast cereal makers is the 'door opener' for an attack against all concentrated industries."

This statement, viewed in the context of the staff's memo, leads me to only one conclusion, that being, that there is substantial lack of agreement at a staff level at least with respect to the underlying thrust of the present proceedings. This ambivalence is substantiated by discussions I have had with staff members and was reflected at the press conference held at the time of the issuance of the proposed complaint.

Without placing any great significance upon this ambivalence except to explain my writing to each member of the Commission rather than continue my pursuit of the matter at a staff level, let me proceed to further identify my concern about and objections to the pending action.

Although I have been away from the practice of law for some time now and never considered myself an expert, or even much of a practitioner, before administrative tribunals, examination of the complaint and the substance set forth therein as a basis for

the structural and licensing remedies advocated in the proposed order leaves me cold. Even any reasonable extrapolation of the substantive allegations in the complaint provides no foundation for the structural and licensing remedies incorporated in the proposed order since all of the allegations in the complaint can be remedied and corrected, if the facts justify, through exercise by the Commission of its authority to correct "behavioral" misconduct by the offending companies.

Somewhat simplified, the proposed complaint makes substantive allegations of proliferation of brands and trademark promotion; artificial differentiation of products; unfair methods of competition in advertising and product promotion; and, restrictive retail shelf-space control programs.

I submit that complaint itself is a masterpiece of "artificial differentiation" of allegations.

However one views the practices or results upon which each allegation is based, it becomes apparent that each such practice or result has as its only basis for success or efficacy a behavioral matter: advertising.

There can be no effective proliferation of brands and trademark promotion; there can be no successful artificial differentiation of products; and, there can be no unfair methods of competition and product promotion in advertising—unless there is advertising. As I understand the law, it is totally within the authority of the Federal Trade Commission, and heretofore has been more properly its role, to control, regulate, even prohiibt, through cease and desist orders, those practices found to be unfair or deceptive. Resort to an unwarranted, and very possibly unauthorized, action such as the structural and licensing remedies contemplated by the proposed order is unnecessary at best.

Even the concern of the Commission, as that concern is expressed in the proposed complaint, relative to "restrictive" retail shelf-space control programs comes under and is equally subject to the above critique. If your staff has done an objective study of the allocation of shelf space in retail establishments, it has reported to you that shelf space is allocated according to sales volume; there is no specific allocation precedent to stocking of products except as is justified on this basis of sales. It is my understanding that whenever assistance is provided by, for instance the Kellogg Company to a retailer in computing the allocation of shelf space, it is done on the basis of sales volume information supplied by the retailer. Whether or not the retailer accepts the shelf-space allocation program recommended to him is within the retailer's total discretion, and he may make modifications before installing the program. Since such allocations are made on the basis of sales volume, it is putting the cart before the horse to claim that depending upon shelf space allocated, sales will result in proportion thereto. Rather, again, advertising may create the interest in products which results in sales, and the extent of the volume of sales determines the extent of the allocation of shelf space.

Not only does the "cart before the horse" cliche apply to the shelf-space question, but I respectfully suggest that it applies to the whole argument set forth in the complaint and the proposed order insofar as they relate to structural and licensing remedial action. It would appear to me that by some mental acrobatics, advertising, the energy and motivating force—the horse—has somehow become the cart to an animated, energetic, powerful force—company structure! I can't believe the members of the Federal Trade Commission are ready to engage in such gymnastics.

I suggest Commissioner MacIntyre and Commissioner Dennison may have shared this doubt when they failed to concur in the issuance of the proposed complaint. Possibly a "concentrated industries" case may be made out wherein corporate or organizational structure plays a sufficient role to justify a structural attack, but I again respectfully submit it is not in the ready-to-eat cereal industry or in the Kellogg Company.

Before concluding, I would like to raise a further question which remains unanswered in my mind. It seems apparent to me that however broad a view one might take of the Commission's mission and authority, Congress never intended the use of formal complaint and order proceedings against anything other than identifiable and provable behavior or misbehavior. I don't think it was an accident that the stature, granting but necessarily limiting the Commission's authority, uses the words "methods", "acts", and "practices." As pointed out above if there is anything in the conduct of their business by the cereal companies which calls for correction under the law, I would fully support your action against them as the facts may warrant. But, I am unable to understand the posture of the Commission as it is reflected in the complaint and proposed order which assumes a basis in law and Congressional intent to reorganize corporate structures through divestiture and royalty-free licensing of the cereal industry or any other industry simply on the basis of the allegations contained in the proposed complaint.

I do not believe that such action by the Commission was intended by the Congress in its establishment of the agency or has ever been contemplated by the Congress in its continuing review of appropriations for the agency. The fact that little support has been found in the Congress for a bill which has been introduced calling for nondiscriminatory action against "concentrated industries," seems to tell me, and I hope you, that there is little Congressional support for that which the Commission is attempting, not in even a nondiscriminatory way, but in a selective, even possibly an arbitrary and capricious, way.

In conclusion, I am told that under your rules the release by the Commission of a proposed complaint does not necessarily mean that each of you, or even a majority, has decided to formally proceed on the basis of the complaint released. It has been suggested that this may be particularly true where the Commission does not appear to have reached any agreement on what relief might be appropriate even if all the allegations of the complaint were sustained. Trusting this is true, I urge you to reject proceeding formally on the complaint as *presently proposed*, particularly as it relates to the industrial structure and royalty-free licensing provisions of the proposed order. If there is to be formalization of this proceeding, there should be stricken these references in both the complaint and the proposed order.

I apologize for the length and argumentativeness of this letter but knew of no other way to bring to your personal attention the sincere and serious concern I feel. I would much appreciate an opportunity to meet with you so that we might discuss firsthand any misunderstanding or misconception I may be laboring under relative to this matter. Pending the granting of an opportunity for such a discussion, I would greatly appreciate your sincere and careful consideration of the matter I have set forth herein.

With best regards,

Respectfully,

GARRY BROWN.

P.S. Although "the law does not require one to do a useless thing," I would again suggest that my access to a copy of the "staff report" might improve my understanding of at least the staff's view of the basis for the action . . . receipt would be appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the concern I have expressed about the action of the FTC in the ready-to-eat cereal industry matter, others have voiced similar concern. One of the more in-depth, probing discussions I have seen touching upon this broad area is a speech given in Detroit in February of this year by Yale Brozen, professor of business economics at the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago. Although his speech is more directed at the FTC's attack on advertising, it is relevant since it provides a good factual representation and critique of the FTC's charges about advertising in the ready-to-eat cereal industry. I think there are many of my colleagues who would be interested in what he has had to say and so I have excerpted those of his remarks which have direct relevance to the FTC-cereal industry controversy; they follow:

DETROIT SPEECH BY PROF. YALE BROZEN

The FTC is now calling on advertisers, industry by industry, to file with it documentary proof of all claims. Perhaps the FTC should be forced to substantiate its claims before issuing press releases which greatly mislead consumers. I have already told you about the misleading claims it made about Zerex advertising. It has also made misleading claims about its own virtues in asking for appropriations from Congress.

When the FTC made appropriation requests to Congress for fiscal 1971 and for fiscal 1972 it released a barrage of publicity about how it could reduce the price of ready-to-eat cereals by 25% by its efforts if it obtained the appropriations it requested. It told the news media that advertising by the industry cost 20% of retail sales (see memorandum of Rufus E. Wilson, dated May 15, 1969). In its budget justification material sent to Congress, it was a bit more discreet, claiming that "advertising expenditures as a percent of sales increased from 4.6% in 1954 to 18.3% in 1966." (Hearings, pt. 6 at 134, 1971). If the Federal Trade Commission staff had bothered to check the data instead of guessing, they would have found that advertising expenditures for cereals had declined from 11.3% in 1954 to 10.9% in 1970. They would have found that they never exceeded 15.1% in the entire period from 1954 to 1970 much less rising to a high of 18.3% or 20% as claimed. The Federal Trade Commission would be hard put to it to substantiate the claims it has made to Congress and to the public.

Further, their statement that the retail price of cereals would be or could be 25% less without advertising cannot be substantiated. One member of the Federal Trade Commission staff told the UPI that "If the cereal business became more competitive, say like the produce section of grocery stores, the consumer might save 25% or at least 15%." (Detroit Free Press, June 21, 1971). According to this FTC staff member, retail markups on cereal are high because manufacturers, with all their advertising clout, suggest retail prices to grocers giving the grocer a markup of 20%.

All I can say is that this is a remarkable display of ignorance which no one could possibly substantiate—not even the FTC. The facts are that the average retail margin on cereals is 14.1% (Chain Store Age, July, 1971, p. 62), not 20%. Second, if the cereals carried the kind of markups that prevail in the produce section of groceries, the price would have to go up. The average margin on produce is twice that on cereals—31.0% on produce versus 14.1% on cereals.

Third, if cereals were not advertised, they would be more costly to produce and would carry higher mark-ups—not lower margins at retail—contrary to the FTC's contentions. Ready-to-eat cereals had marked seasonal swings in their consumption prior to the

advent of television advertising. December–January consumption rates were little more than half June–July consumption (12.7% of annual consumption in December–January, 21.0% in June–July 1940). With the advent of television advertising, December–January consumption is now only 16% below June–July consumption instead of 40% below. The saving in costs resulting from the smoothing of the consumption pattern by advertising has contributed to keeping the price of cereals low.

Fourth, if cereals were not advertised, the distribution and selling costs to manufacturers would be much higher. Cookie and cracker companies averaged only 2.2% of sales spent on advertising in 1964 in contrast to 14.9% spent by cereal companies. (National Commission on Food Marketing, p. 147). Did this reduce the wholesale cost of cookies and crackers as compared to cereals? The National Commission on Food Marketing found that it did not. In the absence of advertising, cookie companies were forced to spend 19.7% of sales on other selling and physical distribution costs while cereal companies spent only 7.7% of sales on these costs.

Cookie companies provide door-to-door delivery service, check shelves for out-of-stock items, and help stock store shelves. Cereal companies have found that the increased consumer demand resulting from advertising has caused retailers to carry fuller lines and to correct their "out-of-stocks" themselves. This made it possible for cereal companies to eliminate personal selling and panel truck service to store door, which had been common to the industry prior to 1950, with a considerable saving in cost. Advertising in the cereal industry has been a means enabling the cereal companies to economize on other costs—not simply an addition to cost which was passed on to the buyer.

Selling, other marketing, and distribution costs for cereals prior to 1940 average 35% of sales. With the rise of advertising in the cereal industry, marketing, delivery, and other distribution costs dropped to 25% of sales in the 1960's. The FTC should be praising the cereal industry for its successful use of advertising to cut costs instead of condemning it for its use of advertising.

The FTC also charges the cereal companies with using advertising to bar would-be competitors from the market and thereby monopolize the market. The FTC says that advertising is a barrier to entry by firms new to the market and by new products. This could hardly be more completely at variance with the truth. This claim cannot be substantiated. What can be substantiated is the opposite of this claim.

Advertising is a means of entry—not a barrier to entry. Advertising is a means of competing—not a method of monopolizing. Monopolists don't advertise. Competitors advertise. Where, for example, a single company is granted the franchise to supply both gas and electricity to a town, promotion and advertising expenditures are less than half the level they are when two different companies hold the franchise to supply gas and electricity (Paul S. Brandon, "The Electric Side of Combination Gas-Electric Utilities," The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science, 1971) and compete with each other. If there were truly monopoly (or oligopoly) in the cereal industry, advertising expenditures would be much lower than they are. If there were "shared monopoly" as the FTC claims, one of the first things the monopolists would do would be to cut costs and increase profits by agreement to reduce advertising. That is what American Tobacco did in the nineteenth century after merging 95% of the capacity in the industry. The level of advertising in cereals indicates vigorous competition. Comes the FTC claiming, with its twisted "logic" and no substantiation, that the level of advertising is evidence of monopoly.

If advertising were a barrier to entry, we would expect low product turnover in industries with high levels of advertising. What we find is exactly opposite (Lester Telser, "Advertising and Competition," Journal of Political Economy, 1964). The more intense the level of advertising, the higher the rate of product turnover.

Advertising is used as a means of informing potential customers of the appearance of a new product. It is used as a means for entering a market—not as a means for barring entry, the FTC to the contrary notwithstanding. It is new products which are heavily advertised, not old products The *cereal industry has heavy advertising outlays* because it has been introducing new products. If it were not an innovative industry, its advertising outlays would be less. But the FTC says the cereal industry is not innovative. I would like to see their substantiation of that claim. . . ."

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my initial statement on this matter, there is a need for governmental assistance in the area of consumer protection, but our efforts in this regard will be counter-productive if we let our regulatory enthusiasm prejudice the potential for consumer choice, which is so essential to the welfare of the consumer.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO AID MIA FAMILIES

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two bills to aid the families of servicemen who are missing in action. There are approximately 60 servicemen who were missing before the special insurance policy for Vietnam, the servicemen's group life insurance, was approved and went into effect on September 29, 1965. Even though the monthly insurance premium continues to be deducted from the servicemen's regular pay, the families will not be eligible for the benefits should the GI be determined to have died during the period the insurance program was not in effect.

One of these bills, H.R. 13990, would extend the life insurance program to members of the Armed Forces in missing status. Any serviceman who was officially declared missing before September 29, 1965, and after February 28, 1961, and is declared dead prior to September 29, 1965, shall be considered for insurance purposes to have died on September 30, 1965.

The second bill, H.R. 13988, would authorize the payment of a death gratuity to the survivors of members of the Armed Forces who have been in a missing-in-action status and subsequently determined to have died during a period when no Government life insurance program was in effect.

The families of the POW's/MIA's live under a difficult emotional strain without this added legal burden. I hope that Congress will act soon to solve one of the problems of these families.

RHODESIAN CHROME ORE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, section 503 of the Defense Procurement Act of 1972, enables U.S. importers to break the United Nations-imposed sanctions against the oppressive Smith regime in Rhodesia. The supporters of that section contended that its adoption was in our "national interest." However many of us felt the amendment was designed to permit privately owned U.S. companies to protect their investment in Rhodesian chrome. There is no strategic need for Rhodesia chrome.

An excellent piece of investigative reporting appeared Sunday, March 19, 1972, in the Washington Post. Mr. Bruce Oudes traces the development of section 503 and identifies those who played a role in its promotion. Although the Department of State opposed the amendment, Mr. Oudes points out that the White House did nothing to prevent its passage. He indicates that certain members of the administration were in favor of breaking the sanctions and cooperated with the companies involved to accomplish that end.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious charges. To break an international treaty for national security purposes is a grave move. To do so is the interest of a handful of private companies is inexcusable.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I chair, will reopen its hearings on the subject of sanctions in the near future.

The material follows:

RHODESIA ORE: HERE'S TO THEE, OH "CLUB 503"

(By Bruce Oudes)

"We love the people we are with, And raise a glass for Ian Smith . . ."

The words of the song rang out time and again through the holiday season and into the new year, not in Southern Rhodesia where Ian Smith is the prime minister of the white minority government, but here in Washington. Representatives of American industry and Rhodesian diplomats emptied their glasses to mark victory in a 6-year campaign to get the United States to violate the so-called "mandatory" economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

Those sanctions are being violated this week with the arrival in the United States of the first shipload of Rhodesian chrome ore. This makes this country the third U.N. member officially to sidestep the ban; South Africa and Portugal are the other two.

The alliance of Foote Mineral Co. of Exton, Pa., and Union Carbide with Rhodesia's white government extends well beyond the minimum necessary to protect their long-standing investment in that chrome-rich country. The two firms openly acknowledge they have been opposed to the U.N. sanctions from the start. Union Carbide actively worked to undermine it as early as 1966.

The Rhodesia-U.S. corporate clique informally is known as the "503 Club" commemorating the relevant section of the Military Procurement Act of 1971 allowing U.S. firms to import Rhodesian chrome, copper, asbestos, manganese, nickel, and dozens of other commodities, seemingly because of an overriding "national security" requirement.

However, as a knowledgeable Union Carbide source privately concedes, the "strategic" label was simply camouflage to get Congress to authorize U.S. firms to break the U.N. regulations.

An excellent description of the alliance linking white Rhodesia, conservative congressmen, Union Carbide and Foote Mineral is in their victory song, "The Absolutely Tentatively Provisional Official Marching Song of 'The 503 Club.'" To the tune of "O Tannenbaum," the song roasts liberal Democrats and the State Department, but not the White House, which has remained silent on the sanctions question.

"MANY FINGERS IN THE PIE"

According to Margaret Cox-Sullivan, a Union Carbide consultant who is "blow(n) a kiss" in the lyrics, "a lot of people got their fingers in the pie" writing it. The song project was a topic of conversation at a party marking the sixth anniversary of Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence at the International Club given by the Rhodesia Information Service, the Smith government's unofficial embassy here, on Nov. 11.

The ditty made its official debut at a Christmas party given by the RIS at its offices at 2852 McGill Terrace, NW, and since has been aired at numerous private affairs.

The song cites L. G. "Tony" Bliss, Foote's chairman of the board; John Donahey, Foote's public relations specialist; E. F. "Andy" Andrews of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, another warm supporter of "503"; Margaret Cox-Sullivan ("Margaret S."); commentator Fulton Lewis III, who has just visited Rhodesia a second time; and Kenneth Towsey ("Kenneth T."), RIS director, and his associate, John Hooper, among others. Bliss, Donahey and Union Carbide's Washington representative, Jerry Kenney, were among those present for the debut, Mrs. Cox-Sullivan said.

Sen. Howard Cannon (D-Nev.) is "a hit" in the song, presumably because of his support for "503" as well as his blocking a routine administration bill that would have released excess chrome from the national stockpile. David Newsom, assistant secretary of state for African affairs, is named among the clique's foes.

The complicated story culminating in the deft use of corporate muscle in Washington started almost half a century ago, Rhodesia, then a British territory, was discovered to have high-grade chrome ore. As American investment flowed in, it turned out that except possibly for the Soviet Union, Rhodesia had the world's largest known reserves of the premium ore.

This, however, had little meaning in political terms until Rhodesia's white-minority government declared its independence of British constitutional harassment in November, 1965, a move designed to stifle the black majority's demands for political power. Rhodesia's 5 million blacks outnumber whites in an ever widening 20-to-1 ratio. Britain's Labor government, fearful that its troops might mutiny if ordered to quell a rebellion by Rhodesia's "kith and kin" government, announced six months before the event that it would not use force to bring down and eventual white Rhodesian "uprising."

A COMPROMISE

Instead, Prime Minister Harold Wilson—under the pressure of world opinion—chose a compromise strategy of asking the United Nations to impose economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The last time a world organization attempted such a step was in 1936, when the League of Nations tried to quarantine Italy for invading Ethiopia. Thus far, the U.N.'s Rhodesia sanctions have been about as sieve-like as the League's.

The Johnson administration, rejecting suggestions that it urge Britain to use force to bring down the Smith regime, went along with Wilson. But when it became apparent that the majority of the world's industrial nations were secretly going to continue trading with Rhodesia, the United States decided that it would not vigorously protest, either publicly or privately, the violations.

According to a knowledgeable State Department official, Union Carbide began to undermine the sanctions in 1966 while the sanctions screws were not yet fully tightened. It hastily transferred dollars to its Rhodesian subsidiary to "pay" for 150,000 tons of chrome ore that had not yet left the quarantined country. This later became the basis for its claim that it should be granted an exception to permit import of the 150,000 tons. The Johnson administration, well aware of the ploy, rejected the claim, but the Nixon administration granted it in September, 1970, after extensive Union Carbide lobbying.

POWERFUL ARGUMENT

Meanwhile, Foote, which had not been that astute in 1966, began to think in terms of a permanent, legislated exemption from the sanctions. Rep. James Collins (D-Tex.) and Sen. Harry Byrd Jr. (Ind-Va.) introduced legislation a year ago which said that the President could not ban the importation of a strategic commodity from a "free world" country so long as it was being imported from a Communist country. In 1965, the United States imported about a third of its high-grade chrome from the Soviet Union. Since the sanctions, the Soviets have furnished more than half of U.S. high-grade chrome imports. Given the size of the U.S. stockpile and the relatively modest chrome needed for defense purposes, experts scoff at the thought that the Soviets could bring the United States to its knees by stopping chrome exports. But this was a powerful argument.

Union Carbide quickly associated itself with Foote's effort, and both testified before House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee hearings last summer in favor of the bill. Although they complained strenuously about sanctions violations by other nations, nowhere in the two firms' testimony did they suggest the United States begin blowing the whistle on violators—a step that would have made life rougher for the white-minority government but more equitable for the world's chrome users in sharing the burden of the loss of Rhodesian ore.

Instead they were foursquare against sanctions. Foote chairman Bliss told the Senate committee July 8: "The position of the Foote Mineral Company, and, I think the rest of the producers in the United States, is this: That it would be total chaos if indeed the sanctions or the embargo would be effective against Rhodesia, because that would eliminate their input into world markets and throw us all into the marketplace in Russia and Turkey, and I am exceedingly doubtful, as the statistics disclose, that those source materials would be adequate to take care of world demand." A Union Carbide spokesman said that accurately reflects his company's position.

Andrews of Allegheny Ludlum, who testified in favor of the legislation as chairman of the critical materials committee of the Iron and Steel Institute, took the same position in a telephone interview. "I opposed the embargo the day it went on for business reasons," he said. "The social and political aspects (of sanctions) have been overemphasized to the detriment of the economic aspects." Andrews said he visited Rhodesia in early 1970 and attended the Nov. 11 Rhodesian victory party. But he denied knowledge of the song, in which he is hailed as being "true blue."

BYRD AMENDMENT

When the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs committees blocked the legislation, by now known as the "Byrd Amendment," Sen. Byrd took it to the sympathetic Senate Armed Services Committee, which reported it as section 503 of the Military Procurement Act. When it reached the Senate floor in a series of roll calls Sept. 23, 30 and Oct. 6 the White House remained silent—as it had before and has since.

A White House aide maintains that it was preoccupied with other elements of the President's legislative program. But other sources suggest that corporate influence had carried the day in a fluid situation in which Henry Kissinger, the national security adviser, preferred not to focus on something as remote as Rhodesia.

One former White House staff member says that of the President's aides, speech writer Pat Buchanan was particularly receptive to Union Carbide's plight. Last week Buchanan said, "I was sort of involved two or three years ago, but I haven't been involved since."

A former Senate committee staff member said that now-Deputy Defense Secretary Kenneth Rush supported Union Carbide's case in private conversation in 1970 while in Bonn as U.S. ambassador. Rush, a Duke professor when the President was a student there, left the presidency of Union Carbide to join the administration.

In the Senate, Byrd stressed that the measure would effect only chrome. However, the administration more recently has allowed the import of some 72 products from Rhodesia, excluding tobacco, a major Rhodesian export but not a "strategic" one. That dividing line serves the interest of Virginia tobacco growers, who have prospered through the elimination of Rhodesian competition.

The Byrd amendment passed its last Senate test Oct. 6 with the assistance of key switches by Sens. William Roth (R.-Del.) and Lee Metcalf (D.-Mont.). Metcalf's office said later his switch was due to pressure from unspecified "Montana chrome-mining interests." The measure sailed through the House, 251 to 100, on Nov. 10.

While the corporations involved, the Rhodesians, and apparently the White House seem to share an unusual private coziness that has influenced U.S. Rhodesia policy during the present administration, it is only rarely that a candid remark seeps into the public record.

One such comment was made by John Moxon, who since then had retired as president of Carpenter Technology Corp. of Reading, Pa., before the House subcommittee last June. Moxon followed Andrews to the witness stand to testify as a consumer of chrome. The only thing he said he wanted to add to his carefully worded written statement was, "We also have in the back of our minds the apprehension that the same people that are upset about Rhodesia will become equally upset about South Africa and then we are in a mess . . ." He quickly added that he is "not in sympathy with an apartheid or any of these things." He called U.S. participation in the U.N. sanctions "a short-sighted decision."

One U.S. official who closely follows the influence of Foote and Union Carbide in American Rhodesia policy is philosophical. He notes that their mining subsidiaries in Rhodesia are still producing chrome which in turn is earning vital foreign exchange for the Smith government. "They've got a lot in common," he said thinking of Foote, Carbide, and Rhodesia. "You just don't work that closely together without getting involved."

MOVING FORWARD

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago the people of Vicksburg and the State of Mississippi dedicated the beginning of a great industrial park and port facility that had long been a dream to return that city to a position of importance as a river port. This past week an addition was dedicated to this facility adding greatly to its importance.

And today we have a harbor industrial park and port at Vicksburg that serves not only as an important contribution to the economy of the city and State but also serves as a vital link for Mississippi products to the rest of the world.

In the past year alone the port of Vicksburg showed the largest percentage increase in tonnage of any port on the Mississippi River. With the addition to this new facility, the cargo capacity will be doubled.

I would like to include here in my remarks an editorial from the Vicksburg Evening Post noting the rapid development of this fine facility, and to commend those whose efforts helped bring about this development.

The editorial follows:

[From the Vicksburg Evening Post, Mar. 2 1972]

MOVING FORWARD

Back in the 1940s, a Chamber of Commerce committee was appointed to investigate the means to be taken to bring Vicksburg, once more, to a position of prominence as a river port. Known as the Vicksburg-Yazoo Project, this work was pursued by subsequent committees, until it began to bear fruit and an appropriation was made by the Congress through which the Corps of Engineers transformed waste and marsh land north of the city into a most attractive industrial park. The feat was accomplished by dredging the Yazoo and making the fill above flood stage.

With a fine industrial park of almost 250 acres, another part of the project was the erection of a terminal, and this resulted in one of the most modern terminals on the river.

On a cold day in February, 1961, the new facility was formally dedicated, with the hopes for steady progress expressed by all who had any part in the ceremonies.

Even the most optimistic could not have foreseen the rapid development of the park, and its growing importance to Vicksburg. Eleven years after dedication, the land is practically all occupied, and a study is now under way on expansion of the park.

Even more dramatic has been the tremendous increase in river commerce. Vicksburg is now and has been for the past several years, the number one river port in Mississippi. Today products of Vicksburg manufacture are shipped to overseas destinations and received there in the original barges and containers used for loading here. Today, after having strained the facilities of the terminal, we are ready for the dedication of a huge addition to them, which is but an indication of the real importance of our port.

Tomorrow, at 3 o'clock, this new addition to the Port of Vicksburg will be formally dedicated, and tomorrow night, at Memorial Auditorium, a dinner will be held honoring Senator John Stennis, who, down through all of the years, has been the guiding light in making possible the appropriations which made Vicksburg's great Harbor Industrial Park and Port not only an important part of our expanding economy, but a link with the rest of the world, as we now are taking full advantage of our big river.

Many, many people have had a part in the development of our Harbor Industrial Park and the Port of Vicksburg Terminal, but, during the last fifteen years the major share of the credit for the implementation of the plans which became reality, must go to the Warren County Board of Supervisors and to the magnificent administration of the facilities by the Warren County Port Commission.

Tomorrow's dedication will be but a forerunner of other progressive moves. We await, with deep interest, the designation of Vicksburg as a port of entry, and with equal interest, the results of the study of the possibility of expanded land facilities.

Vicksburg and Warren County are moving forward, and our port is making a major contribution to that progress.

GEORGE B. SHAMON

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the 12th chapter of Luke, it is written that:

For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required.

On Monday, March 20, the city of Auburn in my congressional district, lost a man whose entire life was dedicated to this principle. Mr. George B. Shamon, attorney, and former city clerk and corporation counsel of Auburn, unexpectedly passed away.

George Shamon, a life resident of Auburn, left a mark on his community which few could hope to equal, much less surpass. He was active in a multitude of civic activities including the YMCA, the School for Retarded Children, and the American Cancer Society.

I first met George at a "meet the student" forum for entering freshmen to Notre Dame. George graduated from that university in 1932 and played an active role in promoting it throughout the central New York area. Since that first opportunity to talk with him in 1941, I have respected this very able man for his dedication and concern for others. He was blessed with boundless energy and aptitude and he used those qualities to benefit the residents of his much beloved city of Auburn.

The Auburn Citizen Advertiser eulogized George Shamon on its editorial page. I include those comments as a most appropriate comment on the life of George B. Shamon:

[From the Auburn Citizen Advertiser, Mar. 21, 1972]

GEORGE B. SHAMON

George B. Shamon's heart has stopped. And it has left many individuals and organizations without a stimulating and important throb.

A native of Auburn, George Shamon was one of these individuals who put as much, if not more, back into his community as he took out. Whether it was the library, Mercy Hospital, the baseball team, Mt. Carmel High School, city government, or his church, he provided a spark and drive.

A competitor on the handball courts of the YMCA, before the bench in court, on the Democratic campaign trail or anywhere a bull session was going on, he had a zest and a strength of belief which were his trademarks. He loved to read and had a particular interest in history.

But to most, George Shamon was a warm and happy man whose size and sometimes booming voice hid a gentleness. He was most generous of his time, talents and money—in short, he was a soft touch. And as such, he lent himself to such organizations as the School for Retarded Children, the Cancer Fund and the YMCA–WEIU reaped the network.

Even a man-made Pacemaker couldn't keep George Shamon's heart going; we like to think that the reason was that it had gotten so big helping others.

AMCHITKA

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues of the unwise hysteria that occasionally develops in the discussion of environmental matters. As the House is about to consider the Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, I think the advice of Francis and Bruce Harper of the Prescott Journal in Prescott, Wis., is most timely.

Messrs. Harpers' March 16 editorial reminds us that in the 4 months since the underground nuclear test on Amchitka Island, despite "expert" opinion that the blast would trigger earthquakes and tidal waves with massive destructive force, there have been no noticeable aftereffects.

The Amchitka test offered to some an opportunity to indulge in irresponsible and emotional oratory. As a steady defender of our environment, I would urge my colleagues to take a hard look at questions on this emotion-laden subject. Ask the hard questions, sift through the emotion for the hard facts. The threat to our environment is real enough without jeopardizing the credibility of our effort by indulging in harmful demagoguery.

I include in the RECORD Mr. Harper's thoughtful remarks for your careful consideration:

AMCHITKA

In November, 1971, catastrophe was supposed to have followed the Amchitka underground nuclear test that took place far out in the Aleutian Islands. Opponents of the test, either inspired by fear that ecology would be harmed or in pursuit of more sinister motives such as obstructing America's defense effort, predicted calamitous earthquakes and tidal waves. The blast was detonated on schedule and nothing of the sort took place. An AP dispatch reports that the blast ". . . apparently opened the way to making the Spartan antiballistics missile fully operational." On the scientific side, ". . . seismologists expect to extract significant new information on the causal mechanisms of (earthquake) after shocks, and hope to be

able to apply that knowledge to an improved understanding of natural earthquake source-mechanisms . . ."

The Amchitka nuclear test, since it failed to produce catastrophe as some expected, has been quickly forgotten by all but those concerned with the defense of the nation and the researchers and scientists who devote their lives to probing the unknown.

POLICE AND RISING CRIME IN THE SCHOOLS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in response to growing concern over crime in the public schools, I introduced the Safe Schools Act (H.R. 10641), which would establish a new category of Federal grants to better enable schools to provide security. These Federal funds would be used to carry out locally approved school security plans to reduce crime against children, staff and property.

An article in the March 19, 1972, New York Times, reports some interesting changes in the type of crime and violence occurring in the schools, and discouraging increases in the incidence of crime. Also, an informative and thoughtful article by Phyllis Meyers analyzing the complex legal and emotional issues involved in the use of police in the schools appeared in the January–February issue of City, a magazine of urban life and environment published by the National Urban Coalition. In view of the considerable interest in this aspect of the current crisis in our educational systems, I wish to submit the New York Times article by Leonard Buder, and the article from City, entitled "Police in the Schools: Two Troubled Institutions Meet," for the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1972]

CRIME AND VIOLENCE RISE IN CITY SCHOOLS

(By Leonard Buder)

The number of reported acts of crime and violence in and around city schools increased from 333 in 1970 to 580 last year, according to Board of Education figures.

These incidents involved assaults on teachers and students, including rapes, attempted rapes and molestations; robberies and purse snatchings; the setting off of smoke and fire bombs; and telephoned and written threats against school staff members.

Among the "untoward" incidents reported to board headquarters during the 1971 calendar year were 285 assaults on teachers and other school personnel—two fewer than in 1970 but well above the figures for previous years.

Last January and February there were a total of 170 such incidents reported, including 88 assaults on school personnel. If this rate continues, headquarters officials said, the 1972 totals will far exceed those for last year.

A TOTAL OF 197 ARRESTS IN 1971

The headquarters records show a total of 197 reported arrests of youngsters and adults last year in connection with school incidents, compared with 102 in 1970. However, officials point out that arrests are sometimes made days and weeks after the incident and are often not reported to headquarters.

Although the board's figures are generally regarded as an imprecise barometer—many school incidents are never reported to headquarters—such groups as the United Federation of Teachers, the High School Principals Association and the Council of Supervisors and Administrators have asserted that school violence was increasing.

Supervisors, teachers and headquarters officials who were interviewed recently also said that while school violence and unrest have been a persistent problem in this city as well as elsewhere for many years, there was a difficult character to the problem today.

Dr. George Patterson, an assistant superintendent at headquarters, who handles school security matters, said: "A few years ago, there were more group confrontations. Now we largely have pretty vicious individual assaults."

Similarly, George Altomare, the United Federation of Teachers' vice president for academic high schools, said:

"The schools are not the focal point of violence aimed at change. School issues are not involved, as they were some years ago, when students organized protests, peaceful and violent, to bring about change. Now it is student against student."

Although there was sometimes a racial or ethnic element—one Manhattan high school has been torn by conflict between blacks and Dominicans—in many schools, Mr. Altomare said, the problem was "essentially nonracial."

Edward Muir, the U.F.T.'s representative on the school stability team set up last year by the School Chancellor, Harvey B. Scribner, noted that there has been a re-emergence of "fighting gangs" in such areas as the south Bronx and northern Manhattan. These gangs conflicts, he said, frequently spill over into the schools.

HANDGUNS PROLIFERATE

"The tragic element that distinguishes this from earlier gang activity is the proliferation of handguns among teen-agers," Mr. Muir said. "The 'Saturday night special' [a cheap, small-caliber gun] has hit the high schools."

He added that he had heard of four shootings in and around schools in recent months.

Dr. Patterson also said he had heard that an increasing number of students were carrying guns.

"Some carry guns out of bravado, some for business—a stickup—and some for self-defense," he said.

PARENTS COMPLAIN

Parent and student complaints about violence in the schools and attacks on youngsters going to and from school have become a recurring theme at recent public-agenda meetings of the Board of Education. At these sessions unlike the regular calendar meetings, speakers can bring up any subject they wish.

At last Tuesday night's board meeting, a group of parents and elected officials from the northeast Bronx said that about 350 students had been kept home from Adlai E. Stevenson High School since last September out of fear for their safety. A parent spokesman said that students were being "mugged, robbed, intimidated, harassed and stabbed" by other students, who were members of south Bronx gangs.

SCRIBNER VOICES CONCERN

Chancellor Scribner, who in the past has emphasized that violence in the schools was, to a degree, a reflection of the violence in society, said yesterday that he was very concerned about the problem.

"Every student and teacher has the right to go to school in safety and without fear for his safety," he said.

Dr. Scribner said that he was planning to implement new measures to enable the high schools to cope more effectively with problem youngsters, including those who persistently refused to attend classes but congregated in school buildings and, in some instances, endangered the safety of others. He said these measures would be disclosed soon.

"UNTOWARD ACCIDENTS" LISTED

The record of school incidents is compiled by a unit of the Office of Educational Information Services at central headquarters. Each school day the office gives Dr. Scribner and other top officials a "Log of Untoward Incidents" reported by the schools. Among the incidents reported recently were the following:

An English teacher at a Brooklyn junior high school was assaulted by two intruders he had encountered in the hall. They hit him on the head with a hammer and knocked him down a flight of steps. The teacher was taken semiconscious to a hospital.

Students from a Bronx high school were attacked by a group of youths while waiting for buses. Several students were injured.

Two students sitting in the lunchroom of a Manhattan high school were attacked by four unidentified assailants. Both youngsters suffered stab wounds of the back and other injuries.

An 8-year-old boy, on his way back to class from the lavatory, was "accosted by a male intruder who dragged him to the fourth-floor landing leading to the roof and sexually assaulted him."

A Queens principal was robbed at gunpoint in his office by a young man, shortly after the end of the school day.

Occasionally the reports contain assertions from parents that teachers have assaulted their children.

PUPILS EXPRESS FEAR

Many school officials who were interviewed recently said that the daily reports gave only a fragmentary picture of the situation.

One board of Education official, who did not want to be identified, said that in many schools pupils were afraid to go to the toilet for fear that they would be accosted by other youngsters, who will demand or take their money, or be "molested" by "outsiders."

The official said that pupils and teachers also shunned deserted corridors and stairways during the school day and that principals often advised teachers not to remain alone in their classrooms during free periods or after school.

Deputy chancellor Irving Anker recently issued a directive to principals that women secretaries should not be asked to remain in the school office alone after school hours. The directive, issued in response to complaints from secretaries, said that when secretaries were asked to work after school, adequate protection must be provided for them.

An analysis of school incidents made a year ago by George Lent, who kept the headquarters log until he went on leave last fall, found that 70 per cent of the assaults on school personnel were committed by students, 10 per cent by parents of students and 20 per cent by intruders.

School officials generally report that intruders are a steadily growing problem. Some of the outsiders are adults, often drug addicts seeking something to steal.

But a number of them, Dr. Patterson said, are truants from other schools who prey upon younger pupils or are out to settle an old score. High school students, he noted, sometimes invade junior high schools and junior high school pupils may go to nearby elementary schools.

Mr. Lent also estimated that 30 to 60 per cent of all school incidents are not reported to headquarters.

Albert Shanker, president of the teachers' union, said that many teachers, parents and students do not report incidents to local school officials because they "have no confidence in the school system's procedures for dealing with violence" and fear that a complaint could possibly lead to another assault.

He said that "the question of safety and working without fear" would be a major item in the union's forthcoming contract negotiations with the Board of Education.

Not included in the board's tally of untoward incidents, although mentioned in the log, were bomb threats received by schools—a headquarters aide said that these had become "almost too numerous to count"—and acts of vandalism, fires and thefts occurring during non-school hours.

During one week earlier this month, 13 city schools were targets of bomb threats, including one Brooklyn elementary school that received five threats in a 55-minute period.

Some schools have also been plagued by fires of suspicious origin. At one Bronx high school recently, there were four false fire alarms one day. The next morning a fire was discovered in a classroom closet, forcing the evacuation of the building. An hour after classes resumed, another fire was discovered, this time in a lavatory, and again the building had to be evacuated.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

The following table lists the number of violent incidents reported to the Board of Education in 1970 and 1971 and the number of arrests made. Some of the incidents were resolved without being reported to the police and some arrests were not linked to incidents referred to police.

Schools	Incidents		Arrests	
	1970	1971	1970	1971
Elementary	97	209	19	33
Intermediate-junior high	164	230	51	102
Academic	59	124	25	55
Vocational high	13	17	6	7
Total	333	580	101	197

Source: Board of Education Office of Education Information Service.

POLICE IN THE SCHOOLS: TWO TROUBLED INSTITUTIONS MEET

(By Phyllis Myers)

Men in blue are an increasingly common sight in the corridors of urban schools, but there is little agreement on their role.

Several weeks ago, I witnessed a scene that shook me into examining one of the dark corners of public school governance in our troubled cities: the increasing use of police power.

As I waited for a counselor in the corridors of my son's junior high school in Washington, D.C., a group of three young boys, all black, came sauntering by the counselor's office. One was repeating, "Hey man, hey man" rhythmically, at the top of his voice. The counselor asked them to leave. Two did, but the boy who was saying "Hey man" in that strange, loud unregulated way pushed past her and opened a nearby door. Suddenly, an arm thrust out of the room, grabbed the boy, tossed him up and down, and said roughly, "Who're you saying 'Hey man' to"? As the door shut, I caught a flash of a policeman's uniform and then heard sounds of scuffling and shouting.

Somewhat shaken, I asked the counselor what was happening. "Don't ask me," she said firmly, "I'm not saying anything. I just don't like what's going on around here." When I reported the incident to the principal of the school, he told me he had nothing to do with what the police officer did, and that the officer was under command of the local police district, where I should make my complaint. I hadn't expected this answer, although I have lived in Washington for eight years and have always sent my children to its public schools. I pressed forward with a few questions that came immediately into my mind. Didn't the officer keep in touch with the principal about his activities in the school? No. Did he file a weekly, daily, or monthly report to the school? No, only at police headquarters. Were there any guidelines about what the officer did in the school, and his relationship to the principal? No, except what was worked out on the spot between the personalities involved. Was he armed? Yes. Who chose the officer? He was assigned by the local police headquarters. Did he have any special training? No.

The principal told me he didn't believe the police were needed in the school at all. As for the incident I saw, he confirmed what I had quickly sensed: The boy was very disturbed and didn't belong in a regular public school. Washington, however, had no special facilities for him. The principal concluded by saying that the officer involved, who also was black, was better than most, and that on the whole the relationship worked out "not too badly." (The officer had told the principal that the boy had attacked him first.)

The incident kept popping up in my mind and, as I talked about it with others in my community, they too seemed surprised about the same things I had been. I didn't want to blow up the incident out of proportion. It would take someone far more militant than I to call it brutality. But there it was. A hostile boy, an emotional and educational problem, had been mistreated. The uniformed policeman had reacted to his words as a simple case of "lip." The officer had acted wrongly both by the standards of the institution that was legally responsible for the boy and by the standards of the police department for which he worked. Yet, it was unlikely that anyone other than I would ever complain.

At about the same time, I became aware of a furor at a nearby high school. It seemed police were picking up large numbers of "truants"—over 100 a day, some said—riding them in squad cars to local police headquarters, filing charges, and only then bringing them back to school authorities and notifying parents. The police insisted that no new drive against truancy was under way, but that they were simply extending their successful pilot program tested in another part of the city last year as a result of studies linking truancy with neighborhood shoplifting. All sorts of questions came up. Was a student who was five minutes late en route to school a "truant"? Was a student over 16 a truant? Was a class-cutter a truant? Since the truancy law makes parents the offenders, was it legal for police to pick up students? If it was legal, was it wise to take them to police headquarters?

Three black students got into a fracas when one refused to give her name to a police officer. After some heated discussion, all were held incommunicado at police headquarters for a time variously estimated from one to four hours. Only after student protests escalated into a threatened mass walkout did parents, principal, and police get together. Students believe some of the ground rules have changed: Truants are now taken back to school, rather than to police headquarters; students over 16 are left alone. A policeman has been detailed to the school full time, both to quiet the school and as an Officer Friendly to hear student complaints. Asked whether it would not have been preferable to explain the stricter enforcement policy in advance to students, deputy chief of police Owen W. Davis replied: "Oh, that's not necessary. The students learn about it fast enough via the grapevine."

Spurred by these two incidents, I began to do some more thinking and talking with people about the role of police in public schools, both here in the District of Columbia and across the country. I tried to find out how often and when and under what conditions police were called in, who made the decision, if the impact of their presence were assessed, and what other kinds of options were considered. I was not at all sure that the rights of students and young people were either clearly defined or protected, nor that, in a situation where fear or hysteria had taken over, the best protection systems to deal with the problems had been worked out. I found it was not a subject anyone wanted to talk about very much. Crime in the schools turned out to be even less susceptible to rational discussion than crime in the streets.

I encountered an unexpected amount of hostility, as it merely to raise these questions were either to condone rampant criminal behavior in the schools or to infer that policemen were pigs. Whatever else it means, the calling in of police to schools symbolizes a terrible failure, reaching beyond the institutions out into the community, and while most people seem to agree that there is a new kind of problem, no one—including police and school officials—knows what to do about it.

While it was difficult to get to the facts, the situation seems to look this way:

The involvement of police in public schools has been on the rise in cities across the nation. Such involvement ranges, in increasing order of controversy, from image-building, Officer-Friendly type programs, to police-liaison programs that combine regular assignments of officers with a broader community relations and educational role in the schools, to regular beat-type assignments in the schools, to the use of police cadets as nonuniformed undercover agents.

The International City Management Association queried police departments in over 2,000 cities in June, 1970, and reported that 91 percent of police departments conduct special educational programs in schools; police departments in 94 cities (7 percent of the total, but one-third of the larger cities) said there was "continuous full-time police coverage of selected or all public schools."

However, the issue of whether police belong in the schools is less strident today than it was in 1968 and 1969 when racially and politically motivated student protests were at their peak and expanded the use of police in secondary schools as well as on college campuses. Some of the lessened concern today is related to a toning down of these crises; part of it, however, is related to an acceptance of the police presence as "a fact of life" in schools, as elsewhere in our cities.

While protests grab fewer headlines, the increase in juvenile crime continues to rise, at a rate most people consider alarming. According to the FBI uniform crime reports, juvenile arrests have jumped three times as fast as all arrests in the past decade; young people under 18 account for more than half of all arrests for auto thefts, larcency, burglary, and arson. Numbers like these lead easily to speculations about extensive crime spillover in schools, but statistics—to the extent they are available—are closely guarded, by police and education officials alike. The only known national survey, taken in 1970 by the Senate subcommittee on juvenile delinquency of a sample of 110 big-city school districts, concluded that "violence in our public schools has increased dramatically" but warned that its statistics were too sketchy to express more than a "trend."

The increasing use of police in city schools raises many new complex political, administrative, legal, and educational issues: Should police come in on their own volition, or only when invited? Should they take part in educational programs or restrict their activities to criminal wrongdoing? Should they be uniformed, carry arms, have an office? What kind of special training, if any, do they need? Who pays for the police? Do they have access to school records? What are young people's rights with respect to questioning, search, arrest? What are parents' rights? What are the school's responsibilities? The ICMA survey of police departments reported that half

have written policies dealing with young people on school property, and among these there was a great variation of policies (let alone practices). I was able to locate only a handful of cities and states where written guidelines between the schools and police had been published.

In an increasing number of cities, students, sometimes aided by local civil liberties lawyers, have begun publishing their own rights handbooks, attempting to spell out the legalities of dealing with both police and school officials. Their effort exposes a worrisome vagueness about the law as it applies to young people. "It is a no-man's-land. Animals in our society have more rights than children," commented Mrs. Ruby Yaryan, a juvenile delinquency expert with the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. It was only in 1970 that the Supreme Court affirmed that the Bill of Rights did not stop at the schoolhouse door.

A year ago, ICMA observed that despite the importance of the subject of police relationships with schools, "little research has been conducted on (its) nature and extent." This is just as true today. Roy C. McLaren, director of the field operations division of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, points out that any compilation of crime statistics or police practices is an extremely complex job—and in order to do so, someone has to want to know and pay for the effort. So far, there has not been enough public concern in this area says McLaren.

There are signs that pressure may be building up for change, however, as school systems reverse their traditional stance and call on the police for help.

"Historically, there has been a lack of cooperation between the schools and the police," says IACP's Richard Kobetz. "School authorities often wait too long to call in police. They are reluctant to think of these things. Yet, their first job is to protect life and limb." Until recently, admits Charles Baltimore of the Association of Secondary School Principals, school officials considered it a failure to call in the police. Now this has changed, says Baltimore—nevertheless proudly pointing out that in his years as principal of a racially changing school in the inner city, he never called for the police. Baltimore is concerned about the erosion of the principal's authority when police come in, that they might make the school "a military state." Kobetz is exasperated by this reluctance to use police officers. He says: "The role of policemen is very complex because Americans have made it so. First they give him a job, then they dare him to do it."

At the heart of the confusion is a clash between differing philosophies of how conflicts are controlled in a democratic society—by authority and fear, or by self-control and self-responsibility, repression or rapport—and uncertainty about what police are supposed to be doing. Is their primary function to keep order and apprehend criminals, with all other activities largely peripheral, or should a major portion of their time be devoted to prevention of crime? At the school level, these differing strains of thought break down into two basic approaches to handling disorder, violence, and criminal activity: one, to restrict police functions to emergencies and, if necessary, build a capability within the school system to handle most situations without calling in the police; and the other, to expand the role of police officers in schools by involving them more broadly in counseling and educational community programs, thereby breaking down barriers between young citizens and police officers.

The first approach is that advocated by McLaren, emphasizing that he is speaking as an individual and not for IACP: "If the calling in of police is a short-term temporary assignment to deal with emergency situations, then the use of police is entirely appropriate. But if the situation is going to be long-standing, then some security system ought to be worked out, paid for by the school system and accountable to it and the principals." He believes this would lead to a more effective use of manpower, since it "takes a higher level of police competence to investigate crimes than to stop fights."

In 1969, Education U.S.A., a publication of a National Education Association affiliate, reported that school systems in cities all over the country were adding substantial numbers of security personnel to their staffs. Often these are off-duty or retired policemen. Policies vary from city to city about duties, uniforms, and the gut issues of police powers—the right to arrest and to bear arms. Security officers in Detroit, hired "reluctantly" by former superintendent Norman Drachler as a result of fears he felt were "exaggerated," did not wear uniforms. In New York City, however, students protested the lack of identifying clothes, and guards were given special blazers. In Kansas City, security personnel felt unsafe without arms and were given Mace and handcuffs. In Oakland, Calif., "peace officers" are armed and have the power to detain suspects.

Out of the need to exchange ideas and practices about school-directed security programs, a new group, the International Association of School Security Officers, has sprung up in Fort Lauderdale. The organization is supporting a "safe schools" bill introduced by Rep. Jonathan Bingham (Dem-N.Y.) and cosponsored by the unlikely combination of Rep. Shirley Chisholm (Dem-N.Y.) and Louise Day Hicks (Dem-Mass.) which would give federal funds, through HEW, to schools to finance their own security systems. Such funds could not be used to support the introduction of "firearms, weapons, or chemical agents," but otherwise schools and communities would have broad latitude to work out what measures they preferred. According to Roger Majak, Bingham's assistant, it is the lack of funds that causes many school systems to turn to police departments. Sending funds to the schools would be a counterweight to the support now funneled by LEAA to police departments—estimated at $6 million—for programs to combat school crime.

While many see school-operated security forces as a more palatable approach to protection, some are fearful that such groups pose a new danger in themselves. Mark Furstenberg of the Police Foundation says he sees "no reason to have other police systems. All the experiments I have seen point against it." Where there is a need, he would rather see the police called in. "They are trained in the legal use of force, how to arrest and use weapons, and are, in most cities, accountable to the political forces. This is the nature of a police function in a democratic society." Emphasized Furstenberg: "The police attitude is, We prefer not to come into schools, but if we're needed, then we're coming in and going to use our own judgment."

If police are going to be in schools on a continuing basis, however, Furstenberg believes they should increase their positive role in the schools. This approach is exemplified by a series of model programs that began in Atlanta almost 40 years ago, but is more usually traced to Flint, Mich., in 1958 and Tucson, Ariz., in 1963. Although details vary, the police officers—still under command of police headquarters but called something like police-liaison officers, school resource officers, or monitors—are assigned to schools full time as part of a concerted attack on prevention and early detection of proneness to delinquency. Sometimes they take off their uniform, but they are always armed. In addition to normal police duties, the police may work with counselors and teach special law enforcement courses and refer young people with problems to service agencies in the community. Both Flint and Tucson report that such low-key involvement of the police has cut down the number of student arrests, rather than increasing them, as some feared.

While such programs have spread to about two dozen cities, their further proliferation has been limited by two major problems. One, cited by hard-pressed police departments, is manpower. In ICMA's survey of police departments, the main concern expressed about further assignment of police to schools seemed to be "lack of personnel." "Should a trained police officer be giving lectures to students?" asks a police official. Says Furstenberg, "I don't worry much about efficiency. We must remember this is our only opportunity for positive police contacts among students." But such contacts are not necessarily positive—as my own experience proved. Like so many other such programs, if the effort is not carried out carefully and sensitively, the impact can be marginal, or even negative. However, IACP's Bjorn Pedersen, who is assisting several model cities in developing police-school liaison programs, believes that many cities are now attracting sufficient "exceptional policemen" for such programs.

A second limitation has to do with the desirability of constant exposure to the police. The southern Arizona chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union unsuccessfully attacked Tucson's program as an "unnecessary extension of police authority." Mark Keane, city manager of Tucson when it adopted its police liaison program and now ICMA's executive director, says such criticism prodded the development of "precise guidelines" that "reduced fear of police abuse." The controversy still simmers, however, according to a recent article in School Management magazine, which quoted a Tucson psychologist's succinct summation of a deep strain in American views about police: "The basic thought (about) a policeman is that he is out on the street. If you need him, you go out and get him. If you have been bad, he comes after you. But he doesn't live with you."

Such ideas are hard to hold onto in these difficult days. As a thoughtful member of the parent board of my son's junior high school said when I told her of the incident concerning the boy and the police officer: "I know how you feel, but it is very hard to say. You can have one feeling in your living room—but if it is your child who is jumped on by a gang in the school yard, or if it is your child's new coat that is stolen, then your feelings change, and you want not one, but two policemen around."

I found no easy answers. Police and schools are interacting increasingly, but all too often, in a no-man's-land where effective relationships have not been thought through. As these two powerful and heavily strained institutions come together in new ways, they must work out public policies that ensure staff and pupil security in an atmosphere that teaches—by example—the rules, procedures, and laws underpinning our society.

Police in the Schools: Politics in Philadelphia

(By Lenora Berson)

On November 17, 1967, several thousand black public school students from all parts of the city of Philadelphia converged on the school administration building. Their purpose was to petition the authorities for black studies, more black teachers, and the right to wear Afro garb. The demonstration had been openly planned for weeks. Board of education members and superintendent of schools Mark Shedd had developed a plan to handle the student protest. They decided to meet with the black student leaders, to formally accept their petition, and publicly promise to consider it.

While the black students were inside the

white limestone school complex, the crowd of 4,000 teenagers became restive. A few jumped on top of cars to lead songs. Police commissioner Frank L. Rizzo, who had been warily circling the demonstration, took this as a signal for action and shouted, "Get their asses!"

Several hundred policemen who had been stationed in ammunition-loaded buses on the edge of the crowd charged. A small riot ensued. The wounded were black students, a black school administrator, and a dozen white pedestrians several blocks away who had been hit in misplaced retaliation by the angry young blacks.

School board president Richardson Dilworth, a former mayor and a leading figure in legal as well as social circles, denounced the police action and Rizzo, now Philadelphia's mayor. School superintendent Shedd joined in this denunciation.

In retaliation against the criticism, Rizzo demanded the right to station officers *at his own discretion* within the schools.

Richardson Dilworth, on a CBS-TV documentary aired on December 23, 1971, recalled the circumstances under which the demand was made: "Toward the end of the (school board) meeting, the commissioner very ostentatiously threw a number of files on the table and said, 'I've got enough on every one of you,' pointing to us, 'to run you out of the city.'"

Mark Shedd supported Dilworth's charge. "Rizzo made it clear he was keeping a close surveillance on the board and the (school) administration and that he had sufficient information on every one of the board members and members of the administration, on our personal lives, that could be incriminating."

Shedd went on to quote Rizzo as saying: "Everybody in the room ought to be very glad they had a police commissioner who was a person who wouldn't use such information for his personal advantage, that Philadelphia had a police commissioner who is a responsible kind of person. He indicated that if everybody behaved themselves the information wouldn't be used."

Despite the threat, which Rizzo now denies making, the board rejected the commissioner's demand for complete autonomy over police in the schools.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, this year's winner from the State of Massachusetts in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest was Miss Betsy Jean Bouchard of Kingston in my congressional district.

Built around the national contest theme, "My Responsibility to Freedom," Betsy's speech has an important and refreshing message for us all. I recommend its reading to my colleagues:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

"My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty, Of thee I sing; Land where my fathers died, Land of the pilgrims' pride, From ev'ry mountain side Let Freedom ring."

I saluted my country as a child in grade school; proud to be able to sing those words. That was my introduction to the use of the word "freedom." What did freedom mean to me at that age? It was just another word, another pretty song. As I grew older and my interests broadened, so did my concept of freedom.

Television and other media continue to graphically point out that what is freedom to men in one country at a particular time in history may not necessarily mean freedom to men in a different setting.

Like most citizens of the United States, I am able to take freedom from want, hunger, and fear for granted. As an American, I consider freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and all the other freedoms contained in the Bill of Rights, to be of the highest priority. However, I am also very much aware of the fact that to over half the people in the world today, freedom from hunger, want, and fear is of far greater relevance.

Even in our own country, black people have never known the freedoms enjoyed by their white neighbors. I can understand the frustration of struggling to obtain the freedoms which have been guaranteed but not extended to the black. In a speech delivered at Gettysburg during the centennial celebration of Lincoln's immortal address, Vice-President Lyndon Johnson touched upon this subject.

He said:

"To ask patience from the Negro is to ask him to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him, and of all Americans, perseverance within the process of a free and responsible society, would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens."

Recently, I have become aware of the passing of one of my freedoms—the freedom of childhood. At this time next year, the freedoms which I enjoy and which other people have been safeguarding for me will become part of my responsibility, too. It will be my duty to be an informed voter, an involved citizen of my community, and an industrious member of our society. These are basics of good citizenship which will be both necessary and rewarding to me.

Beyond this, however, I would hope that I could contribute to improving the quality of our freedoms for future generations. For too long, Americans have been satisfied with the blight of mediocrity and impoverished imaginations. We have confused status with standards.

Commercialism invades every facet of our lives, often in degrading and demoralizing ways. Our educational system has been allowed to drift too far into an intellectual abyss. Rather than sharing the best of our world with the least fortunate, we have allowed the best of our culture to become diluted, thus lowering the expectations of everyone.

Maybe by doing my best within the context of my life, by working to achieve harmony and understanding with other people, and by promoting the quality of excellence in our national life, I can be a positive force toward a better America.

As each generation comes of age, the cause of freedom has a special need.

In the words of John Gardner, author of "The Recovery of Confidence,"

"If we want a society built around the creative possibilities of the self-directing individual, then we have tasks to perform. Each of us has tasks to perform. Each of us is that self-directing individual. This free society begins with us. It mustn't end with us."

SHELVING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you an editorial appearing in the March 12, 1972, edition of the Sunday Oklahoman regarding the abolishment of capital punishment. I believe this editorial contains some very interesting and challenging observations, particularly since the problem of violent crime is a harsh reality in our lives today.

I call your attention to the contention in this editorial that the public has not rejected capital punishment in view of the fact juries continue to prescribe it in spite of legal obstacles placed in the way of its implementation. Further, that crimes of premeditated violence continue widespread throughout the Nation, and undoubtedly repeaters, who are responsible for a great percentage of our crimes, have not failed to note the complete absence of legal executions anywhere in the country for more than 4½ years.

Another valid point is the grim situation facing prison personnel who must work daily with lifers" with no hope of parole. Can these men fail to wonder what they have to lose by committing further violence if the threat of capital punishment is removed?

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we need great wisdom in finding ways to bring about law and order in our Nation, I think we should consider the alternatives if capital punishment is eliminated as part of our judicial system.

I hope everyone who receives the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will give careful consideration to the following editorial:

SHELVING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Interminable legal challenges and procedural nitpicking by the courts have brought capital punishment to a standstill throughout the nation.

It has fallen into disuse simply because the courts have made it impossible to carry out, and not because the people have rejected it. Public support of it is apparent in the fact that juries continue to prescribe it even as waiting lists of the condemned lengthen.

No convicted killer has gone to an electric chair, gas chamber or gallows anywhere in the country for four and a half years, but about 100 defendants still are being sentenced to death every year. The number awaiting execution now is about 680, including 15 in Oklahoma's death row at McAlster.

If the death penalty has become "unacceptable to society," as its opponents like to contend, its presumed rejection certainly isn't reflected in the findings of juries in capital cases.

Having placed insurmountable legal technicalities in the way of swift and certain capital punishment, its opponents then argue that it is "cruel" because of the lengthening wait between sentencing and execution. In ruling it in conflict with the California constitution's ban against "cruel or unusual punishment," the California Supreme Court said a death sentence was in fact the "lingering death" that most courts had agreed would be unconstitutional.

The California court said among other things that the state could not prove the deterrent effect of capital punishment. Proof of deterrence is difficult, particularly in unpremeditated killings—the spur-of-the-moment so-called crimes of passion. But a strong presumption of lost deterrence must be drawn from the proliferating crimes of premeditated violence now sweeping the nation.

The death penalty can't deter if the courts won't permit it to be carried out. The total absence of legal executions for more than four years hasn't escaped the notice of the

criminal "repeaters" who are responsible for most of the nation's crimes.

To a convict serving a life sentence without hope of parole, the action of the California Supreme Court amounts to a license to kill penitentiary guards and other custodial employees. Such a convict would have nothing to lose. The grim implications won't be lost on prison personnel everywhere. If the ruling stands, its predictable effect will be to complicate enormously the staffing problems of California penal institutions.

Similar prison staffing problems will occur nationwide if the U.S. Supreme Court follows the California example and determines that the death penalty is in conflict with the federal Eighth Amendment's ban on "cruel and unusual punishments."

Another nationwide effect visible already in California will be the release on bond of persons charged with but not yet convicted of murder, since non-capital offenses ordinarily are bailable.

Even if the U.S. Supreme court decides the death penalty is not "cruel and unusual," its execution still will be tied up by an earlier ruling that it isn't proper in a murder case for the prosecution to challenge prospective jurors having conscientious or religious scruples against its infliction.

The death penalty isn't being carried out any longer, not because it has become "unacceptable to society" but because an incessant and organized campaign of litigation has kept the opposition to it always before the courts.

POVERTY BACKGROUND FOR OEO HEAD

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the opportunity of working with Phillip V. Sanchez, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, have been highly impressed by his deep commitment to making a success of OEO and really doing something for people.

I have found him to be an effective administrator who is concerned about cutting the redtape of bureaucracy as much as possible in order to get a job done.

The Kansas City Star recently published a feature on the job Mr. Sanchez is doing which is worthy of the attention of Members of Congress. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article, which was written by Nick Thimmesch of Newsday, Inc.:

POVERTY BACKGROUND FOR OEO HEAD

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—My, oh my, the Office of Economic Opportunity, from which federal antipoverty efforts spring, is finally being run by a man with authentically poor origins. Sargent Shriver, Donald Rumsfeld and Frank Carlucci—former OEO directors—never knew hunger, want or discrimination, but Phillip Victor Sanchez, 41, the recently installed new boss of the "poorhouse" did.

As a scrawny 6-year-old, Sanchez joined his Mexican migrant family in California's Salinas Valley, picking fruit and cotton. In those depression days, his English was poor, and the opportunities limited. He soon acquired another handicap when his father abandoned his wife and the family of six children.

Sanchez didn't go on to make a million, American style. He chose a civic and government career, a hero to the Jaycees. At age 32 (1962) he was named Fresno County administrator, thus California's youngest county executive. He proved his stuff over the years, and the Nixon administration recruited him in 1971, making him director last fall. Now Sanchez, whose appearance is distinctly Mexican, finds himself where every OEO director before him has been—in controversy.

OEO directors have always heard charges that: The agency is underfunded and administered to oblivion; the poor aren't properly represented; and the legal aid program interferes with the rights of local government. Now the new directions of OEO, initiated by the Nixon administration, bring new charges that the agency is reckless and is systematically being dismembered.

"We've quit the nickel-and-dime approach," Sanchez says. "We're using research and development to get to the root causes of poverty in jobs, education, housing and income. We conducted a project to find out if performance contracting with schools would improve children's math and reading skills. We learned they don't, and maybe we saved school districts all over the country millions. We're trying education voucher experiments, and higher education programs for prison inmates.

"We did another with income maintenance and learned that families getting this assistance showed no decline in earnings. We would also like to blend children of working-class families with poor children into child development programs, charging the near-poor small fees."

The 984 Community Action agencies (down from 1,200 in the L.B.J. years) now hear "sophisticated advocacy" instead of "burn, baby, burn rhetoric," Sanchez says. "I wish the bureaucracy and members of Congress, who formed their impression of these agencies on the turmoil of a few years ago, would get off their duffs and visit us now. They'd learn the approach is more productive."

Sanchez talks warmly of a demonstration project in Jackson, Miss., where white architects and local bankers helped establish an OEO medical service center for poor blacks in a local school; and of a strawberry farm co-operative in Watsonville, Calif., established with a $500,000 OEO assistance grant and run by "migrant farmers with many kiddies."

He's also happy that for the first time a majority of OEO's 10 regional directors are minority people (three blacks and three Spanish-speaking).

The Nixon administration has spun off several major OEO programs, including Head Start, VISTA, manpower development and training and health services, to other government departments. But the administration's 1973 OEO budget request of $758 million is up $54 million from the 1972 appropriation by Congress of $704 million. The President also asked for an extra $34 million for HEW to pick up OEO's health programs.

OEO's funding level has not been significantly changed by the Nixon administration but it has shifted money to research and development. It also wants to make the legal services program a separate, independent corporation like Public Service Broadcast.

Sanchez says he's in accord with all of these. A lifelong Democrat, he converted to Republicanism in 1969, he says, because "Democrats took people with my kind of name for granted, and I've seen this administration do more for my people than what was done before."

"What brought me here," he says smilingly, "was not my distinguished record of writing campaign contribution checks or waving political banners. I burned my bridges to come here, and gave up a good job and a pleasant life in Fresno. I didn't come to Washington to be the pallbearer for OEO's funeral as some charge."

TRAVEL GROUP CHARTER PROPOSALS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned with the future and continued service of nonscheduled airlines, because of their great importance to this country's air transportation. I believe that eventually the nonscheduled airlines will be called upon to carry a larger volume of cargo and passengers.

In support of this belief, I include in the RECORD a press release issued by the National Air Carrier Association, Inc., in connection with the statement by their president, Edward J. Driscoll, in response to comments filed by the scheduled carriers in opposition to the Civil Aeronautics Board's travel group charter proposals:

"UNREASONED FEAR OF COMPETITION" BEHIND ATTACK ON CAB PROPOSAL—JUSTICE AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENTS BACK LIBERALIZED CHARTER RULES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—March 15.—Scheduled airlines' objections to liberalized charter rules are based on an "unreasoned fear of competition," the nation's leading supplemental (charter) airlines told the Civil Aeronautics Board today.

National Air Carrier Association president Edward J. Driscoll made the statement in a reply to comments filed by the scheduled carriers in opposition to the CAB's Travel Group Charter proposals.

Claims that the new rules will bring about the eventual demise of scheduled air transport, reflect, said Driscoll "an unreasoned fear of competition and of any change in the status quo."

"They reveal an undue readiness to blame others—in this instance, the supplementals and the Board—for economic problems substantially of their own making.

"And they imply an obligation on the part of the Board—which simply does not exist—to make scheduled services profitable at whatever capacity or frequency levels the carriers choose to operate, without regard to the needs of the public for low cost bulk air transportation."

Mr. Driscoll pointed out that the Departments of Justice and Transportation had both commented favorably on the Board's proposal and had, in fact, suggested further liberalization—particularly in regard to the proposed six-month advance purchase requirement.

The Department of Justice statement said "there is in fact no persuasive evidence that expanding the availability of charters would substantially impair the operations of either the scheduled or supplemental air carriers."

Similarly, Mr. Driscoll said, more than 40 consumer groups, student organizations, colleges, unions, cooperatives, senior citizens and farmers' organizations have filed comments "supporting the travel group charter proposal, and in many cases urging the relaxation of restrictions."

Mr. Driscoll said that the scheduled carriers' claims of diversion "ignore the fact that the growth of scheduled passenger traffic in the transatlantic market—the only market in which charter services are a significant factor—has been sizable and consistent during the entire period of development of large-scale charter traffic."

During the past decade, he said, U.S. flag carriers have experienced a 17 percent annual

growth rate—compared with 14 percent for IATA carriers as a group.

They also ignored the role played by their own "managerial misjudgments," he said. "In recent periods, both the U.S. transatlantic carriers and the IATA carriers as a group have increased available seats in transatlantic scheduled services more rapidly than the growth in traffic warranted."

NEEDS OF THE MENTALLY ILL CHILD IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, members of the District of Columbia Mental Health Association appeared before the House District Committee to discuss the needs and accomplishments of the association. Mrs. Sandra Bergman, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Childhood Mental Illness, presented an excellent statement which I am submitting at this time for the benefit of my colleagues who were not able to hear Mrs. Bergman.

The needs of the people of the District of Columbia are no different than the needs of people in every city and town in the Nation. More services and more money must be appropriated soon if we are to save the hundreds of thousands of citizens who are suffering from some form of mental illness. As Mrs. Bergman so ably points out, any expenditures we now make will save us many times that amount in future expenditures.

The testimony follows:

[Testimony before the Committee on the District of Columbia, March 14, 1972]

NEEDS OF THE MENTALLY ILL CHILD IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Sandra Bergman)

The D. C. Mental Health Association would like you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of your Committee, to know how deeply appreciative we are that you have given us this opportunity to talk to you about the plight of the mentally ill child in the District of Columbia.

Although we, as a chapter of the National Association for Mental Health, speak for all the mentally ill, not only children, we feel it is imperative that we give priority to the problems of children and adolescents in the District of Columbia, because that is where the need is the most acute; that is where the hope for change is the greatest.

In 1970 the National Association for Mental Health and its forty-seven Divisions throughout the nation with a membership of hundreds of thousands, focused on "Children in Crisis"—the problems of the mentally ill child in America. Our mental health association, fulfilling its commitment as the voice of the consumer-citizen, as the advocate for those persons who are already seriously ill and those who might be prevented from becoming seriously ill with preventative measures, has pursued the critical needs of children in this city, with few results.

At this point, I want to make it very clear that we do not speak for the Mental Health Administration or for any other part of the District government. Though our members sit on advisory task forces in a consultant capacity to the Mental Health Administration, we are in no way beholden to the city government. We speak only for the citizens of the District; especially for those in need of mental health help.

More specifically we speak for some four thousand members, and a 40-member Board of Directors that represents the entire metropolitan area. Our Board represents all ethnic groups, the socio-economic spectrum, the laymen and the professional. We have businessmen, inner city parents, doctors, social workers, teachers, and lawyers on our Board. We also have a Professional Advisory Board made up of the most outstanding members of the mental health profession in the city.

Yet we have been able to accomplish little in the way of meeting the needs of our children.

We have given benefit balls, appeared on television program after television program, held public forums, testified before the City Council and the Board of Education. I am sorry to tell you that most of our energy and good intentions have basically come to naught. Without your help we can have more benefits, more TV appearances, more workshops, seminars and lectures, and still not have the money or access to reach or help a fraction of the children needing help.

THE NEED

Thirty thousand children who need help from mental health workers live here in D. C.—and this is said to be an extremely conservative estimate by demographers at the National Institute of Mental Health and by the D. C. Mental Health Administration.[1]

How do we know that there are 30,000 children emotionally ill? We don't! We don't have their names and addresses. Nobody has really cared enough to find out. We have bits and scraps of information upon which we base these estimates.

The Mental Health Administration has come up with the figure of 30,000 by applying to the District of Columbia national percentages from the Joint Commission Report on the Mental Health of Children, published in 1969. This Report was commissioned by an Act of Congress. I refer you to Appendix A for a breakdown of the 30,000 figure.

Another way used by the Mental Health Administration to estimate the number of children seriously emotionally disturbed is to calculate the number of children receiving services from the Social Rehabilitation Administration. As of June 1971, the Children Services Division reported that 3,500 children were under care and supervision, and an additional 1,309 were at the Children's Center at Laurel. (These are court adjudicated children, those delinquent and declared beyond parental control.) This total of 4,809 does not include the children who are at Forest Haven, the institution for the mentally retarded children.

The Family Service Division caseload on June, 1971 included 52,911 children. Our Association was told that "one out of every four children (an estimate, again) is disturbed or maladjusted." So if we just total the number of children under the care of the Social Rehabilitation Administration we get an estimate of 13 to 14 thousand children with serious emotional problems. This does not include the thousands of children who have no connection with the Social Rehabilitation Administration.

DEFINITION OF EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILD

In the interest of clarity I would like to differentiate between a child who is mentally retarded and a child who is emotionally disturbed. Mental retardation refers to subaverage general intellectual functioning which originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment in adaptive behavior. Mental retardation does not preclude the development of normal personality and emotional functioning. The majority of children in our institutions for the retarded, excluding those with overwhelming retardation, are requiring such special care because of personality and adjustment disturbances which make it difficult for them to function in the community. Appropriate treatment and training would enable many of the children in our institutions such as Forest Haven to return to the much less costly established community programs.

Though we feel great compassion for mentally retarded children, our concern today is for the emotionally disturbed child.

An emotionally disturbed child is one who cannot cope with his life; his personality development has been interfered with or stopped by factors in his environment. He seems immature for his age and intellectual endowment, which is frequently quite high. He cannot interact in an acceptable way with his peers. Some have temper tantrums and crying fits; perhaps he bangs his head against the wall unceasingly; or he walks on all fours and barks like a dog; or he can only relate to a tree, not to his mother or teacher; or he withdraws inside himself and refuses to communicate with human beings; he cannot control his impulses, he cannot learn. And those who are most severely depressed, try to kill themselves. I will never forget a committee meeting early last spring at our office—a member of the Department of Education, took her seat wearily, and said: "I hate to see spring come, we have so many suicide attempts in the schools each spring."

When we speak of mentally ill children, there is a vast range of severity in describing their condition and their needs. One thing is certain: when a child begins to develop problems, if that child is not helped then, he will only get worse. The sooner a child in trouble can be diagnosed and helped, the greater the chance that his illness will not become severe.

I would like to tell you about the calls for help we receive in our office, calls which leave us depressed and frustrated because the appropriate facilities and services simply do not exist in D.C.

The wife of a United States Congressman, an Urban Service Corps public school volunteer, called asking us to recommend a residential facility for a seriously disturbed 14 year old girl who talks and talks, walks around the streets looking for her mother who deserted her, or shuts herself up in closets. She will not stay in a classroom. She has no money.

A private psychiatrist tells us she is keeping four disturbed children in her home along with her own children rather than let them go to an inappropriate institution or back to their own homes which have been the primary cause of their illness.

The Social Worker at the Hospital for Sick Children reports that a 12 year old boy with an I.Q. of 130 was sent to their institution from Junior Village in a catatonic state after 13 previous moves around different foster homes. He was an asthmatic, so the hospital, which is not a psychiatric facility, could take him in. He made a phenomenal adjustment and was placed in another foster home from which he was rejected in two days. When he was returned to the hospital, he threatened suicide. He was finally sent back to Junior Village and kept under lock and key.

At this same hospital they have a boy who is a cyclical vomiter. He saw his father burn his mother to death.

We had a school counsellor call asking for

[1] By applying to the District of Columbia national percentages from the Joint Commission Report on the Mental Health of Children, we can estimate that 1,770 D. C. children are probably psychotic; 5,900 to 8,850 children are severely disturbed, and between 23,600 and 30,000 are in need of help with some emotional problem.

help. She had a bright but uncontrollable 6th grade girl who brings a pocket knife to school and threatens the other children. Did we know of any residential facility this girl could be placed in?

Two of our Board Members witnessed a 13 year old girl screaming and banging the walls of the detention room at Juvenile Court for 45 minutes. At five p.m. when the Judge returned from hearing cases they asked him what was wrong with the girl. He replied that she was "obviously psychotic." They asked him what would happen to her that night. He said she would be returned to the Receiving Home and, if there was anyone there to do so, someone would give her a tranquilizer.

We hear of hundreds of cases like these each year. And there is nothing we can recommend because there is no place for these children in Washington.

At the conclusion of this statement, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce to you for an informal conversation, three citizens who will tell you about their frustrations in trying to help emotionally ill children in this city: the mother of a disturbed child, a child psychiatrist in private practice, and the Director of the Information Center for Handicapped Children.

WHAT IS AVAILABLE FOR THESE CHILDREN?

I would now like to turn your attention to the facilities and services the Mental Health Administration and the private sector provide for these 30,000 children.

Our Association conducted a survey in 1970 to determine what was available both in the public and private sector to help these children. A copy is attached.

There are no public residential treatment centers for seriously ill children. There are less than 60 beds in the entire public sector for children, which includes St. Elizabeths. There are seven private facilities—among the finest in the country—capable of treating three hundred children at a cost of from $11,000 to $26,000 per child, per year. These seven private institutions, in addition to being beyond the means of all but the affluent families, have long waiting lists.

The Mental Health Administration has two day care centers caring for 44 children and two therapeutic nurseries caring for 17 children. Yet we have thousands of small children—under six—who are seriously emotionally disturbed, and require special care.

What does all this add up to—in terms of the vast numbers of children needing help? Not very much at all, as you can see.

In fact, we send 505 children at a cost of $1,300,000 per year on tuition grants to residential treatment centers—some as far away as Texas—because there are not enough appropriate facilities here. There is a waiting list of 398 children for these tuition grants.

It is the opinion of our Association that the highest priority need for children is the creation of a system of four comprehensive care centers, located in the four health areas of the city, A, B, C, D. Each of these centers would care for 100 patients on a daily basis, with residential facilities for twenty out of the 100 children.

"Residential treatment" is essentially a therapeutic mileu designed to provide corrective life experiences to counteract the damaging and painful experiences which led to the child's emotional disturbance. Residential treatment provides a variety of programs that include various forms of therapy (individual and group), education, nursing care, and the other kinds of adult supervision required for 24-hour living. The basic elements in treatment are "people, things and cultural patterns" within a consistent, planned and controlled environment.

This requires a staff of skilled personnel, trained and experienced in working with children, and able to collaborate in a complex and highly varied program. Such a program also requires close collaboration with people in the child's natural environment, such as parents, other family members and teachers. It should often include supportive therapy with the family. It also requires out-patient facilities for use as the child moves toward community living.

These residential facilities are necessary for youngsters with severe emotional disorders and mental illness. The severity of their disorders presents extremely complex problems: those of deep emotional hunger, extreme over-activity, withdrawal from the outer world, extremely high levels of aggression, violent uncontrolled behavior, bizarre and incomprehensible reaction patterns. A wide range of services are essential for the full care of such children. These children need more than individual treatment; they need an all-embracing care which is therapeutic in nature and which includes attention to their total development. For instance, they need individualized, highly skilled attention to their educational and recreational needs; and their daily routine needs to be handled with psychological skill.

Obviously, such treatment is expensive. In our local private institutions the cost ranges from $11,000 to $26,000 per child; in the state of Massachusetts where by law all children have been deinstitutionalized (those in correctional facilities, institutions for mentally retarded, etc.) and placed in small residential treatment facilities, the cost per child is estimated at $7,000 per year. The cost of providing residential treatment services at the Episcopal Church Home for Children in York, South Carolina is $9,115.50 per child, per year. The Executive Director of the Episcopal Church Home for Children, Mr. H. S. Howie, Jr. has stated that "without residential treatment services these children would have to spend their adult lives in state institutions." South Carolina's state Senator Waddell has estimated the cost of keeping a child in a state institution for his life expectancy at $1 million dollars for six children. To the cost of keeping a child institutionalized, we must add the other side of the picture . . . the 40 year work expectancy as a productive human being, the loss in state and federal income tax dollars.

But even more important than all of this . . . how can we measure the cost of the salvaging of a human personality?

Publications from the National Institute of Mental Health state that the average cost, nationwide in 1969 for residential treatment was $9,855 per child.

The D.C. Mental Health Association urgently requests that this Committee act favorably on legislation creating a system of "comprehensive care residential treatment centers." These centers, one for each geographic area of the city, should be kept small and as homelike as possible.

The Congress has already provided funds for constructing two such centers and $600,000 for operating costs, insufficient to run even one of them based on the program budget and staffing plan designed by Dr. Essex Noel, Director of the Mental Health Administration.

What we are requesting you to do today is to authorize the creation and operation of four centers or two more than are currently contemplated. The additional capital cost we estimate at 1.5 million dollars, the yearly operating cost would be approximately 4 million.

These figures are high, the benefits incredibly higher. We would all agree that it is impossible to place a price tag on the saving of a human life. But we also are aware that Congress understandably wants to know what they are buying with every public dollar. Accordingly, if we assume—and this is conservative—that these centers will treat 400 children each every year and that perhaps half of them will, because of the treatment, not have to undergo institutionalization, then, applying Senator Waddell's figures for the life-long lock-up, we will be saving $135 million for this annual expenditure of 4 million on the four centers. Would any of you hesitate to invest your money, let alone the public's in such a proposition?

SPECIAL EDUCATION

As you can see the creation of a system of residential treatment facilities is costly, yet so urgent for the severely ill child. It makes sense, it seems to us, to develop programs that will prevent thousands of children from ever needing residential care. The best way to do this is to improve the Department of Special Education of the D.C. Public Schools.

When we address ourselves to the problems within the Department of Special Education we become the advocate of all children, not just the mentally ill. Children who suffer from any physical handicap—bad vision, bad hearing, dyslexia, slight mental retardation—are particularly vulnerable to becoming emotionally disturbed. So we have a two pronged interest in the Department of Special Education. We are interested in seeing that the child who suffers from serious emotional disturbance is not denied his right to a free public education. Secondly, we are concerned with helping these already "exceptional" children (the ones who are blind, deaf, retarded, suffering from muscular or neuromuscular handicaps) from becoming emotionally disturbed.

The history of special education in D.C. has been one of late development, uneven growth, and constant pressure to do more with limited resources. Thus, quality of programming has suffered. Children now in special education programs are inadequately served because sufficient funds have not been made available.

When the regular classroom teacher believes that the child is not functioning well in the classroom, she refers the child for testing to the Department of Pupil Personnel. After a long wait, the child is finally tested. Then begins the really long wait. Some parents have reported to us that they have waited as long as three years after the child was tested and diagnosed as needing special education, before the child was finally placed in a special education class. In the meantime, the child was disrupting the classroom, making it impossible for the other children to learn. He was not learning at his potential level himself, due to his handicap. Chances are very good that at times his frustration level was overwhelmed and he acted in an aggressive and threatening manner toward his classmates and teacher. If his behavior was bad enough, he was dismissed from the school, and probably roamed the streets until his parents realized he was out of school. In fact, recommendations for special education placement either in the District program or through tuition grants far exceed the present program capacity.

As of the week of September 27, 1971, 1,501 children who require special education services were on "the waiting list" and are not now receiving those services. Most are attending regular elementary school programs.

The Department of Education has no data available on the adolescents or for those children and youth who are not now enrolled in a D.C. public school. The above figure of 1,501 on the waiting list represents only those children attending elementary schools who have actually been identified and diagnosed as needing special education classes. To service these children, a special allocation of $3.5 million dollars is needed immediately.

But that would be just the beginning.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped there are an estimated 18,296 children currently living in D.C. who require special education services. We can only identify 6,264 of them by name; the others are still waiting to be noticed and tested.

To provide special education classes for the children in Washington who need these services would cost $41,566,280 per year. The FY 1972 Budget Request is for $6.995 million. To provide for minimal needs for only those children already identified would cost $10.563 million.

We believe that it is the right of every child in America to receive a free public education that meets his needs. Thousands of children in Washington are being denied this basic right. And their classmates are suffering also, because with so much disruption in the classroom, everyone loses.

For these reasons we believe it is mandatory at this time that Congress enact legislation to assure that funds are appropriated to meet the needs of emotionally disturbed children, and all children who are "exceptional," including the gifted children in our midst. The legislation should be both comprehensive and specifically enforceable. The Statutes of the District now merely provide that specialized instruction for the mentally disturbed child shall be furnished "if such instruction is available." There are no provisions for identification and placement of the child, financing or enforcement.

There is ample precedent for comprehensive legislation. The statutes of all of the states provide for special education of the disturbed child. They vary dramatically in scope and approach—thus approximately one-half of the states require mandatory special education while the other half adopt a voluntary approach. At their best, the state statutes represent an enforceable commitment to the emotionally disturbed child; at their worst, as in the District of Columbia, they are so vague as to be illusory.

We recognize that laws, of themselves, do not effect an instant cure. Thus 30 states during the 1968–1969 school year were serving less than 11% of their emotionally disturbed children. However, legislation evidences a written public policy to recognize, confront and deal with a social ill. Therefore, we support, and hope that your Committee will support when presented to it, legislation for the District of Columbia which:

Requires mandatory education for the exceptional child.

Establishes procedure for identification and placement of the child, and ensures due process for the child and family.

Designates the agency responsible for supervising the program and identifies the program facilities.

Establishes standards for teacher qualification and administrative staff.

Sets forth specific requirements for matters such as continuing evaluation, transportation of children, teacher-child ratios.

Provides for funding and enforcement mechanisms, to guarantee that these funds may only be used for special education and not merged into or diverted to other needs.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that your own state of South Carolina has enacted legislation creating residential treatment facilities for children; your state also has a statute calling for special education for handicapped children.

Again our cost analysis more than justifies our request. For $3.5 million we can handle an additional 1,500 children. If even 25% of them would otherwise be forced out of the school system into institutions, we will save $64 million over their lifetime, a return of close to 20 to 1.

CHILDREN IN FOSTER HOMES

The third and last recommendation we wish to make today concerns small children placed in foster homes in Washington. There are all kinds of reasons why children must be placed in foster homes, and all the reasons are unhappy. Perhaps their parents are separated, mentally ill, in jail, or have recently died. Sometimes simple poverty is the reason why children must be removed temporarily from their natural parents. There are over 500 children between birth and five years of age currently living in foster homes in the Washington area. Some of these homes are terrific. Some are gloomy and dreary.

Even while the search for better foster homes and more skilled and compassionate foster parents goes on, it is imperative that the D.C. government take measures supportive of foster parenthood, and these very high risk children. I say "High-risk" advisedly. A very large percentage of children who have lived in foster homes during the early years of their lives become mentally ill. It is incumbent on us to take preventive measures to protect these children.

The D. C. Mental Health Association embarked on a project five years ago to establish a model of a therapeutic nursery school for children in foster homes. After much careful planning by our most skilled professionals, we opened the "Child Learning Center" at Catholic University of America, in September, 1971. The pilot project, unique in the United States, was funded entirely by money we raised with our annual Bal du Futur.

The Center includes substantive learning of the Head Start type. But more importantly, it's purpose is preventive and therapeutic. The foster mothers assist the teachers, just as mothers in the neighborhood nursery schools do. But here the purpose is for the foster mother to learn specific child rearing techniques. Also, if problems develop, the teachers and social workers are trained to recognize them immediately and intercede to help the child. Weekly parents meetings are held so parents can explore their problems and discuss ways in which they might be more helpful to their children. This nursery school situation works to build the child's self esteem, strengthen the foster mother's understanding of what is going on inside the child, and give her an outlet for problems with her child.

We have built into this Child Learning Center some minimal evaluation techniques, and we hope to assess how this approach has benefited each child this coming June. Our research results will be general and individual.

It is our firm belief that an early childhood education system, perhaps based on the model we have developed, must be designed to meet the needs of children in foster homes, and be made available as soon as possible to these five hundred children in D.C.

Placing these children in foster homes, rather than a large institution, is both healthier for the children and less expensive to the city. We believe that the money saved by placing them in foster homes should be used to provide supportive services to these high-risk children; we believe this early childhood education system is a must for these children.

At Catholic University we are spending $2,000 per child per year. We believe it could be done less expensively by including more children in each nursery school. (We have only ten children in our Center because the physical facility is very small.) We would estimate that this type of model could be duplicated by the city at a cost of approximately $1,500 to $1,800 per child per year.

Our third request, Mr. Chairman, is that your committee act favorably on legislation creating an early childhood education system specifically geared to the needs of children in foster homes.

We are modestly seeking coverage of only 500 children at the outset, Mr. Chairman. Were one-fourth of them to have to go to St. Elizabeth's or jail, society would have to spend $20 million on them, not three-quarters of a million.

SUMMARY

In summary then, the three requests we make of this Committee today are that it act favorably upon legislation affecting these 30,000 or more children.

We ask you to authorize

I. The creation of a system of four "comprehensive care residential centers" for children and adolescents, to be placed in the four health sections of the city.

II. Enact a mandatory special education law.

III. Create a system of early childhood education facilities, including children in foster homes.

If we go home today, having failed to move this committee to action, then we or some other citizen group will come back in a year or two to repeat this request. Meanwhile, the cost of providing services for those needing special attention will easily be twice the substantiated figures or guesstimates we have unfolded to you today.

The cost to society will be horrendous: wasted lives, wasted human potential. There will be more children on drugs, committing crimes, dropping out of school. Continued neglect of these children can only mean continuation of crime, violence, disrupted classrooms, and innumerable unfulfilled and unproductive lives.

We think alternatives are clear: residential treatment services and more drop-outs, more robberies, more assaults, more Lortons, more St. E's, more wasted lives.

I know this kind of testimony is depressing, but so is reading our daily newspapers. We are past the urgent stage. We must provide treatment for these children who are, by anyone's definition, mentally ill. If we are ever to make a dent in the adult mentally ill population, we must begin by treating the problems of our children. We cannot continue to allow children to be sent to correctional institutions, when what they really need is psychiatric treatment.

I know that you recognize that the children of today represent our nation's future, our most precious national resource. In Washington, this morning, many children are out of school because they are emotionally ill and yet they go untreated. Hundreds more are finding their way to detention facilities at Laurel, or to Juvenile Court—something which could have been prevented if services had been readily available a few years ago.

The need is obvious. Our child-care professionals know how to help these troubled children; we know how to rehabilitate them. What we need from this committee is the committee to fill the glaring gaps in service which spell disaster for so many of our children.

COST ANALYSIS

Our request	Additional cost annually	Number of children served	Projected savings over institutionalization (millions)
I. 4 residential treatment centers.	$4,000,000	1,600	$135
II. Special Education	3,500,000	1,500	64
III. Early childhood intervention	750,000	500	20
Total costs	8,250,000	3,600	219

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Representa-

tives join in commemorating Byelorussian Independence Day this year, we should keep in mind the significance of these tributes at a time when our President is preparing for his forthcoming trip to the Soviet Union. The oppression of the people in captive nations and the colonized nations under Soviet control has not ceased with the passing of time, nor have the hopes of those people for freedom ceased to exist.

I want to join with my colleagues in remembering the proclamation of national independence by the Byelorussian people 54 years ago on March 25, 1918. The invasion by the Soviet troops shortly after that independence proclamation has not wiped out the memory of freedom for the people not governed by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. The story of the courageous people of that nation has been told in this Chamber before and each year it is retold during the ceremonies marking the Independence Day.

As the President prepares his agenda for the Soviet Union trip, I wish him success in efforts to lessen world tensions and I urge him to keep in mind the people who have not known the fruits of true freedom or liberty, because of the policies of the Soviet Government. The thoughts of the Byelorussian people and their history will protect us in negotiating the agreements which will alter the future course of world history.

HELP FOR WILDLIFE

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when threats to our wildlife are said to be increasing, the protection and development of good wildlife areas through sound soil and water conservation measures is vital. Among those working to improve wildlife habitat areas, the farmer is a major figure.

In my own State of Illinois, where more than 90 percent of the land is privately owned, wild creatures are dependent almost entirely upon rural landowners to provide them with food, cover, and nesting areas. Farmers furnish animals and birds with much of their food through grain left in the fields, through special plants in areas set aside for wildlife and through cultural practices such as stripcropping, which provide a more favorable habitat for wild creatures. Illinois farmers, who build about 1,200 small pounds each year, and who plant many miles of trees, shrubs, and hedge rows, also provide wildlife with shelter and more abundant water supplies.

An excellent example of this assistance is the Pilgram Wildlife Area, covering some 13,000 acres in Perry County, Ill. It was developed by 35 local landowners or operators, who were aided by the Soil Conservation Service, the Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Illinois Department of Conservation.

To improve their land for wildlife, these 35 farmers planted 15 miles of multiflora rose hedgerows, which serve as corridors to and from nearby croplands and provide protection from weather and predators. About 600 more acres are planted to native grasses, legumes and other food for wildlife, such as buckwheat, lespedezas, and millet. Farm ponds in the Pilgram Wildlife Areas provide about 50 acres of bass, bluegill, and catfish farming, as well as water and nesting places for wild animals and birds.

Many Illinois farmers are deeply involved in providing better habitat for wildlife. They should be commended by all of us who benefit from their work.

NEW YORK CITY PROGRAM AGAINST DRUGS IN HIGH SCHOOLS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the destruction and tragedy caused by drugs in our society. It is particularly distressing to see drugs fall into the hands of the youth of our Nation and to know that many of our high schools have become breeding grounds for drug addiction. The incidence of drug-related deaths among teenagers has risen sharply over the years and many of our high schools are gripped in fear over the infiltration of drug-pushers among the students. The need for a massive preventive and educational effort to combat the spread of drug abuse in our high schools is imperative. Schools can and are more than willing to initiate and take the major responsibility for this drive to keep drugs out of the hands of the young; and many schools have already demonstrated the effectiveness of the drug programs they have instituted. Yet in spite of this and the compelling need for these kinds of programs, the State of New York has announced that they are going to cut off funds now being used by many New York school officials trying to set up drug abuse programs. In an attempt to trim their budget, the State of New York would sacrifice the well-being of their young; this seems to me a ruefully misguided effort.

One very important New York City program, in fact the Nation's largest antidrug program geared toward students, which will effectively be killed by a cutoff of funds, is SPARK—school prevention of addiction through rehabilitation and knowledge. SPARK has nine-member intervention and prevention teams in 12 New York City high schools: Evander Childs, Monroe, and Taft in the Bronx; Boys, Eastern District, and Wingate in Brooklyn; Julia Richman and Seward Park, Manhattan; Flushing, Francis Lewis, and Jackson, Queens; and Susan E. Wagner on Staten Island. SPARK employs professional counselers and former addicts in an intensive effort to keep students away from drugs before drugs can reach them.

In less than a year they counseled more than 133,000 students and achieved amazing results in preventing the spread of drugs and in helping those whom they could not reach in time. SPARK's program director, Mr. Arthur Jaffe, has announced that if the New York State legislature upholds the narcotics addiction control commission's decision not to refund education and preventive efforts, they will toll the death bell for SPARK and many similar programs throughout New York; and, unfortunately, the real victims will be the young people of New York.

Rather than cutting off funds for SPARK and its counterparts, the State should be expanding these efforts and giving these programs every possible means of encouragement. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who are urging the State to reconsider denying funds for preventive and educational programs as greatly needed as SPARK.

THE RAVAGED AND UNPROTECTED CONSUMER

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the average American operates under a basic delusion; that somewhere, somehow, the Federal Government is protecting him and his family from impure food, untested drugs, and hazardous products of many kinds. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Consider the following facts. Four and one-half years after the Flammable Fabrics Act was passed, children are still dying of accidental burnings because their clothing is not made of fireproofed materials. Yet the act in question requires such flameproof fabrics to be on the market for such items. The Commerce Department, as is its wont, sputters feebly whenever anyone inquires of the progress of the measure's enforcement. We must content ourselves with the knowledge that in the eyes of this agency, consumer—particularly child—safety, comes second to the wishes of industry, which simply does not want to spend the money for enforcement. Also, it does not want to allow a precedent to be set of enforcement of a good law, for fear that a plethora of other evils it is hiding will surface and be subject to Government interest, legislation, and enforcement.

The moving industry is a raging scandal, victimizing one of every five Americans who move annually. Rates are fixed. Estimates are deliberately set low. Scheduling exists only in the expectations of the average family hoping that a mover they have contracted with will show up. Yet the Interstate Commerce Commission, charged with policing this noncompetitive industry, acts as if consumers are inconveniencing it when they seek redress for innumerable outrages against them.

Observe the American frankfurter, or hot dog, in the year 1972. Fifteen billion are sold annually. Yet it now offers less

nutrition and more added fat and water than its predecessor did 35 years ago in the days of the Depression. In 1937, U.S. Department of Agriculture tests showed franks to average 19 percent fat and 19.6 percent protein. Today, percentages average out at 28 percent fat and 11.7 percent protein. A permissive USDA looks the other way while processors add 10 percent water, at a minimum.

USDA does not require full labeling of ingredients. It does allow franks to be touted as "all meat" or "all beef," which is a palpable fraud on its face. In this way, portions of beef cattle that could not be sold any other way is peddled to unsuspecting consumers. All edible offal, and just use your imagination, is allowed into such trashdogs and so-called sausage meats. Recently, Consumers Union conducted tests revealing that franks are commonly contaminated. Forty percent of widely available brands contained bacteria counts exceeding 10 million per gram. Putrefaction sets in at the 10 million per gram level.

Nitrite is commonly used as a cosmetic in many meat products. A question of cancer causation has been raised in regard to the effect of consuming nitrites. Consumers have petitioned USDA to ban all cosmetic uses of sodium nitrate and sodium nitrite. A suit has been filed in Federal Court to have USDA ban use of the growth-promoting hormone, stilbestrol, in cattle and sheep. Twenty nations have already banned this cancer-causing hormone. Not the good old USA. Why? Because this administration could care less about the health of consumers. Because the industry in question has far more clout with USDA and FDA than the American public.

There is another Federal agency that is a 14-carat disaster among agencies; that noted scandal of scandals; that collector's items among industry-controlled Government operations; the Food and Drug Administration.

From the same people who brought us Thalidomide and MER 29, we have a mammoth collection of cataclysmic decisions that have harmed uncounted thousands of innocent Americans.

There is the Safe Toy Act, enacted several years ago, which is by and large unenforced by FDA. A Boston lawyer had to come to Washington and show us stark evidence of the toys that maim and kill, before FDA would take even minimal action.

There is the Poison Prevention Packaging Act, designed to place childproof safety closures on the thousands of hazardous products that maim, injure, and kill 600,000 American youngsters under age 5 annually. It has been on the books almost 15 full months and still no product in the Nation is actually being sold with effective childproof safety closures as a direct result of FDA action and enforcement. Hurrah for FDA.

Has your child swallowed any lye in the form of a liquid-lye bowl cleaner recently? You can go out and replace what he or she drank by buying such horrible substances over the counter at your corner store. FDA has only published preliminary childproof safety standards on these and a few other products. Nothing is being done to really hold manufacturers' feet to the fire of enforcement in this area. Only aspirin and oil-based furniture polishes have had final compliance orders published in the Federal Register. And it will be months, at least, before safety tops are actually emplaced on these products.

I could continue these horror stories indefinitely, for it is important that Americans discover the disgusting but true facts about the Government operations they pay massive quantities of taxes for, but which do not give them even a modicum of protection in return.

It points out that the American consumer is not being granted any kind of real security by his Government.

The regulatory agency structure is a fourth level of Government, and is charged with a number of utterly vital functions in the area of consumer protection. Almost without exception, these agencies have become the captives of those they are supposed to regulate. This is especially pronounced under this administration.

Ordinarily, one could simply laugh it off and expect that eventually matters would improve. Such is not the case. Situationwise, this state of affairs is growing worse daily.

What is called for is a major reform on behalf of the consumer. A series of consumer protection functions should be stripped from agencies presently possessing them, commencing with FDA. This agency is so incredibly bad that to term it merely incompetent is to compliment its functionaries. Stronger words could easily be employed, but this is not the time or place for them. Such enforcement and consumer protection powers should be vested in a new agency entirely, set up solely for the purpose of protecting the consumer. That agency should have significant power, complete with subpena authority. Once such an operation is functioning, it should look into the reform not only of the specific evils I have just pinpointed, but into other areas as well. I speak of guarantees and warrantees made by companies that are not lived up to when consumers seek redress.

Life insurance is another area requiring a careful investigation. Trading stamps and phony promotion games utilized by oil companies to defraud the public are high on the list of reform. The entire area of drug pricing and ingredient labeling is literally shrieking for exposure, and deserves it immediately.

One could exhaust time and encroach upon eternity in listing the evils that are emptying consumer wallets, harming consumers themselves, and undermining cumulative public confidence in the marketplace as a whole.

Suffice it to say that people are dying, being crippled, being injured, and defrauded daily because Government will not protect them against shoddy goods, services, and practices. The very approach of Government is from a false philosophical premise: that it is more important not to harm industry than it is vital to protect human beings from harm.

Anyone for hot dogs?

CHURCHMEN REPORT ON U.S. BUSINESSES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in November 1971 an ecumenical church team of 14 persons visited South Africa to research and report on the involvement of U.S. corporations in that society. The participants were representatives of the Episcopal Church, the United Presbyterian Church, the American Baptist Convention, and the United Church of Christ. They visited the Chrysler Corp., the First National City Bank of New York, the Ford Motor Co. of South Africa, the General Motors Corp., International Business Machines Corp., Mobil Oil Corp., Frank & Hirsch—distributors for Polaroid—Caltex—Standard Oil of California and Texaco—Standard Bank—partially owned by Chase Manhattan—and Goodyear Rubber Co. Their premise is that U.S. investment in Southern Africa is a focus for church concern and action. Mr. Speaker, I commend their report and insert it in the RECORD for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues.

The report follows:

U.S. INVESTMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA—A FOCUS FOR CHURCH CONCERN AND ACTION

(A report by an ecumenical Church team who visited South Africa in November, 1971 to research and report on the involvement of U.S. corporations in that land)

Southern Africa has become an area of major world concern. Throughout the subcontinent the majority of the people are denied participation in the governments which rule them, nor is such participation an accepted goal of the white minority regimes there.

The basic facts are that in South Africa, Namibia (South West Africa), Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), and the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique, 36 million Africans, Asians, and Coloreds (mixed blood) are living under governments controlled by 5 million whites, governments which, by their laws and policies deny "non-whites"* effective representation or participation.

In Mozambique whites represent 1 per cent of the population; in Angola 4 per cent; in Rhodesia 4.6 per cent; in Namibia 14 per cent; and in South Africa 19 per cent. Opposition to minority rule is particularly evident in the Portuguese colonies. In Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, the African Movements for independence have been fighting the Portuguese for the last ten years in a war that is largely unreported in the American press.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Under the banner of white supremacy the Nationalist Party came to power in 1948. At this stage the Nationalists's schemes of apartheid were crude white supremacist policies, and it was not until the advent to power of Dr. Verwoerd that a previously unschematic historic process was refined into a systematized program.

White fear of black domination has been an abiding factor in South African history. It was indeed "the South African way of life" that whites should rule and blacks should be

their servants, but the Nationalists brought a religious fervor to this way of life, sincerely believing that they had supplanted the Jews as God's chosen people.

Dr. Verwoerd, then editor of the *Afrikaans* newspaper, Die Transvaler, said of the 1948 victory: "That which seemed humanly impossible was possible to God who has always watched over Afrikanerdom. It behooves each and all of us who contributed to the victory to thank Him in prayer for what He has brought to pass." [1]

Population of South Africa at the 1970 census was 15 million Africans, 4 million whites, 2 million Coloreds, and half a million Asians.

The basic pieces of legislation under which apartheid is maintained and extended are the Population Registration Act of 1950 and the Group Areas Act of 1950.

The first Act classified people into racial categories based on skin color, descent, general acceptance and repute. The second imposed compulsory residential segregation on whites, Coloreds, Malays, Asians and Africans. The Population Registration Act also provided for the issuance of identify papers to people of all races, except African men who were already forced to carry "pass books". These "pass books" are an essential component of police and government control over Africans.

To blacks the pass book is a symbol of servile status, characterized by mass raids, arrests and imprisonment. Between 1951 and 1962 an average of 339,255 people [2] were convicted under pass law offenses each year. By 1968–69 the figure had risen to 632,077 [3] people who were sent for trial for infringing the pass laws.

Based on the racial categories set down in 1950, and utilizing a vast body of previous racist legislation, the apartheid system is aimed at depriving "non-whites" of all social, political, and in fact, all basic human rights. Inter-racial marriage is, of course, forbidden, as are sexual relations between members of different races. All public social activities, public services, education, housing, transport, and sports are rigidly segregated.

Africans ("Natives" or "Bantu" in the pejorative language of South African legislation) do not have the right to vote, and South Africa's array of security laws prohibits them from participating in any meaningful political activity aimed at changing apartheid.

LAWS

The provisions of the security laws include the following laws:

The Suppression of Communism Act, which has been strengthened and broadened by 80 amendments since 1950, is so loose in its definitions that almost any form of difference with the South African government's policies may be and has been labelled Communism. One key clause in this law declares that any person deemed a Communist by the head of State is subject to punishment under the Act.[4]

The government has repeatedly used this power to silence opponents. South African law frequently is drafted so that it can be used as a political weapon; e.g., one clause of the Terrorism Act defines terrorism as "embarrassing the state in the administration of its affairs." Such phrases can be applied to any political activity, enabling the government to harass, intimidate, and destroy any opposition. The burden of proof under both the Suppression of Communism and the Terrorism Acts rests with the defendant, who is thus guilty until proven innocent.

The government has banned all organizations that effectively represent black opinion, and their leaders have been imprisoned or banned. (Many people have died while being interrogated by the Security Police.) The government maintains an extensive spy network to root out any political opposition.

Finally, the Minister of Police and Justice has the power to place anyone in solitary confinement for indefinite detention. He does not have to lay any charges, nor show any violation of the law. There is no appeal to the courts.

"BANTUSTANS"

The main focus of the government's policy of territorial apartheid is to force Africans out of the cities and on to rural reservations or "Bantustans". It has been estimated that under various pieces of legislation more than 1.1 million South Africans have been forced to move. Of these, more than 900,000 were Africans and only 2,624 were whites.[5]

The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 ostensibly allows Africans to govern themselves in their "homelands", but in reality it concedes little more than local government functions. More importantly, the central government exercises close supervision, controls most significant fiscal functions and maintains an ultimate veto over actions of local councils, including selection of the candidates for a majority of the members. This Act was designed to separate the Bantustans from the political life of the nation—in that it has largely succeeded. All the urban areas are, of course, classified as "white areas", where Africans are considered temporary migrant laborers.

The reserves established by this and other legislation, in which the Africans had no effective voice, consist of 260 separate land areas, occupying a total of 6,500 square miles. Yet the reserves, encompassing less than 14 per cent of the country are supposed to contain and support 70 per cent of the population,[6] an impossible task.

Land on the reserves is desperately overworked; it cannot possibly provide the food and cash crops to maintain the present population, let along the large numbers of people that the stepped-up government enforcement of the resettlement laws brings in each year. Rather than bases for "separate development", the reserves are, in fact, "vast slums whose chief export is their manpower." [7]

BORDER INDUSTRIES PROGRAM

As part of a program to remove blacks from the cities, the government's Border Industries Program, aiming for decentralization of industry, provides incentives ranging from tax rebates to direct participation in capital costs to encourage corporations to build new facilities adjacent to the reserves. Thus, in addition to the substantial Government incentives, they get an abundant supply of cheap labor from among those who have been forced to resettle on the reserves. As a rule, wages in the border areas are one-half as much as those in the cities from which the African workers have been ejected. Any company building a new factory in a border area is a direct accomplice in the government's racist policy of removing blacks to the reserves.

INFLUX CONTROL

Although millions of Africans are still allowed to work in the cities,[8] there is an elaborate system of control over their movements, based on the checking and stamping of pass books. With minor exceptions, *all* Africans working in the cities are treated as temporary migrant laborers, "visitors who will never be entitled to any political rights." [9] For example:

No African residing in a town by virtue of a work permit issued to him is entitled to have his wife and children living with him unless he renounces all rights to live any place other than where the government sends him. (This creates a tremendous break up of African family life and creates thousands of married "bachelors" in the cities.)

No friend is entitled to visit him for more than 72 hours.

If he loses his job and cannot find another, he must go back to the reserve set aside for his tribute, even though he may never have been there and may have no relatives there.[10]

ECONOMICS AND APARTHEID

Economically, apartheid affects the kinds of jobs, wages, living conditions and fringe benefits that whites and "non-whites" may achieve.

The economic effect of apartheid, designed to ensure that the white minority retains control of and the major share of the national wealth, has the following results. Whites, constituting some 19.2 per cent of the population, receive an estimated 73.3 per cent of all cash income. In 1969, per capita income for Africans was $117 per year, compared with $1,591 for whites. In fact, whites in South Africa enjoy a standard of living that is in general higher than in Europe and taxes on income are lower than in most European countries.[11] Part of the reason for the relative affluence of the white South African is, of course, imbedded in the apartheid system. Servants are cheap and readily available, many locally-manufactured products are priced well below comparable items elsewhere due to the low labor costs in South Africa, and so on. It is fair to say that white South Africa's affluence is based solidly on the exploitation of the country's African, Asian and Colored inhabitants.

EMPLOYMENT

By law and custom, no "non-white" can ever hold a supervisory position over a white. All skilled or otherwise desirable jobs are reserved for whites.

"Job reservation", initiated as part of the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956, protects whites from competition in certain types of skilled employment.[12] Under this system, applied to several major industries, only a white may replace a white in a certain job, only a white or a Colored may replace a Colored, down to the African who may be replaced by anyone. An employer may request an exception to this law in order to fill essential jobs for which there is a shortage of trained personnel of proper race, but the government retains exclusive discretion over the granting of these concessions.

Unions are another example of the disenfranchisement of the "non-white". As early as 1942 some strikes by Africans were outlawed. Under the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, African workers continued to be denied the right to be considered an "employee." It follows that a non-person cannot negotiate labor agreements, so that the existence of African labor unions, which have no legal status, becomes meaningless. Africans are forbidden to strike. All negotiations on behalf of African workers are carried on by the Bantu Labour Board, composed of officials of the same government that denied them the right to negotiate for themselves. Colored unions do exist, but their powers are severely limited, so that, in effect, the ony meaningful negotiations are those between the white management and its white employees. The "non-white" majority is, once again, powerless.

EDUCATION

Whereas education is in most nations a catalyst for economic advancement, in South Africa it is a dead end street dedicated to keeping Africans as "hewers of wood and drawers of water". Education is compulsory for white, but not for black South Africans. The government spends approximately $20 a year per "non-white" child for education, $320 a year—or 16 times as much—per white child. Schoolbooks are free for whites but Africans must pay for them. In addition students are initially taught in their "native" tongue.

Since the laws in South Africa are made by an all-white group, they inevitably work to strengthen white prosperity, privilege and control. This then is the milieu within which U.S. investors must do business.

WHY WE WENT

American churches have long exhibited an interest in the peoples of Africa, and have

Footnote at end of article.

been involved in mission work on that continent for more than 150 years.

In recent years American churches have emphasized in their mission undertakings that mission must be carried out *with* persons, not *to* them, and with a concern for the totality of the person.

A new understanding of mission and of stewardship that is emerging concerns the responsible use of the churches' investments.

Churches in the United States traditionally have used their investment portfolios to earn revenue for the support of religious work. The *source* of this revenue, however, is now becoming of increasing concern.

As churches receive the dividends from corporations, they also have a moral responsibility for the manner in which these profits are made.

Fifty years ago, most major Protestant denominations decided to refrain from investing in companies involved in the production or sale of alcoholic beverages or tobacco. In the mid-1960's, several denominations elected to use their stockholder rights to express their concern about the racial policies of Kodak, at the annual meeting, when the issue was the employment of black workers in Rochester, New York. In the late sixties, churches joined with other groups, including the United Nations, in expressing concern over a $40 million line of credit granted to the Republic of South Africa by ten major banks in the United States. The line of credit has since been cancelled.

In 1971 the Episcopal Church filed a stockholder motion for consideration by General Motors stockholders, urging the company to wind up all operations in South Africa. The United Presbyterian Church, the United Church of Christ, and others carried on conversations in 1970 and 1971 with the management of Gulf Oil Corporation concerning that company's business in Angola. The Southern Africa Task Force of the United Presbyterian Church filed a motion proposing, among other things, that Gulf withdraw from the Portuguese colony of Angola because its investment substantially strengthens Portuguese colonial control.

Each of these involvements has been an effort by churches to be responsible in the use of their investments, by coordinating those investments with their ethical and mission concerns. Thus the role of American industry in South Africa is a growing concern within churches as well as other institutional and individual stockholders.

American Christians and the churches of which they are members are forced to consider the following questions:

1. What is my responsibility if I am an investor in a company operating in southern Africa?

2. Can I as a Christian derive, without question, profits from a company which, in southern Africa, operates with immoral codes, laws, and practices?

3. Can I as a United States citizen justify passive participation in a company whose operations in southern Africa defy our national principles and policies for human rights?

4. How do I use my stockholder rights and responsibilities to bring pressure to bear on these corporations to affect their operations in southern Africa?

Recently the highest policy-making bodies of several major American Protestant churches have adopted guidelines for investments as a means of putting their concerns into practice. Further, they have authorized cooperative efforts with other denominations to strentghen the impact of these policies.

Based on such policies, and concerned with the basic injustice in southern Africa, six denominations recently sent 15 representatives to visit South Africa in order to examine the involvement of United States corporations in that country, particularly those in which the churches hold stock. It was the hope and plan of the team to visit the Gulf Oil facilities at Cabinda, Angola, as well, but after weeks of delay and without explanation, the Portuguese government rejected the team members' applications for visas—two days before their scheduled arrival in Angola.)

The Consultation, therefore, went to South Africa with the purpose of gathering facts from employers and employees, and other interested parties, regarding the role of American corporations in which many of our denominations are shareholders, as well as to gain a better understanding of the general situation in southern Africa.

A SENSE OF URGENCY—WHY WE MUST BE CONCERNED

The problems of justice in South Africa are not those of that nation alone, they affect all of us around the world.

Let it be clear that South Africa is not the only nation with problems of racial justice. Nonetheless, it is a nation in which an official policy of white supremacy is in operation—designed and enforced by a white minority government.

Control of government and the lives of the black majority in Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola also rests in the hands of a white minority. The concern of American Christians for the situation in southern Africa is based on a number of factors:

1. There is no moral defense for a philosophy and policy of racism and colonialism.

2. The racial policies of South Africa are contrary to the policies of the world community as expressed by the United Nations, and to the principles of the United States.

3. The policies of South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese colonies are a potential source of racial war internally as well as between the white-ruled nations and black Africa.

4. Such massive investments in southern Africa by American corporations creates a vested interest in the preservation of the status quo, which is a strong influence on the formation and conduct of United States foreign policy.

UNITED STATES CORPORATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

South African government figures show that more than three hundred United States corporations operate in South Africa, with a total investment in 1969 of $834 million—an increase of 80 per cent over 1964. American investments represent 15 per cent of all foreign investment in South Africa. In 1969 it provided an average annual return of 16.8 percent ($127 million) of book value as compared with a world average of 11.3 per cent—the richest return on American capital invested abroad except for foreign oil fields.

American investment in South Africa constituted only 1 per cent of all U.S. foreign investment in 1969 but produced 1.6 per cent of all foreign earnings. About 50 per cent of U.S. investment in South Africa is in manufacturing—automobile manufacture and assembly, drugs, cosmetics, industrial equipment and machinery, tire and rubber manufacture, and tractor and farm equipment and distribution. Other substantial U.S. investments are in petroleum, mining and smelting.

However, U.S. investment in South Africa is much more significant to that country than the dollar amounts would indicate. American investment figures prominently in the key sectors of the economy that in turn stimulate the economy as a whole.

For instance, U.S. companies control at least 50 per cent of the auto market. This becomes of vastly greater significance when one considers the allied industrial growth stimulated by the auto manufacturing industry in tire and components manufacturing, road, highway and bridge construction, oil refining, and service station construction.

In addition the inflow of American technological knowhow and personnel cannot be discounted.

The Consultation realizes that when American corporations operate in foreign countries, they assume a number of obligations. There is the obligation to fulfill the expectations of the government of the host country which gives them the legal right to engage in business. They must, therefore, further the general political and economic goals set by the government of that country.

Corporations must also help to create a climate of public opinion or public acceptance of their product and/or presence, which will enable them to operate profitably in that country. However, recent history has shown that acceptance and approval by a few leaders of the government, industry and commerce is different from the acceptance and approval which comes when the majority of the people in a country recognize the corporation as operating with *their* interests also in mind.

Nevertheless, these corporations also represent the United States: American know-how, openness to change, and creativity, as well as American ideals of liberty and justice for all. Indeed, the total American system symbolically participates in the lives of various countries through the involvement of American industry and commerce.

ENGAGEMENT AND DISENGAGEMENT

One question confronting a group analyzing the role of U.S. business in South Africa is what is popularly known as the "engagement versus disengagement" dispute. There are arguments to the effect that the presence of U.S. firms in South Africa benefits rather than harms "non-whites". Others argue that the investment of one billion American dollars strengthens the white minority government in its control over the majority. A summary of some of the arguments used by both sides follows.

Proponents of engagement or continued U.S. investment feel that this creates jobs and money for all races, aiding the growth of a black middle class with increasing job and social mobility, and increased economic power. Education and economic growth, they argue, are a key to social change; withdrawal would only hurt the "non-white" South African. Moreover, they point out, strict apartheid and economic growth are incompatible, with the economy's need for "non-white" skilled labor conflicting with ideological imperatives.

Critics point to the ever widening economic gap between white "haves" and the African, Asian, and Colored "have nots", and that over the last decade an expanding economy has in fact seen an increase in repression and a loss rather than a gain in political and human rights for the "have nots".

While a few blacks might make it to a sort of middle class the vast majority would still under systematic racism, they argue. And, while withdrawal would economically inconvenience Africans, Asians and Coloreds as well as whites, it is clear that many black people would support disengagement if this would challenge the white government to alter its policies.

Recent events in Rhodesia would tend to support this point of view. In spite of all protestations to the contrary by the Smith government, the Rhodesian economy has been hard hit by sanctions, adversely affecting Africans who were unable to find jobs on a contracting labor market. But this most economically disadvantaged sector of the economy have shown their strong disapproval of Britain's proposed settlement which would set the economy moving again, but also legitimitize minority rule there. This indicates that they are prepared to bear the burden of economic hardship if this would further their claims to basic human rights. The desire for freedom outweighs narrow economic considerations.

The action of the Ovambo people of Namibia taking part in a mass strike in defiance of South African laws is another illustration of this. The strikers demanded repatriation to Ovambo (Ovamboland) where they

were at all stages faced with the possibility of starvation if their actions were unsuccessful, or with brutal repression by the South African authorities in attempts to break their strike The strikers still chose this more difficult course.

Other arguments by advocates of engagement point directly at United States self-interest. They say that the United States needs South Africa because it is a major source of strategic materials, it is a stable, pro-American anti-Communist state, and controls the strategically important Cape sea route. Also, corporations can expect an average annual profit of 17 per cent which could possibly reach 30 per cent.

Opponents point out that this is the sort of logic which leads American into Vietnam-type situations. What happens to America's international image and her image at home if we oppose Communism at the cost of allying ourselves with a racial dictatorship? In fact, they contend, if revolution comes to South Africa the new government may well be anti-American since we had so little regard for black needs. It is true to say, also, that much of the legislation which has been used to suppress genuine black political aspirations in recent years was passed with the alleged purpose of "combatting Communism". Finally, high corporate profits made at the cost of exploiting cheap black labor should not necessarily be seen as a credit to America.

U.S. companies often explain that they cannot be involved in politics but are merely in South Africa doing business as usual. Besides, they are quick to add, if U.S. companies withdrew other companies would swiftly come in to replace them.

But critics state that investors in South Africa are inevitably involved in politics in a country where laws and custom are dominated by questions of race. The sale of a computer, the establishment of a new plant, assistance given to a government sponsored oil search, the decision to upgrade a black worker or sell supplies to the military, all have political overtones. One cannot escape from politics in South Africa.

In South Africa economics are dominated by political considerations and, therefore, any investor automatically is involved in furthering the political and economic goals of the white minority government. This is simply a fact of life in South Africa.

In addition, this massive infusion of much-needed foreign capital has clear political implications. As for other foreign companies taking their place if a U.S. firm withdrew, it is strange to argue that because others would do wrong if we did not, we should, therefore, continue. Furthermore, South Africa economic state is uncertain because of inflation and there are many indications that foreign business would not move in to replace U.S. firms if they withdrew. This might be the very time that a withdrawal by U.S. companies would tell white South Africa that apartheid is no longer acceptable to the world.

Advocates of disengagement or withdrawal of U.S. business contend that U.S. firms strengthen the unjust status quo in South Africa in many ways and we should in no way assist that system of discrimination and minority rule. They insist that American firms comfortably follow discriminatory laws which ensure that white South Africans are always given first preference and continued privilege on the basis of skin color.

Further, they reason, U.S. investment has helped strengthen and diversify the South African economy. This has advanced government plans to make South Africa impervious to outside influences so that white supremacy can continue unchallenged. They argue that American investment contributes to a healthy economy, reducing the possibility of dissension within white ranks as the government can silence opposition by pointing to increasing white prosperity. In fact it was only in 1970, when white bank balances were, for the first time, being affected by the country's economic ills, that voters reversed the trend of continually increasing support for the Nationalist Party, and the government lost seats in an election for the first time since 1948.

Finally, those supporting disengagement query U.S. contributions to South Africa's military potential which strengthens her ability to suppress possible internal protest by the majority. They conclude that U.S. firms bolster rather than weaken apartheid or minority rule and that companies should withdraw and cease any form of support for a system we abhor.

SOME SPECIFIC COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS ON U.S. COMPANIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

1. While every American company visited stated that they felt themselves to be "good" and "progressive" employers, we found that American companies as a general rule are not more enlightened in their employment practices nor in their sensitivity to the South African situation than are other companies in South Africa.

It must be made plain here that American corporations in South Africa reflect the customs and practices of that country rather than those of the United States. They are not notably "better" or "more humane" than the average South African or foreign corporation. The black workers with whom we talked by no means believed that American firms are more enlightened than other firms.

Local managements of the companies visited were consistent in their declarations that their presence does not mean their companies approve of the policies of apartheid. Many agreed that their past behavior has been too unquestioning of the customs of South Africa; they agreed that more could be done within the law to treat black employees more justly; and they acknowledged the value and necessity of outside pressure to bring about change.

2. Management in the U.S. does not necessarily get clear reporting of their "non financial" South Africa operations.

At General Motors we were told that South African management had reported to their Detroit headquarters that they had 30 employees in a minorty training program. According to a report given us by black employees, there are only 8 trainees in fact.

Although all companies indicated that they report regularly to their parent companies, in no case was there an indication of clear guidelines in terms of race relations on what these reports should contain.

Again at GM, management reported there were 60 "nonwhites" receiving technical training at a technical school. In actuality, GM workers reported they were getting very little technical training. Rather, they were being taught elementary drawing, arithmetic, and communications skills, even though many of the people have had this instruction already. There are no blacks in this program; only Coloreds.

At Ford, we were told that black and white employees receive the same food even though in separate dining rooms. Our own observation was that they received distinctly different menus. The white workers received meat and the black workers received rice and eggs.

We conclude that reporting by management in South Africa to their U.S. mannent and others is often not accurate, and therefore management in the U.S. paints a positive picture of their South African operations without sufficient data.

In addition it is often painfully clear to us from conversations with management both here in the United States and in South Africa that there is often a general ignorance of the real conditions which African, Asian and Colored South Africans face in their daily lives. This of course affects the company's labor policies in South Africa and adds to misinformation in the United States about South Africa.

Few, if any, managers in South Africa have any meaningful contact with "nonwhites" outside of normal working relations. One member of an auto company's management team in South Africa admitted that he had never been in a "township", which is the segregated residential area for Africans. He, therefore, had no first hand experience of the terrible slums Africans are forced to live in.

3. Most companies do not pay "equal pay for equal work" despite their assertions that they do. It was our observation that many workers doing the same or comparable work were not receiving comparable pay. In addition the question of equal pay for equal work must be seen in the light of whether or not there are the same jobs open for black and white employees.

Many U.S. firms engage in "fragmentation" or breaking down of a job so that a task done by one white would be performed by two or three "non-whites", so that the equal pay concept did not apply.

Chrysler clearly said they do not pay equal pay for equal work, because the law of supply and demand and the pressure and privileges of white unions forces them to pay more to whites.

Goodyear management in South Africa said clearly they gave equal pay for equal work, then noted a differential between the starting pay of black and white workers, and finally clarified that those employed as tire builders are paid an equal piecework rate. Outside of tire building, our understanding of Goodyear policies do not indicate equal pay for equal work.

All this is in the light of the fact that provisions of the law do not prohibit equal pay for equal work, even though this has not been the custom.

More important than the question of equal pay for equal work is whether U.S. firms pay living wages to workers. Most U.S. firms follow the wage pattern in South Africa which pays "starvation" level wages to thousands of African, Asian and Colored employees. (Africans fare the worst.) It is indefensible that a U.S. company should be paying an employee doing an honest day's work a wage which is inadequate for his family to live on.

The Poverty Datum Line or "breadline" is estimated to be $100 a month for an average African family by the white Johannesburg City Council. But the "minimum effective income" level at which an average African family can live decently is estimated to be $140 a month by the white Johannesburg Chamber of Commerce. The South African Institute of Race Relations, among others, has urged that companies pay all employees wages at least equal to minimum effective income level instead of the poverty level.

All U.S. firms we interviewed paid most "non-white" employees well below that minimum effective level. In 1970 Chrysler's Pretoria plant paid an average monthly wage of $85 to African workers. Ford management told us in South Africa in 1971 that African workers in their Port Elizabeth factory averaged $123 a month (obviously starting workers make much less.)

Mobil management contended that they did not keep records of their wage levels but further research showed that Mobil paid a monthly starting wage of between $52 and $76 to "non-white" employees.

Needless to say white South African workers in these plants make excellent salaries.

The cause of this broad diversity in wage scales between whites and blacks is based not on a free labor market, but on the basis that blacks are not allowed by law to organize themselves or use traditional powers of withdrawal of their services, i.e. strikes. Therefore, any correctional steps are in the hands of corporate management. It is unconscionable that American firms pay wages below the "minimum effective level" for Africans, Asians and Coloreds.

4. The problem of justifying certain hiring practices on the basis of job reservation laws versus the role of "ancient custom".

Many companies argue that they are not able to train and advance black workers into more meaningful job categories because of restrictions by South African law. In fact, this appears to be more an example of following the norms and customs of South Africa rather than any particular law. The Job Reservation Act only applies to a very small percentage of businesses, therefore, most companies would be free under the law to advance their non-white employees and train them for better jobs at a much faster rate than they are doing.

It was clear in testimony from companies such as Mobil, re their office force and computer technicians, and all the oil companies interviewed in terms of their sales representatives, that job reservation does not apply by law to them. Below 3 per cent of all the jobs in South Africa are covered by specific reference in the Job Reservation Act, however, practically every manager with whom we talked expressed a fear that the government would impose additional limitations if they made any visible or aggressive steps in the training or advancement on "non-white" employees.

In contrast however, Polaroid reported to us in South Africa and subsequently in their statement of December 30, 1971, that the government has not intervened in nor attempted to interrupt their efforts towards non-white advancement.

The general excuse of U.S. firms is exemplified by a statement of Ford management that their company "is not discriminating on the basis of race or color, except insofar as legislation compels us".

5. Corporate planning by American industry in South Africa does not lead to programs which bring even minimal change within South Africa. For example, company grants made to universities are made overwhelmingly to white institutions. This tends to perpetuate the status quo.

Grants are made by U.S. companies to the South Africa Foundation, whose primary function is to lobby internationally for support of South Africa. Among the companies which have contributed to this Foundation are John Deere, Caterpillar, Mobil Oil, Caltex, International Harvester, Union Carbide, Chrysler, General Motors, and Barlow-Weyerhauser.

American companies belong to Industrial Councils which set wage levels in given industries. Company interests are represented at such meetings as are white workers, but the interests of African, Asian and Colored workers, the majority of the work force, are minimally represented at best.

In the absence of any right of African employees to organize, bargain collectively, or strike, Industrial Council meetings allow the companies to set minimum wages for their employees at the lowest possible level.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

At a minimum, American firms doing business in South Africa can be expected to require at least the following:

1. Recognition in good faith of bargaining representatives for "non-whites".

2. A minimum wage which takes into account the poverty datum line and minimum effective living level for an average family for all "non-white" workers.

3. Fair job classifications and upward mobility for "non-whites."

4. Comparable pay for comparable work (i.e., "equal pay for equal work").

5. Employment of "non-whites" in personnel departments and management.

6. Recognition of human equality in manner of address, treatment, and respect.

EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

7. Equal benefits for "non-whites" in matters of health, disability, retirement, and death benefits, on a non-contributory basis. This should include sick leave and pay.

8. The general lack of medical and dental services for "non-whites" requires that free medical and dental service be provided for "non-white" employees and their families.

9. The general lack of educational opportunity for "non-whites" requires that free vocational and educational assistance be offered to "non-white" employees as well as to their children (including libraries.)

10. The lack of minimally adequate and safe housing and transportation facilities require that company housing and transportation facilities be made available for "non-white" employees.

11. American firms should also provide free family counseling services and credit unions.

12. Profit-sharing plans, including ownership of company stock, should also be developed for "non-white" employees.

13. The harassment of "non-whites" by the police and courts requires that companies should provide free legal assistance to their "non-white" employees and their families.

GENERAL

14. Exemplary life-style by management—e.g. servants' wages, memberships, residences, personal relationships and behavior.

15. Utilization of "non-white" suppliers.

16. No further donations to organizations inside South Africa which support the status quo. Creative grants to groups working for social change.

17. Use of influence with the South African government to press for changes in restrictive laws and regulations.

18. Challenge of restrictive laws in the courts.

19. Reinvestment of all South African profits in the above programs until social change is evident.

20. No further investment from the United States unless earmarked for one or more of the above programs.

21. Quarterly review by U.S. management of South African activities of their company and reports in detail to shareholders.

Polaroid Corporation has been involved in a program called the "Polaroid Experiment" which includes several of the suggestions on this list. A November 1971 special report done on the Polaroid Experiment by the Institute of Race Relations concluded that as far as its impact on black wage levels in the country was concerned (1) "if it was intended to significantly improve the wages and working conditions of black South Africans in general it must be regarded as a failure" and (2) "if the intention was to create greater social concern among businessmen, it appears to have been moderately successful".

Even beyond this, Polaroid's contention that their program if adopted by other companies helps bring about social change is open to serious question. We do not propose this list to American companies under the illusory belief that following such a program would bring about the systemic change needed in South Africa. Rather we see it as a list of actions which would bring U.S. firms towards the status of a fair employer after decades of dependence on unfair labor practices to produce high profits.

THE OVERALL CONTRIBUTION OF U.S. INVESTMENT TO SOUTH AFRICA

The question of employment and labor relations in operation in South Africa is a real one. However, our concern for the plight of Black, Asian and Colored workers must also be seen in the light of the contribution a company may make to a strategic sector of the economy, economically strengthening South Africa to the extent that the white control and military power is bolstered.

A meaningful evaluation of the role of a company in South Africa must go beyond labor practices to examine the contribution of a firm to white minority government. For instance, what products does a company make that are used by the white police and military? Does a company's investment follow the long range political and economic plan of the government? Does this involvement bolster the confidence of the white electorate?

Even though, for example, IBM labor practices may be commendable, their leasing of a 360/50 computer for government use in the Population Registration Act directly assists the police state in suppressing dissent and controlling the activities of the Asian and Colored population.

For example, GM, Chrysler and Ford by following the government's local content program (which demands that cars must be built with a certain percentage of local products) have assisted the government in substantially strengthening and diversifying the South African economy and making it impervious to outside pressures. Products from these companies are also available to the military.

U.S. petroleum companies are actively engaged in a South African government program to search for and refine oil. According to the South African Financial Mail, a business magazine, "it was a political move that probably got South African oil prospecting off the ground; a United Nations resolution towards the end of 1963 urging member states to stop supplying oil to South Africa . . . But the lesson was not lost on Pretoria: South Africa would be in real trouble if its oil imports were ever cut off". Mobil and Caltex (jointly owned by Standard Oil of California and Texaco) control approximately 44 per cent of the market for all petroleum products in South Africa and several other U.S. firms are active in exploring.

Thus, our concern is not merely for the labor practices of U.S. companies in the Republic of South Africa but for the ways U.S. companies may strengthen the whole system of minority rule.

OUR CONCLUSION

Apartheid is wrong.

It imposes inferior status on some of God's people solely on the basis of their race. It promotes the domination of a large number of these people by a much smaller number of white people. It is dehumanizing and it is undemocratic.

Based on our understanding of the Scriptures and our first-hand knowledge of the situation in South Africa, we are convinced that any cooperation with or strengthening of apartheid is contrary to the fundamentals of Christianity.

Some of the participants in this Consultation believe that if American corporations adopted vigorous new policies they might, over a period of many years, make a contribution to improving the lot of the "non-white" worker.

Most of us believe that American corporations should totally disengage from southern Africa; that the presence of American corporations in which we are shareholders undergirds the system of racism colonialism and apartheid which prevails in southern Africa.

And we are unanimous in our conviction that American companies in southern Africa are not doing that which they are able to do and ought to be doing with regard to their "non-white" employees. But even progressive employment policies on the part of American companies will not bring the basic changes in society that we support because of our Christian commitment to freedom, justice and self-determination.

We acknowledge that the church of Jesus Christ has failed in its own responsibilities—in the U.S., South Africa and around the world—to help bring about that change in systemic racism to which the Gospel commits us.

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

What can concerned Christians do, individually or together, in the light of the situation? The following are some suggestions. They do not represent all that can be done, but point to a number of possibilities.

1. Be informed yourself. Read and discuss all sides of these issues.

2. Inform others: write letters to editors of publications (especially newspapers), use radio and television, including forum-type programs.

3. Encourage study by local church groups and others on Church investment policies and southern Africa.

4. Investigate the investment policies, practices and portfolios of your local church and those of your regional church bodies as well as those of your pension fund, colleges, labor unions, stock clubs, and other groups. What are their holdings in companies with investments in southern Africa?

5. Visit or correspond with companies investing in southern Africa. Ask them about their policies.

6. Exercise your stockholder rights. Take part in stockholder meetings or send a representative. Initiate or support stockholder actions regarding southern Africa.

7. Speak up. Inform your government officials—local, state, and national—of your views. Seek their support and encourage them to speak out.

8. Consider what products, services and investments you buy on the basis of companies' policies, and inform those with whom you do business of your decisions.

9. Get further information from the appropriate agency of your denomination, or other groups concerned with aiding justice through investment practices. Many denominations will be involved in challenges to corporations investing in southern Africa and can be written for resource materials.

APPENDIX I—VISITATIONS

The consultation visited the following companies:

Chrysler Corporation
First National City Bank of New York
Ford Motor Company of South Africa
General Motors Corporation
International Business Machines Corporation
Mobil Oil Corporation
Frank & Hirsch (distributors for Polaroid)
Caltex (Standard Oil of California and Texaco)
Standard Bank (partially owned by Chase Manhattan)
Goodyear Rubber Company

APPENDIX II—CONSULTATION ON AMERICAN CORPORATE INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA, OCT. 29–NOV. 18, 1971

Participants

Episcopal Church

Mr. Robert Potter, Chairman, Committee on Social Criteria for Investments, New York, New York.

Mrs. J. W. Wilson, Member, Committee on Social Criteria for Investments, Detroit, Michigan.

Dr. Karl D. Gregory, Member, Committee on Social Criteria for Investments, Detroit, Michigan.

Rev. Everett Francis, Public Affairs Officer, Executive Council, New York, New York.

Rt. Rev. Archie B. Crowley, Suffragen Bishop of Michigan, Detroit, Michigan.

United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Rev. Shelton Waters, Chairman, Southern Africa Task Force, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Joseph Young, Member, Southern Africa Task Force, Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Rev. Wilbur K. Cox, Jr., Associate Chairman for Operations, Division of Church and Race, New York, New York.

Mr. Josiah Beeman, Staff Director, Southern Africa Task Force, Washington, D.C.

American Baptist Convention

Mr. Richard E. Ice, Deputy Executive Secretary, American Baptist Home Mission Societies, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

Mr. William T. McKee, Associate Executive Director, Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board, New York, New York.

United Church of Christ

Rev. Harry Applewhite, Director of International Relations, Council for Christian Social Action, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William W. Plummer, Member, Council for Christian Social Action, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

United Methodist Church

Rev. Isaac Bivens, Associate General Secretary for Africa, Board of Missions, New York, New York.

Disciples of Christ

Mrs. Carl (Dorothy) France, Vice-President, Church Women United, Pulaski, Virginia.

FOOTNOTES

*"Non-white" is a dubious South African term which includes Africans, Asians, and Coloreds.

[1] Transvaler: 5/28/48

[2] Oxford History of South Africa: Vol. II, p. 200

[3] Annual Report, 1968–69, Commissioner of Police

[4] The Black Paper: An alternative policy for Canada towards Southern Africa. Toronto, Canada, 1970, p. 66.

[5] Rand Daily Mail: "A decade of repressive legislation in S.A." December 22, 1969.

[6] Peoples and Policies of South Africa, L. Masquard: London 1969, pp. 32, 33.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Cities and the rest of the country set aside for whites.—comprise 87% of the country's land surface, yet contain seven-twelfths of the total African population. Oxford History of South Africa: Vol. II, p. 416

[9] Sauer Report: Nationalist Party: 1948

[10] Economic Priorities Report: V1 No. 5-p. 7

[11] South Africa: An economic review; Barclays Bank, Johannesburg: Sept. 1969, p. 96

[12] Oxford History, Vol. II, P. 411

CASE HISTORY OF A POWER CRISIS

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, electric power blackouts during the approaching summer and winter months are threatening large segments of our society. Meeting with Dr. Edward E. David, Jr., Director of the President's Office of Science and Technology, the House Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources was advised that nuclear powerplant delays are making serious power shortages likely in the Midwest and Southeast regions during this summer, and could create critical power conditions in the New England and Colorado regions during the winter.

The Federal Power Commission has urged all electric utilities, that have not done so, to develop contingency operating plans for emergency or short-supply situations. A suggested sequence of steps for utilities to follow, compiled by the FPC's engineering staff, have been sent to each utility, and illustrate possible actions to be expected during power supply shortages:

VOLUNTARY LOAD CURTAILMENT

1. reduce electricity use by the affected power system for unessential loads (warehouse lighting, office air conditioning, advertising displays, etc.)

2. interrupt service to industrial customers as provided by contract

3. ask large commercial and industrial customers to reauce unessential load

4. reduce voltage only if its effectiveness as a load relief tecnnique is known and after consideration of the impact on customers' equipment

5. ask all customers to reduce unessential load (by public appeal through news media)

6. reduce voltage an additional amount if adverse impact on customer equipment can be avoided.

INVOLUNTARY LOAD CURTAILMENT

1. interrupt service to industrial customers after considering their load and system conditions

2. interrupt service to selected distribution feeders for short periods of time, alternating among circuits. Every effort should be made to provide continuous service to essential public facilities such as police, fire stations, hospitals, etc.

3. maintain records so that during subsequent power shortages care is taken to rotate interruptions throughout the service area in an equitable manner.

Contingency plans have been received by the FPC from most utilities and the Task Force on Energy and Resources will meet with Commission representatives soon for a detailed evaluation. It is important that the American people know what to expect if their electric utility cannot meet their power needs.

Britain has recently experienced a national crisis, resulting from a lack of electric power, which can serve as an indication of the importance of electricity for our daily lives. Their crisis demonstrated both the importance of coal as an energy source and the effects of a wide-scale electric power shortage on an industrialized modern society. A description of British life during the shortage is contained in a recent article by Electrical World magazine. As the article states:

A black market in candles developed with ordinary white-wax candles changing hands for 50¢ each. Butane gas stoves and lamps and standby electric generators disappeared from the market. Water supplies were cut in some areas, and milk was often rationed. Train services were out. Highway accidents and even crime increased. A London businessman who regularly visits New York was astonished at being mugged in his own London office.

The impact on workers and industry is dramatically illustrated by the numbers of men and women who were laid off, and is simply summarized in the article by, "All industries were affected."

On a more individual level, there is a photograph accompanying the article, labeled "People power when pumps don't work," showing a man drawing water into a pail from a crudely constructed wagon. This form of water supply is not right even in a small, isolated community, but it certainly is impractical for any major urban center. It serves, however, as one more example of the critical need for guaranteeing an adequate supply of reliable energy in the coming years. What may begin this summer in the nited States as minor inconveniences—or worse—could grow into major crises in

future winters. The Congress should begin now, in a cooperative effort, to prepare a national energy program for the United States, to insure that we will have the necessary energy to meet our needs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleagues, Representative ASPINALL and Senator HANSON, for having already brought to the attention of the Congress some of the possible consequences of electrical power shortages, and I am inserting the article from Electrical World in the RECORD at this point:

CASE HISTORY OF A POWER CRISIS

Last Jan. 9, British Prime Minister Edward Heath had plans to lead a strong, buoyant, thriving Britain into the Common Market. Exports were humming, easily outstripping imports. Inflationary wage claims were being resisted, opening the way to what would be an export-led boom that would soak up a million English unemployed. Ominously, that was also the day 280,000 British coal miners began a nationwide strike.

Five weeks and four days later, Heath's Conservative government was close to falling, most of Britain's power plants had run out of coal, miners had thrown up picket lines at two oil refineries, and even oil-fired power plants were running short of fuel. Millions of workers had been idled, and there was talk of calling out troops. Three days earlier, on Feb. 14, drastic rationing of power had begun. Some 20,000 firms with demand of over 100 kw were told to cut work to three days a week. Major electrical consumers such as the steel industry had power supply cut in half. British Ford laid off up to 30,000 of its 52,000 workers, and its daily auto production was halved. Ford's plants shut down on alternating schedules because component supplies had been disrupted.

British Steel Corp reported laying off 20,000 workers. The British textile giant, Courtaulds Ltd, closed one in three of its Lancashire spinning mills. Distillers Co Ltd was reported stopping Scotch whisky production altogether. Britain's uranium-enrichment plant was closed. British Aluminum Co Ltd, with power supplies for its 100,000-long-ton/yr smelter at Invergordon, Scotland, cut in half, worried about molten metal solidifying. All industries were affected.

And so too was normal, everyday life. The use of electricity for heating offices, stores, and entertainment halls was banned. Over half of Britain's street lights were switched off. Unemployment levels went up to over 11%.

When the strike began, CEGB had a record coal stockpile of 12.5-million long tons, and its normal winter rate of consumption was 1.5-million long tons a week. Though it had an eight-week supply, CEGB ran into trouble sooner because the coal was unevenly distributed. The strikers were quickly to set up picket lines, and other workers would not cross the picket lines.

Only three weeks after the strike began, with a demand of 12,000 Mw, CEGB was forced to drop voltage. Cuts of 3% to 6% were ordered throughout England and Wales. Pickets eventually succeeded in shutting down a 200-Mw oil-fired station at Kirkstall near Leeds, a plant that got oil only by rail, and where railroad workers refused to cross picket lines. Another station, closed for three weeks for lack of hydrogen coolant, went back on line when hydrogen was flown in by helicopter.

After initial voltage drops on Jan. 30, the operation was repeated Jan. 31. Voltage drops of 6% were forced Feb. 1 and 2. Demands were met during warm weather from Feb. 3–7.

A state of emergency was declared Feb. 9 because a "significant number of power plants are operating at reduced output and a number are closed," said CEGB. Electricity for advertising and display was banned immediately. Load shedding began Feb. 10—5% in some parts of the country and as much as 10% in other parts. A system of rotational power cuts began Feb. 11, beginning at 6 a.m. and continuing until midnight each day. Disconnects were originally 10%, then 15%. On high-risk days, some users were without power for up to nine hours, broken down into three three-hour cuts. In some areas of northern England, cuts lasted up to 12 hours.

The press and television warned consumers on when cuts were likely. In London, consumers were warned by momentary breaks a few minutes before the cuts began. Two days were called high-risk days, two were medium-risk days, and two were low-risk. Sundays were not classified.

A black market in candles developed, with ordinary white-wax candles changing hands for 50¢ each. Butane gas stoves and lamps and standby electric generators disappeared from the market. Water supplies were cut in some areas, and milk was often rationed. Train services were out. Highway accidents and even crime increased. A London businessman who regularly visits New York was astonished at being mugged in his own London office.

Cable communications to the US were out. St. Valentine's Day became "misery Monday" across the nation. The stock market plummeted, and the value of the pound dropped. The opposition Labor Party threatened to censure the government in the House of Commons, and the government warned of a total shutdown if the strike did not end in two weeks. Jaguar halted all production in its Coventry plant. Triumph Motors laid off 2,500 workers, and Rover halted all auto production, noting that all 14,000 employees would be affected by the end of the week.

In other words, Britain, once the mightiest nation on earth, a nation that withstood the full blast of a strong Nazi war machine, was brought to its knees by the lack of electric power.

Britain's coal strike ended Feb. 25, when the miners voted overwhelmingly to go back to work. Relaxation of load-shedding procedures began Feb. 28. The government lifted most of the remaining restrictions on industrial use of power, except for rotational power cuts and a continuing restriction of major power users to 85% of normal use.

A utility official acknowledged this "could be a risky operation." But it was a risk utilities were prepared to take to get other industries working again. Said Sir John Eden, Minister for Industry: "Against the background of heavy unemployment and with the full cooperation of the public, the government thinks this risk should be accepted."

Coal is expected to be in short supply for another week or so, since net weekly deliveries are 500,000 long tons, compared with consumption of 800,000 to 900,000 long tons weekly. So, as the strike ended and recovery began, England was ending each week with less coal than when the week started.

As soon as a pay deal was agreed to by union chiefs on Feb. 19, pickets were removed from Central Electricity Generating Board plants, and CEGB was able to shift coal from national stockpiles and from a stockpile of 500,000 tons held in Holland. Coal was also moved from stations with large stockpiles to stations with short stockpiles.

If CEGB had run out of coal, it would have been forced into a position where it would have had to depend entirely on oil-fired and nuclear stations, which account for only 26.7% of Great Britain's nominal capacity of about 52,000 Mw. In theory, this would have been enough to keep essential services going. But "there would be electricity for neither industry nor the home," said John Davies, Secretary of State for Trade & Industry. Furthermore, he said, CEGB had no experience operating at such low levels. "The certainty of being able to provide for essential services would have to be regarded as pretty precarious," he noted.

On Feb. 17, on the floor of the US House of Representatives, Rep. Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) said: "Great Britain today faces what may be the greatest threat to its security since World War II. The threat is not enemy bombers, but peacetime chaos caused by widespread power shortages.

"Britain's plight illustrates what can happen to any industrialized nation when there is a break in the fuel and energy supply lines. It also illustrates what could happen to the US if we fail to understand the severity of the energy crisis in our own country."

And in the Senate, Clifford P. Hanson (R-Wyo.) said: "No modern nation can survive if its lifeline of energy is severed. Without fuel there is no energy—no power to light or heat our homes, to cook our food—no power to run the multitude of machines needed to keep our factories in operation. Any serious disruption of vital fuel supplies simply means disaster."

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Voice of Democracy Contest winning speech from Georgia, which was written by Miss Mary Beth Powers.

Although Mary Beth lives in Belvedere, S.C., she attends Aquinas High School in my district in Augusta, Ga. I am proud that this is the fourth consecutive year that a student attending school in my district has won this honor.

The theme of Mary Beth's speech is that "Freedom and Responsibility Are Inseparable." Her remarks are extremely thoughtful and pertinent, and I am glad to be able to share her speech with my colleagues:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

You are Number 301. The State provides for all your physical needs, and in return, you perform the tasks assigned to you. Life holds neither excitement nor difficulty, for you shoulder no real responsibility as long as you play by the rules. The only price is your freedom.

Now, picture a reverse situation. Chaos reigns in the lawless society. All may do as they please, yet they accomplish nothing. The "free" people of this society are not free to develop their talents or their humanity, for they must always be on guard against their "free" neighbors. Mutual mistrust smothers any sign of friendship, for "friends" may cheat, rob, or slander without fear of punishment.

In the first case, responsibility is tamely transferred to the State, while in the second it appears non-existent. Absent from both is true freedom. Conclusion: freedom and responsibility are inseparable.

The simplicity of this common phrase belies its tremendous significance. For me, it has come to mean that while freedom brings fulfillment and human dignity, it also makes life a great deal harder. If I expect to achieve my purpose in life, I cannot allow myself the luxury of permitting others to

control my life for me. To do so would mean lowering myself to the level of a pampered puppy. As Benjamin Franklin said: "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

I must be willing to earn my freedom, to be satisfied with nothing less than complete freedom, and to accept the limitations which it entails.

Once having attained this, I am charged with two duties: The first is to preserve my liberty. Freedom resembles a garden. As long as I water it, fertilize it, and pull the weeds which threaten the plants, the garden flourishes. When I carelessly take it for granted, the lovely garden fails. Likewise, if I become apathetic, or lack the courage to speak out against injustice, to exercise my vote, or to develop my intelligence, my freedom will most certainly flounder. The preservation of liberty also demands that I guard against seifish abuse, for this leads to licentiousness. Therefore, all my important decisions must be carefully considered in the l'ght of the questions, "Am I too docile?" or "Am I rebelling for the sake of rebellion?"

The second, even more important responsibility calls for me to join with others so that, together, we may use our freedom to aid the poor, the uneducated, the crippled, and the despised to overcome their handicaps so that they may take their place in this great country, and in the entire world community itself. Unfortunately, this cannot be done in one grand gesture. A great deal of effort must be expended on a person-to-person basis in order to set the stage for broader efforts.

In short, I must make freedom more than just a word. I must cherish it, nurture it, fight for it, share it. Just as my predecessors passed freedom down to me, so must I pass it on to my children. God help me if I fail. God help us all.

JUDGE JOE R. GREENHILL—A GREAT TEXAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Austin and the State of Texas are blessed with many outstanding citizens and favorite sons. One of our most outstanding and well loved is the Honorable Joe R. Greenhill. Justice Greenhill has devoted his life to seeking justice for the citizens of Texas and the people of the United States. He is not in his 15th year on the Texas Supreme Court. Appointed to the court by Governor Price Daniel in 1957, he was reelected for 6-year terms without opposition in 1960 and 1966. He will next January be the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Texas.

A native of Houston and a graduate of the Houston public schools, Judge Greenhill attended the University of Texas where he received three degrees, B.A., B.B.A., and LL.B. He was elected to Phil Beta Kappa and other honorary societies, and was an editor of the Cactus, and the Texas Law Review. He is a director of the American Judicature Society, was chairman of the judicial section of the State Bar of Texas, 1969–70, and is also a former chairman of the mineral law section.

Recently during the Freedom Foundations' 23d annual awards ceremony at Valley Forge, Pa., Justice Greenhill was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal for his magazine article "Disaster Lobby Versus the Good of America," The article originally was an address by Justice Greenhill to the Biennial Scottish Rite appreciation dinner in Austin, March 23, 1971.

I am proud to honor this great Texan and my lifelong personal friend by sharing with you this award-winning article as printed in the Austin American. The article is as follows:

DISASTER LOBBY VERSUS THE GOOD OF AMERICA

(By Justice Joe R. Greenhill)

A large percentage of the guests of the Scottish Rite Bodies here tonight is made of the leaders of executive and legislative branches of our State government. You are conscious of lobbyists of various sorts, both good and bad. You know how to deal with them; and on balance, they perform a helpful and useful service.

But there has been another lobby which, of late, has exercised great influence. This particular group is not subject to the controls imposed on other lobbies; but it is powerful, and bears within itself a danger to our American way of life.

I'm talking about our "Disaster Lobby;" the people who preach that our State and national government is in a state of decay; is on the verge of catastrophe; that everything is wrong in government; that our industries which gave us the highest standard of living in the world are, because of pollution and profits, really enemies; and that unless, by stringent regulation, we virtually take over all utilities, transportation, and other industry, we will all perish in pollution; and that millions will be reduced to abject poverty.

Some of us heard Mr. Justice William O. Douglas speak at the Driskill Hotel last Saturday night. He suggests, as recounted in the front page story of Sunday's Austin paper that "Revolutionary steps are needed;" that people need to confront what he called the Goliaths of modern times "who assume that they have a God-given right to exploit the country, pollute the skies and the rivers, despoil estuaries, and convert every blessed tree into a dollar."

The publisher of Look Magazine, Mr. Thomas Shepard, recently addressed himself to the Disaster Lobby. In a speech in New York, he challenged many of the assertions of the Disaster Lobby, which he characterized as the most dangerous men and women in America.

Take the one about the world's running out of oxygen, and that eventually we will all suffocate. The National Science Foundation recently collected air samples at 78 sites around the world and compared them with samples taken 61 years ago. Result? Today there is precisely the same amount of oxygen in the air as in 1910, about 29.5 per cent.

Take the one that the air pollution of our cities is getting worse all the time. True, we need to work on this, and we have been working on it. But the air in New York City has less pollutants than it had in 1965; and its air is immeasurably cleaner than it was 100 years ago when people burned soft coal for heat.

Our waterways are not as pretty as they used to be, but they are not as deadly either. Our lakes and streams have been cleansed of cholera and typhoid; and the water we drink is the safest in the world.

And that scare about mercury in the tuna fish: The Disaster Lobby, fanned by a national magazine, said it had to be caused by industry. A fraction of it may have been, and all agree that it should be curtailed. But research showed that the mercury in the oceans came from deposits from nature; and that ALL the mercury dumped into the world's oceans in a year would amount to less than 40 carloads. This, Mr. Shepard says, would be like saying that a boy with a water pistol caused the Johnstown flood. Further proof? Fish caught 44 years ago and just analyzed contained twice as much mercury as fish processed this year.

The Disaster Lobby urges a return to "The Good Old Days." Well, 150 years ago, our life expectancy was only 38 years; the work week was 72 hours. The housewife worked and scrubbed away without a dishwasher, clothes washer, or vacuum cleaner. You chopped wood and froze in the winter, and sweltered in the summer.

Some of our radical friends would have their type of people take over the regulation of business enterprise and would socialize it, or communize it all together. I do not need to remind you that an iron curtain is necessary in Berlin to hide the fact that our free enterprise system, run, financed, and managed by free people, far outstrips the productivity and quality of Russia and all the other communist countries combined.

I'm sure you noticed last week that in Cuba, where Castro and the state have taken over farming, that new national laws went into effect requiring forced labor camps. And I'm also sure you remember that the first thing Castro did in taking over power was to get rid of all the judges. He replaced them with his political people; and individual liberty was, and still is, a dead duck.

The armed forces have been dealt a serious blow by the Disaster Lobby. In a recent address, General W. C. Westmoreland stated that, and I quote, "Never in our history, while fighting a war, have we concentrated so intensely on controlling our fire power to avoid civilian casualties and damage to civilian property; and in helping people in a foreign land. We have brought care to thousands who had never seen a doctor; we've built hundreds of schools; and our soldiers have devoted much of their own time to assist the Vietnamese in their search for a better life. "Unfortunately," Westmoreland concludes, "these events are not news."

Instead, the Disaster Lobby now concentrates the world's attention on the acts of a handful of people at My Lai. Our national TV and national magazines make sure that we, and all the world, including the communists, are furnished, even saturated, with ghastly pictures. And Mr. Justice Douglas, in running down our country, told us last Saturday night, again as quoted in the Austin paper, "We extol law, but shun it when we come to major international crises . . . How long can the consciences of men tolerate killing not only the man with a gun but all of his kinfolk and neighbors, whose demands never exceed a bowl of rice a day and education for their children?"

The result, whether designed or not, is that we get a feeling of national guilt. We are in danger of losing confidence in ourselves.

Well, as for me, I am sick up to here of the Disaster Lobby whose function is to spread distrust, discontent, and even rebellion.

I would like to join those who would emphasize what's right with America. William Lindholm, President of the Chesapeake Telephone Company, recently discussed the psychological warfare which we have waged on ourselves without knowing it.

Psychological warfare was originally designed to reduce the enemy's belief in his own cause, to make him distrust his leaders and colleagues, to raise serious doubts as to the justice of his system, and to make him lose faith in the stated objective of his society. Here is the Disaster Lobby. It sows the seeds of distrust and doubt against our own country and our own leaders.

The antidote is an offensive to close ranks

behind one's own cause, to reaffirm one's own ideals and purposes, and to bring moral courage and dedication to things one genuinely holds to be essential to his way of life.

We have had an overdose of the Disaster Lobby's psychological warfare. Its effects can be as deadly as a broadside from a cannon. We're taking an awful lot of this now. But if we lose our faith in ourselves and in one another, we become weak, however heavily armed we may be.

So let's think and act more on the positive side. Let's realize what's good in America and in Texas; let's renew our courage and dedication to things we know to be right.

It would be presumptuous of me to tell this group of dedicated people that our state and our nation today are the very finest ever known to man.

We enjoy more personal freedom than any people on earth. We are all free to worship as we please, without fear of governmental interference. We are one nation, under God. In spite of the cynicism and the "God is Dead" stuff, the Gallup polls show that 70 per cent of the American people think that religion is important; and that 97 per cent of Americans believe that there is a God, and that He is alive.

We are educating more of our population and to a higher degree than any nation on earth. Your problem is not whether to provide education for all, without regard for race or color, but how to do it, and where to get all the money it takes.

Our Texas highways are the very finest.

The per capita disposable income in America is about $3,000—45 per cent more than in Canada and in England; and 70 per cent more than in France. Minimum wages are higher, and workers are protected more than our founding fathers ever dreamed of. The purchaser and consumer are protected and warned at every turn. We take care of our sick, our disabled, and our aged by both public and private charity to the point that our financial resources are seriously strained.

We are told by the Disaster Lobby that we are unfeeling, cold, and insensitive to the needs of others. Answer? Last year, we Americans contributed more than 14 billions of dollars to charitable causes. Some say that this is just the work of foundations and big business. They surely helped.

But three-fourths of that 14 billion dollars came from people like you and me digging down in our pockets. The marvelous work of the Scottish Rite Bodies in assisting crippled children and others is an excellent example.

Yes, there is an abundance of what's good in America and in Texas. Instead of women working in sweatshops, instead of people working as share croppers on the farms, instead of the illiteracy and disease, there is an absence of misery in millions of men who will retire healthy, and with compensation, at age 65.

As Eric Hoffer has pointed out, all these good things have happened in the "only nation founded by the ordinary people, the masses." The best thing about America is her people. We are part of the people. But if we lose faith in ourselves, we will become what our critics, and the Disaster Lobby, say we are.

In order for us to appreciate the greatness of our country and government, and the fact that our form of government is really working at both the national and local level, we sometimes need to see ourselves as others see us;—not from the eyes of those who come here looking for trouble and to bolster the Disaster Lobby, but from the eyes of people who have come in search of freedom and peace.

In the current Reader's Digest, there is an article by Janita Atkins who, with her husband, fled virtually penniless from Poland. After having been here a few years, she was dismayed at what we here tonight call the Disaster Lobby.

She writes:

"Among some of our American-born friends it is not fashionable to be enthusiastic about America. There is Vietnam; there are drugs, urban and racial conflicts, poverty, pollution. Undoubtedly, this country faces urgent and serious problems. But what we, the newcomers, see are not only the problems, but also solutions being sought and applied.

"I love America because people accept me r· · what I am. They do not question my ancestry, my faith, my political beliefs.

"I love this country because when I want to move from one place to another, I do not have to ask permission. Because when I need a needle, I go to the nearest store and get it.

"I love it because I do not have to stand in line for hours to buy a piece of tough, fat meat.

"I love it because, even with inflation, I do not have to pay a day's earnings for a small chicken.

"I love America because America trusts me. When I go into a shop to buy a pair of shoes, I am not asked to produce my identity card.

"I love it because my mail is not censored, my phone is not tapped, my conversation with friends is not reported to the secret police."

There is more, but that is enough to convey her message.

We do have our problems, but we, and you are working very hard to solve them. We have a nation and a state of which we can be proud. Let's renew our faith in our country, our government, and in ourselves. And if we remember and follow the guiding principles of Free Masonry, and the will of the Supreme Architect of the Universe, we cannot help but succeed.

Let us ask the guidance of the Supreme Being, and do our best to follow His will, and no· be distracted or dismayed by the Disaster Lobby.

I feel sure that I am authorized to say that Scottish Rite Masonry is proud of you, and has faith in all of us. I know that I have.

COMMONSENSE ON THE HOME PORTING ISSUE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, over the years our colleague from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has earned a splendid reputation for good judgment on issues and also as to the proprieties to be observed in the legislative process. Proof of this is to be found in the Washington letter to his constituents, which Mr. Frelinghuysen issued last week:

ON THIN ICE

Any student of Congress knows—and even a casual observer soon realizes—that the proper functioning of the legislative process hinges on the committees of the House and Senate. It is their evaluation, and modification, of the thousands of bills introduced each session which determines the flow and character of legislation. It is their failure to act, or to reach agreement, which keeps bills from reaching the President's desk.

Hearings by congressional committees may be primarily educational rather than legislative in intent. Such may have been the purpose of two days of hearings sponsored jointly last week by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. We were given the opportunity to examine the administration's recent decision to seek "home port" facilities in Greece.

The "home port" concept has been developed to maximize the utilization of our Navy—in this case the U.S. 6th Fleet stationed in the Mediterranean. Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Chief of Naval Operations, and two spokesmen for the Defense and State Departments made a detailed presentation of the reasons for seeking to make "a home port" in Piraeus, the port of Athens. If agreement is reached with the Greek Government some 1,200 families of the crews of a carrier task force may be allowed to reside in Greece. The main consideration for the move, it was pointed out, was to improve the morale of our sailors, at a time when reenlistment is important.

Our committee began to tread on thin ice the second day when critics of home porting charged that the choice of a Greek port, rather than one of the 15 others under consideration, was unwise, as it constitutes "an embrace" of an unrepresentative regime. Here I felt we were departing from our role as a deliberative body. The hearings, though ostensibly to discuss "home porting," were being used for quite a different purpose.

It is true that Greece has been without a constitutionally elected government since 1967. It is also the case that the military regime which controls the Government has been the object of widespread criticism for its failure to reinstitute elected civilian rule. Yet hearings on a procedural matter such as "home porting" facilities are not an appropriate place for the investigation of internal policies of an ally.

What particularly disturbed me was an afternoon appearance, as critics of home porting, of two former members of the Greek Parliament, both of whom strongly oppose the present military government of their country. Their testimony was reminiscent of the hearings on Northern Ireland of the previous week. Like those hearings, this testimony presented only a partial picture. It allowed foreigners, very much interested in their own domestic political situation, a public forum to condemn not only their own government but the policy of the United States.

The fact is that the President feels—and many in Congress agree with him—that Greece is of considerable military importance to us, and also to the NATO alliance. While we naturally would like to see the Greek people actively involved in the political process, it is hardly likely that Congressional hearings can make a useful contribution to that end. Indeed, by airing our dissatisfaction with the unrepresentative character of the Greek regime, and allowing Greek citizens to attack its legality and to question American policy, our committee does tread on thin ice. The United States did not install the present Greek regime and has no power to bring it down. In my opinion, public agitation regarding an internal situation of a long-time friend and ally does not serve a useful purpose.

CHARLES REED BISHOP

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding men in Hawaii's history is

Charles Reed Bishop who contributed significantly to the growth and development of the islands. This year Hawaii celebrated the 150th anniversary of his birth. An essay contest was held as part of the celebration.

I would like to insert in the RECORD, the winning essays written by three young girls from Hawaii, which accurately and sincerely describe the generosity and dedication of Charles Reed Bishop. The essay contest was sponsored by the Committee for the Sesquicentennial of the Birth of Charles Reed Bishop.

Miss Heidi Petersen is a fourth-grader at Hilo Union School, Miss Susan Murakami is a ninth-grader at Paauilo Intermediate School, and Miss Natalie Francisco is a junior at Laupahoehoe High School. All three students are from the island of Hawaii and each was judged winner in her respective division. The contest was conducted in the schools in Hawaii.

It is with great pride in these three winners that I offer their essays:

ESSAY ON CHARLES REED BISHOP

(By Heidi E. Petersen, Hilo Union School, Fourth grade, Hilo, Hawaii)

Charles Reed Bishop was a man loved by all Hawaii. He helped even her kings make decisions of great importance between Hawaii and the United States and foreign countries. One of the many things he helped with was the Hawaiian schools. He was president of the trustees for the Kamehameha Schools. He was a trustee and chairman of the finance committee of the Punahou School. He supported boarding schools throughout the Hawaiian Islands; such as Kawaiahao Seminary, East Maui Seminary, Kohala Girls School, Hilo Boys School and many others.

I feel that he was a very devoted man. I think he loved the Hawaiian children very much, because he did not have any children of his own. I know also that his devotion to his wife, Bernich Pauhi Paki Bishop was very strong. He loved her so much that when he died he wanted his ashes to go to Hawaii and to be put in a tomb beside hers.

He was so close to the Hawaiian people and loved them so much that before he went to San Francisco he gave all of the land his wife had inherited from her ancestors back to them in what is now known of as the Bishop Estate. She was of the alii. Other white men who came to Hawaii, cheated, or bought, or inherited land from their wives, but they did not give the land back to the Hawaiians instead they gave the land to their children. But Mr. Bishop gave the land back. So I think that he was a very honest and devoted man.

CHARLES REED BISHOP: FRIEND OF YOUTH

(By Susan Murakami, Ninth grade, Paauilo Intermediate School, Honokaa, Hawaii)

Charles Reed Bishop was a friend of Hawaii's youth. Because of his concern and affection for children, Hawaii benefited.

One of Bishop's most cherished objects of support was the Honolulu Library and Reading Room Association, which he helped to organize. On display were the Bishops' paintings from Europe and Mrs. Bishop's Hawaiian antiquities. For several years he was so engrossed with problems of his wife's estate that he gave little attention to the library. But in 1888, Bishop donated the 300-volume collection of the Fornander Library. Soon he became a trustee, and was a major benefactor. Through Bishop's generosity the library was able to purchase a vacant lot, buy books, and enlarge the building.

In 1889, Bishop started the Bishop Museum. It was a small, modest building of lava rock. Bishop donated ancient Hawaiian collections and manuscripts. Today the museum has grown into a large complex, which is acclaimed as one of the world's leading scientific and historical institutions. The museum has the world's largest collection of Hawaiian and Pacific research specimens and public exhibits. Just by visiting the museum, students can get a vivid picture of what life in Hawaii was like.

Concerned for the health and welfare of children, Bishop gave time and effort as well as money to help build health facilities. He was a trustee, treasurer, and Vice President of Queen's Hospital for thirty-five years and a benefactor of Kapiolani, Children's and Leahi Hospitals.

Bishop was a great supporter of education. This was expressed in one of his letters: "The principal of making a fair return so far as possible for value received, and gratitude for favors and opportunities provided, are essential parts in a sound education. Neither minors nor adults should expect to get anything worth having gratis."

His contributions to the Kamehameha Schools also reflect his interest in education. Bishop gave the Preparatory Department its facilities and money. He wanted the boys to learn "good morals and gentle manners, cleanliness of persons and clothing and . . . neatness in care of rooms and furniture." He also was the trustee and finance committee chairman of Punahou School. Bishop contributed his services, scholarships, buildings, and operating funds. He also supported the Kawaiahao Seminary, Kohala Girls School, East Maui Seminary and other boarding schools.

Bishop believed that educating the children was the surest way to promote wealth and prosperity. Under him public education became non-sectarian and tax supported.

Bishop's concern for the education, health, and welfare of the children showed him to be a sincere friend of youth.

THE MAN IN THE MYTH

(By Natalie Kapewa Francisco, Laupahoehoe High, 11th grade, Hawaii Island, Hawaii)

As quoted in a surfing magazine: "In the 19th century, mankind's myths, excerpts and success have been discredited, reduced to history . . . to lines and footnotes in books and magazines."

Mankind needs its myths of an honored benefactor. Lives, such as Charles Reed Bishop's, represent all that we universally aspire. When one of our kind reaches such a peak in his lifetime he transcends his own time, and he belongs to all ages.

Now what remains? Portraying the deep identity of a very rare man, Charles Reed Bishop's face gazes memorably out of a series of time-softened, ambertinted photographs.

The rare characteristics which originate from this rare identity are the sources of energy which generated the desire to seek an education. Education; the structure of learning and achieving knowledge, is the desire of many. Charles Reed Bishop, Man of Hawaii, stands alone in his achievement of education.

The numerous quoted excerpts from his letters convey the highest ideals and advice profitable to Hawaii's education. He gave intense interest to schools. Most of his interest was devoted to educating students toward industry. A characteristic of Charles Reed Bishop, quoted by Benjamin O. Wist reveals him "As a man imbued with ideals of service, possessed of faith in Hawaii and in public education as a means of promoting its social and economic welfare." This quotation supports his strongest belief that industrial education is a necessity of his concept of a successful program of studies.

To fully interpret his contribution to education and his educational philosophy, one must think and feel the words used in his excerpts. One must be capable of understanding this feeling in order to personally credit Charles Reed Bishop for his contributions to education.

As a young lad, Charles Bishop gained labor experience through employment in farming, accounting, bookkeeping and store clergying. At the youthful age of 24, his skillful ability in accounting was employed by the United States Consul. Preceding his appointment to the United States Consul, he married a glamorous 18 year old princess, Bernice Pauahi Paki. Following their marriage they lived during periods of great changes in the life of Hawaii.

A memorial to Princess Pauahi was the completion of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. This prominent landmark of Hawaiian history was the creation of Charles Reed Bishop. It became an example of the preservation of the rich heritage which the Hawaiians and many others admired and cherished. It was the summit of their achievements. Together Charles and Bernice apreciated the deep values of the past, but looked forward to the future.

Charles Bishop was outstanding for his contribution in other fields, such as religion, government, Hawaiian affairs, the establishment of hospitals and community activities. He contributed an abundant amount of services and interest to preserve Hawaii's rich heritage.

This was the life of Charles Reed Bishop which spoke for Hawaii's education and success. His ability and knowledge acted as a guiding light that will outlive our time. He was honored, respected and greatly loved.

Charles Reed Bishop was the subject of the myth. Myths and men such as Charles Reed Bishop live beyond their time; they live for all ages. We have not lost Charles Reed Bishop.

THE TABLES DOWN AT MORY'S

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, E. Robert Stevenson, an Old Blue from way back, has written a most interesting article, "The Gods Were With Us Yesterday," which appeared in the January issue of the magazine "Yankee."

Mr. Stevenson, who is the retired editor in chief of the Waterbury, Conn., Republican-American newspapers, not only sets the facts straight on Mory's famous restaurant but provides a nostalgic glow in recounting the story of that famous student pub. I append Mr. Stevenson's article herewith for the enlightenment and pleasure of my colleagues:

"THE GODS WERE WITH US YESTERDAY"
(NO GODDESSES ALLOWED, THANK YOU!)

(By E. Robert Stevenson, Yale '07)

If you are not a Yale man—or woman—you may not know that there really are "tables down at Mory's" on the walls and "the place where Louis dwells" is still going strong on York Street in New Haven—though Louis Linder has long since gone "from here to eternity." But now trouble's a-brewing!

Is even Mory's, "the good old Temple Bar we love so well," to succumb to the attack of women students, a few faculty members, and even some male students in this the sec-

ond year of coeducation at Yale? Old-time graduates who remember the atmosphere of Yale and Mory's in their happy college days receive the news of this attack with keen resentment.

For generations Mory's has not been under the jurisdiction of the Yale corporation or faculty. Students who enjoyed its mugs of beer, its songs, and general good spirit of gathering there made the rules and ran the good old Temple Bar. Freshmen were excluded until their sophomore year when it was thought they had become seasoned enough for the good old tap house. It was not a saloon nor a bar for ordinary lunch snacks. Moriarty, the founder, had come from Fleet Street, London, where he had run or was familiar with English pubs and the character of what he set up at Yale was that of a pub. As the years rolled, Yale boys put its own special character into it.

From the earliest days Mory's had a sort of semi-membership. Boys who did not understand its character or know how to conduct themselves while there, were excluded. Its whole atmosphere made it a place for men. Never until Yale became coeducational had it occurred to men that girls would even want to go there. Yale had accepted women but Temple Bar boys could not throw tradition aside and open the door to girls, who began to press for entrance. Hence the irritation of the girls and their supporters. They have succeeded in having its license for selling alcoholic drinks suspended because it has excluded women. What will come of all this remains to be seen.

Mory's belongs with the years. It was boys of the Yale class of 1863 who brought Frank Moriarty and his wife to Yale. The pair had established a tap room in what has been described as a "dingy old building" on Wooster Street in New Haven, down toward the waterfront. In those days and for many years afterward, the Yale boathouse, where crew members kept their rowing shells and general boating paraphernalia, was on the east side of the Quinnipiac River at the end of the causeway just beyond Bell Dock.

Going to or from the boathouse, crew men walked along Wooster Street, where they discovered the pub. They liked it so much that they persuaded the Moriartys to move up near the university. The best place they could find at the time was on Court Street. There they warmly welcomed students to what came to be called "The Quiet House." There was plenty of song-singing but no record of disturbing noise. Perhaps the Moriartys successfully urged quietness and so it came to be called "The Quiet House."

For about ten years Frank presided there, gaining great popularity with the students. Seated about round tables, they drank beer, Fishhouse punch, or St. Croix rum. "The Mrs." Moriarty also won their hearts with her specially prepared Golden Bucks, Grilled Sardines, and Welsh Rarebit. From time to time both Mr. and Mrs. would sit at the tables with the boys and entrance them with tales of Scotland, Ireland, and England.

When her huband died in the early 1870s, "The Widow," as she then came to be called, bought an old house on Temple Street one block off Chapel Street, more convenient to the university. This became known as "Temple Bar." To aid her, "The Widow" hired one Louis Linder, who grew in popularity as is evident in the line of "The Whiffenpoof Song". . . "At the place where Louis dwells." When "The Widow" died, Louis stayed with Temple Bar for many years. It was there that the Whiffenpoofs came into being and from there they went out to travel and sing in concerts all around the nation. They protected their song for years for their own use, allowing no professional singing of it. Finally, Rudy Vallee was given permission and this popular singer used it again and again, giving it wide and popular acceptance.

Change came again. *The Journal-Courier*, a New Haven newspaper, bought for its own use the land on which Temple Bar stood. The Moriartys were gone, Louis was gone, but Yale men were not going to let the Temple Bar disappear. They bought another old house very much like the one on Temple Street. On York Street, it was still nearer to the heart of the university. It was remade, better to fit the uses of the old pub, and it still stands there in use today.

Not only were the round tables at which the boys sat removed to the remodeled structure but so were the tables that had long hung on the walls. For countless time it had been the custom to have each new table carved at the center with a large letter "Y". Then all around it each boy as he came would laboriously carve his own initials and his class numerals. As a table eventually filled with initials and numerals, it was hung for permanent keeping on a wall. Old graduates revisiting would be seen standing on chairs to try and find their own initials thus carved so long ago.

Preserved were the fancy glass wall notices designating the various food delicacies "The Widow" was in days past ready to prepare. The old pewter glass-bottomed beer mugs came, and the photos of outstanding football and baseball players, some seated upon the cherished campus wooden fence, the old London directory, the copy of *Punch*, and other treasures of that character that the Morys had brought with them from England for the delectation of youths who in those days did not so easily travel as they do today.

There preserved is a group picture fronted by Carrie Nation, famous saloon smasher of Kansas. The group with her in 1903 induced her to come to Yale by fraudulently representing themselves as a Temperance Society engaged in trying to reform Yale boys. She came and had her picture taken with the Temperance Society. Without her knowledge, as she stood in front, they held up whiskey bottles to enhance the picture.

My own recollections go back to a special group between 1903 and 1907 that met weekly at Mory's for a genial time. Sinclair Lewis, of *Main Street* fame, was one of us. It was his delight to imitate well-known characters. Our lecturing professor, William Graham Sumner, a distinguished sociologist, was one of them. Alleging that Sumner was speaking, one of Lewis's quirks ran: "Folkways—it's a rare word used by only the brightest minds in the country. In fact I might say it is used only by myself."

William Rose Benét, brother of Stephen Vincent Benét, was one of us. The younger brother, Stephen, not yet in college, visited on occasions to be warmly welcomed. Bill in later years, became an editor on the staff of *The Saturday Review*.

Two who had graduated shortly before us came back to work at Yale. When they found the fun we were having, they joined us. Clarence Day came to edit what was then *The Alumni Weekly*. Through his father's financing, he finally acquired the publication and turned it over to ownership by the university, which then made it a monthly publication.

Clarence, like Thurber, used to like to do funny little drawings as we sat around the table. On one occasion he drew the picture of a monkey hanging on the limb of a tree under which he wrote:

Dear fellows, do not be annoyed
Because I call it anthropoid
It means resembling man 'tis true
But still that man may not be you.

Brian Hooker had gone forth to work on the staff of *The New York Sun*, write lyrics for musicals, and lecture at Columbia University. He returned to teach English at Yale and so joined us. Hooker wrote a poem to the Temple Bar, most fitting at this time. It was entitled "The Gods Were With Us Yesterday" and in part ran:

Look, and remember well, Time was
When many a charmed and chosen few
Made these bare chambers glorious
For Bacchus and his retinue,
When youth and song and mystic brew
Could sublimate the mellowing clay
'Till lights Olympian glimmered through
The gods were with us yesterday.
Good night, Old Temple. Even thus
Thine elders faded out of view,
Old Sacraments turn blasphemous,
Old Nymphs allure, where non pursue
Prophet and warrior, Prince and Jew
Gather to brush our dreams away,
The sciences are with us, too—
The gods were with us yesterday.

Finally, as envoy to the poem Hooker gave a warning that the people who try to break up Temple Bar may well give attention to:

Princes of change, when all ye do
Fares better than ye plan or pray,
Some one—perhaps—will say of you,
"The gods were with us yesterday."

MEASURING THE SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS AND PROGRESS OF COMMUNITIES

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the business community has refined its ability to measure with precision the economic climate of a community, the profit or loss of its business concerns and the market penetration of its products.

But, despite the social awakening of the business community, no procedures have been developed to measure the social and environmental status and progress of communities. The First National Bank of Minneapolis, in its 1971 annual report, has attempted to establish a format for an annual social-environmental audit.

First Minneapolis, after further refinement, will be attempting to record the social and environmental progress of the Twin Cities community. Hopefully, the audit will indicate directions in which the community may want to direct its resources in ways which will improve the local quality of life.

The following is the text of the social-environmental portion of the First Minneapolis report. The proposed components and standards are, of course, tentative, but I commend this report to my colleagues and to the business institutions in their districts:

THE ANNUAL SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT . . . A PROBLEM AND A PROPOSAL

Over the past year, there has been much discussion and concern among leading businessmen about business' commitment to social-environmental improvement—whether that commitment is producing worthwhile results and by what criteria we can judge its effectiveness.

How can a company know that it is engaged in really necessary social-environmental activity? Who determines the value system and the criteria? If a business uses up a part of the natural environment or if its products adversely affect the environment, does our

present accounting system reflect that company's true cost of business? What accounting system would properly reflect this cost, or measure a company's real contribution towards solution of major problems in our urban society?

Answers to these questions are difficult, in part because there is no common agreement about the definition of a "good quality of urban life" or about what standards might properly be used to measure it.

Every business has standards of performance for profit, investment return, reward to employees and stockholders, and the quality and production costs of its products or services. These standards are reflected in a general accounting system that is accepted by most elements of society and especially by the business community. This accounting system is constructed to report a business' actual economic performance over a time period and to make it possible for the performance of one business to be compared with another.

Similarly, in its social-environmental commitments a business must have performance standards which have general recognition and acceptance, and an accounting system to measure them. Otherwise a business cannot know if it is satisfactorily meeting its social-environmental objectives.

To begin, there must be consensus about what constitutes a "good quality of urban life." Perhaps a way to do this to divide the "good quality of urban life" into its components. Some components generally approved in our urban areas are: aesthetically appealing communities, decent housing, safe streets, a clean and pleasant environment, effective health care, efficient transportation and good cultural, educational and job opportunities.

Within each of these components, achievement standards can be developed to fulfill the definition of a good quality of urban life. These standards would change from time to time as society's priorities change.

After achieving acceptable components and standards, a second step would be to develop a reporting mechanism, an accounting system whereby a company can determine what investment it made toward improvement of those quality of life components and standards to which it had addressed its effort. With this system a company can judge whether or not that investment really helped the community, i.e., whether there was a social profit or loss. Clearly, because so many variables affect the attainment of a community's quality of life goals, and because of the magnitude of the problems involved, precise measurement in some cases will be difficult. For these reasons, a company should focus its accounting on specific urban regions since it is there that the impact of business' actions will be most apparent.

Also while each component will be measured by its standards of performance, the social accounting system ultimately must permit the setting of relative values and priorities among components and the measuring of net profit or loss toward the ultimate total of a "good quality of urban life."

An example of possible components and standards for an annual social-environmental audit for the Twin Cities seven-county metropolitan area follows:

Under this concept a given company, because of its know-how or interest in certain fields of activity, may work for improvement of one or two components. A real estate development business, for instance, would probably have a greater interest in housing and in a transportation system than in other components.

Clearly, the business community alone does not control all the components in the quality of urban life. Government's responsibilities have a major impact on both the components and the standards. All segments of society must focus on the same goals because they all affect the outcome in some way. Increased dialogue between business and government will inevitably result in a better coordination of efforts to attain these quality of life goals.

By comparing the results from year to year, the business community will be able to measure trends and progress in its locality, and concentrate on those components most needing improvement. Whether there has been a profit or loss in a particular activity will enable the company and the community to decide which components require the most attention and improvement in the year ahead. For example, if the community decides to concentrate on an adequate transportation system, such a system can be measured by many standards. In measuring the adequacy of its transportation system, the community may discover that if it is to continue its present automobile-oriented system it will, among other things, be dedicating an unacceptable portion of its land and central business district to highway needs and parking.

There are several alternatives which a given company can follow in responding to this problem. It could work with other companies and with governmental agencies to develop a more effective and modern public transportation system. Or, it could initiate a program of incentives to encourage its employees to use public transit or organize car pools. Or, several firms might join together in sponsoring such programs. Whichever action is adopted, this accounting system will allow the company at the end of the accounting period to determine from agreed standards the effectiveness of its efforts, in terms of results for the company and for the community as a whole.

This proposal is a theoretical framework. It needs critical analysis and further refinement. To this end, First Minneapolis in 1972, through its Urban Development Department, will actively seek the assistance of and consensus among all interested civic, business and governmental groups in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Because this report is proposing quality of life components and standards for the first time, First Minneapolis has not attempted to make a precise accounting for the Twin Cities community. First Minneapolis believes that our Twin Cities urban area in 1971 is comparatively healthy in social and economic terms. During 1972, however, we hope to be able to measure the state of its social-environmental health by means of guidelines which are compatible with established business accounting principles.

PROPOSED COMPONENTS AND STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

Components (accounts) and standards

1. Job Opportunities: Percent of persons unemployed. Percent of persons who have changed jobs in the last five years. Percent of population employed. Percent of skilled jobs without people to fill them.

2. Pleasing and Healthy Physical Environment: Amount of pollution in the air measured against established standards. Amount of pollution in the water measured against established standards. Visual appearance of the area as judged by an urban environment committee on the basis of their own criteria. Percent of land dedicated to highway use. Percent of land preserved for parks and open space use.

3. Suitable Housing: Percent of substandard dwelling units. Number of communities with zoning ordinances permitting low and moderate income housing. Number of new housing starts in past year. Average number of persons per dwelling unit.

4. Good Health: Percent of infant mortalities. Life expectancy. Per capita incidence of heart disease. Venereal disease rate.

5. Adequate Income Levels: Percent of households earning less than $5,000 a year. Percent of households earning less than $10,000 a year. Number of people on various forms of public assistance, and annual net gains or losses for public assistance case loads.

6. Quality Education: Percent of high school graduates. Percent of high school dropouts. Percent of high school graduates going to college. Percent of high school students taking national comparative tests who score better than national averages.

7. A Safe Society: Number of violent crimes per 10,000. Number of misdemeanors per 10,000. Number of felonies per 10,000. Percent of core city and suburban persons who feel safe walking the streets at night in their neighborhood.

8. A High Level of Citizen Participation: Percent of eligible persons voting in city elections. Number of persons in city-wide civic groups or numbers of persons in neighborhood associations. Percent of persons over 21 donating to the United Fund.

9. Widespread Cultural Activity: Number of persons visiting: (a) Guthrie Theatre, (b) Walker Art Center, (c) Minneapolis Institute of Arts, (d) Minnesota Orchestra, (e) St. Paul Arts and Sciences Center, (f) Civic and semi-professional theatres. Number of community art exhibitions and concerts.

10. Adequate Transportation: Number of automobiles registered in metropolitan area. Percent of persons using public buses for daily transportation to work. Percent of one-passenger cars driving into downtown area in rush hours.

The Twin Cities area has attained national fame for its cultural activity. In 1971 the new Walker Art Center, adjoining the Guthrie Theatre, opened its modern and spacious galleries. The Walker, among many cultural institutions, receives substantial support from private enterprise.

GOALS OF POISON PREVENTION WEEK DESERVE SUPPORT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Congress of the United States approved a joint resolution requesting that the President annually set aside the third week in March as Poison Prevention Week. This year, the 11th such week has been proclaimed by President Nixon, for the week beginning March 19.

Rarely have I witnessed a problem that so affects our entire society receive so little sustained public attention as poison prevention. Each year there are more than 1 million cases of poisonings in the United States, including those from gases and vapors. There are approximately 3,000 poisoning deaths each year. About half of these deaths are accidental. But, most tragically, fully one-third occur in children under 5 years of age in the quiet confines of the home.

A leading physician, Dr. Jay M. Arena, president of the American Academy of Pediatrics and a member of the medical advisory board of the Council on Family Health, tells us that poisoning is now the most common medical emergency that exists in modern pediatrics. Dr. Arena, who has had a long career as a pediatrician and who now heads the Duke

University Hospital poison control unit, says that children's deaths from poisoning exceed the total of those from polio, measles, scarlet fever, and diphtheria combined.

Each year some 70,000 children under age 5 are involved in accidental poisonings. And at least two children in the age group die of poisoning every 3 days. Most often, these accidents occur between ages 1 and 3, when the child is just beginning to explore his environment and needs close supervision.

In my district alone, for the city of Wichita, Kans., and surrounding areas, 1,604 cases of accidental poisonings were recorded in 1971. These figures indicate the cases taken to hospitals in the area and do not reflect ingestions treated privately by physicians or resolved by parents at home.

Safety experts agree that the basic answer lies in the degree of concern for safety exercised by parents in their own homes. The less the concern the greater the threat of accidents. Seen in this light, the problem of poisonings becomes one of educating parents to understand the importance of using and storing household products safely and wisely. To be effective, even safety closures must be properly sealed. Otherwise their special caps will do nothing to prevent a youngster from reaching the container's contents. Labels provide no protection unless consumers read the warning message and instructions for proper use. Responsibility for the prevention of accidents must always rest in large part with parents at home.

National Poison Prevention Week is one positive national program which attempts to promote greater awareness of the dangers of carelessness. Unfortunately, it only occurs once each year. For the past 6 years, the manufacturers of proprietary medicines have sponsored the Council on Family Health to promote the safe use of medicines and all household substances throughout the year.

The council is the only private, nonprofit organization in the country concerned chiefly with the problem of accidental poisonings among children. It is supported solely through the voluntary contributions of member drug companies. The council's program is designed to reach millions of families through materials distributed to newspapers and magazines, radio and television, community organizations and consumers themselves.

Programs such as that of the Council on Family Health appear to be making significant contributions to the cause of family safety. The council, of course, supports Poison Prevention Week and seeks to carry out its plea for a safer America.

Aspirin products, because of their wide use in homes throughout America, are involved in a high percentage of poisoning cases among children under age 5. The National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers recently reported:

> The 1970 aspirin ingestion percentage of all reports showed a dramatic drop for children under five years of age and were 30 percent lower than the year 1969. . . . During the first six months of 1971, reports of aspirin ingestion are down another seven percent from the 1969 figures.

Industry has helped by voluntarily limiting the amount of aspirin in each bottle. Nevertheless, I am convinced that there is no substitute for a strong parental role in preventing these childhood poisonings.

For that reason, I believe all Americans should support the goals of Poison Prevention Week. The problem of poisoning is often a family-sized tragedy that does not make page one of the papers or the TV screen, but the heartbreak is no less real. It is a daily problem of national magnitude.

I commend the voluntary actions by groups such as the Council on Family Health, and those by the manufacturers of drugs and medicines, to reduce these deaths and injuries. But I also urge all citizens to help do their part to save this Nation's most important resource, our children.

FORD AMENDMENT TO PRESERVE STATES' "NO DISCHARGE" WATER POLLUTION LAWS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will begin consideration of H.R. 11896, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. This bill contains a number of very fine provisions relating to the construction of municipal waste treatment systems and the conduct of antipollution research and other related programs. The Public Works Committee has worked long hours in formulating this legislation, and I would like to commend them for their efforts.

However, there is one provision of this bill which many of us feel can be substantially improved. I refer to section 312 of title III, relating to marine sanitation devices. For this reason I intend to offer an amendment to this section which would preserve the right of States to prohibit the discharge of sewage from vessels operating on their lakes and rivers.

I am joined in offering this amendment by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) and a bipartisan coalition consisting of the following Members:

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF THE FORD AMENDMENT

Hon. Bella S. Abzug (N.Y.).
Hon. Paul Findley (Ill.)
Hon. Les Aspin (Wis.).
Hon. John Brademas (Ind.).
Hon. James J. Delaney (N.Y.).
Hon. John D. Dingell (Mich.).
Hon. John G. Dow (N.Y.).
Hon. Marvin L. Esch (Mich.).
Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr. (N.Y.)
Hon. Seymour Halpern (N.Y.).
Hon. John Kyl (Iowa).
Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski (Wis.)
Hon. Abner J. Mikva (Ill.).
Hon. William E. Minshall (Ohio).
Hon. William S. Moorhead (Pa.).
Hon. Henry S. Reuss (Wis.).
Hon. Philip E. Ruppe (Mich.).
Hon. John P. Saylor (Pa.).
Hon. James H. Scheuer (N.Y.).
Hon. Charles A. Vanik (Ohio).

We are announcing our intention to offer this amendment at this time to afford our colleagues the opportunity to become familiar with some of the reasons why the adoption of this measure is s vital to the preservation of clean waters in our lakes and rivers and to the health of the residents of several States who might otherwise be the victims of overpolluted waters.

At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of our amendment:

AMENDMENT TO TITLE III OF H.R. 11896

To preserve the right of States to prohibit discharge of sewage from vessels (sec. 312(f)).

On page 338, amend lines 4 through 25 to read as follows:

"(f) After the effective date of the initial standards and regulations promulgated under this section, if any State determines that the protection and enhancement of the quality of some or all of the waters within such state require greater environmental protection, such State may completely prohibit the discharge from a vessel of any sewage, whether treated or not, into such waters."

At the outset I would like to emphasize that our amendment would not require the Federal Government to do anything more than it is presently doing. It would cost the Federal Government nothing, and it would take no power away from the Federal Government. Our proposal would simply permit individual State governments to require greater environmental protection with respect to marine sanitation than the minimum Federal standards require if a State determines that such protection of the quality of some or all of its waters is necessary.

Many States have experienced serious problems resulting from the discharge of waste and sewage from vessels operating on their waters and now have laws and regulations which in effect prohibit the discharge of wastes and require vessels to be equipped with holding tanks or self-contained marine toilets. These devices are designed to retain all sewage produced on the vessel for subsequent disposal at a dockside or onshore waste collection and treatment facility.

As presently worded, the committee version of this bill would allow Federal standards and regulation to preempt existing State statutes and regulations. Under Federal standards, which incidentally, would not become effective until 5 years after they are promulgated, the dumping of wastes from vessels into our waters could be permitted after receiving treatment that may not even be as good as the secondary treatment now provided at most municipal sewage treatment plants.

In other words, the committee bill, if passed in its present form, could effectively cripple many very excellent State statutes and regulations now on the books which have stringent "no-discharge" standards probibiting the dumping of waste and sewage into its waters. This could only be construed as a terrible step backwards for the many hardworking citizens and elected officials in States throughout our Nation who have put forth a great deal of effort to enact these highly effective standards into law.

It is my understanding that there are approximately 20 States which now have "no-discharge" regulations in effect in

one form or another. These include many of the Great Lakes States, such as Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, New York, and my own State of Michigan.

I am especially concerned, as are my colleagues from Michigan from both sides of the aisle, over the prospect of having Michigan's very fine law wiped out by the passage of the committee version of this bill.

Michigan's Water Pollution Control Act of 1970 was passed during the 1969–70 legislative session with strong bipartisan support from farsighted legislators in both chambers and from our Gov. William Milliken. It provides in part that "all toilet-equipped watercraft moored or operated on the waters of the State of Michigan are required to be equipped with holding tanks, self-contained marine toilets, or incinerating devices which will effectively prevent the overboard discharge of all sewage wastes produced on the vessel."

Mr. Speaker, it would be a shame for us to pass this very fine bill to combat water pollution with a provision that will effectively undercut some of the efforts which individual States such as Michigan have made in this same area with respect to improving marine sanitation standards. For these reasons we urge our colleagues to consider the merits of our amendment carefully. We are convinced that when the implications of this amendment are fully understood, a majority from both sides of the aisle can support this measure enthusiastically.

At this point I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the most distinguished environmental, conservation, civic, and labor organizations in the Nation which are supporting this amendment:

LIST OF SUPPORTERS

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
Bass Anglers Sportsman Society.
Clean Air, Clean Water, Unlimited.
Common Cause.
Environmental Action.
Environmental Policy Center.
Friends of the Earth.
Izaak Walton League of America.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Michigan Student Environmental Confederation, Inc.
Minnesota Conservation Foundation.
Minnesota Environmental Control Citizens Association.
Minnesota Public Interest Research Group.
National Consumers League.
National Farmers Union.
National Wildlife Federation.
Northern Environmental Council.
Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union.
Save Lake Superior Association.
Sierra Club.
Sport Fishing Institute.
Trout Unlimited.
United Automobile Workers.

SWISS BANKING SYSTEM

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there has been an unusual interest in the present banking system in Switzerland since its origination in the early 1930's. So often, discussion of this system has been based on lack of knowledge and a misunderstanding of how the system works. Actually, it is very similar to our own banking practices.

The United States maintains close ties with Switzerland and its responsible financial community, and in relation to these links, our Government is endeavoring to extend and improve the availability of certain information in the areas of tax evasion cases involving American citizens with financial accounts in Switzerland. Our major effort in this regard has been the passage of the Foreign Secret Bank Accounts Act, now law, in 1971. In criminal areas, however, cooperation has come more readily and I feel it is very important that my colleagues in the Congress be aware of the true situation that exists in Swiss banking circles in such circumstances.

A recent, well-publicized case of alleged fraud and other questionable activities provides an example of the cooperation that Swiss banks offer in criminal matters involving U.S. citizens. Once the Swiss Government and banking officials realized that a criminal charge was imminent in this recent case, they acted quickly to provide all pertinent information in relation to the banking accounts held by the principals. The same procedure has been followed many times in the past when criminal activity was apparent. I think this attests to the fine liaison that exists between our two Governments.

In other types of cases, the reasons for the confidential nature of some banking accounts in Switzerland are founded largely in the lessons of recent European history. In times of military or political upheavals in other European countries, Switzerland provided a haven for those seeking protection from oppression and infringement on personal liberty. Years before Switzerland filled this role, prominent or political refugees often were located, captured, and returned to their country through detections of their banking accounts. Among other reasons, the liberty laws, which included the Bank Secrecy Act of Switzerland, were enacted to help safeguard the lives and well-being of these refugees.

In many respects the Bank Secrecy Act of Switzerland is comparable to our fifth amendment, since it extends and maintains the right to personal liberty and freedom for the sake of individual justice, regardless of national origin or citizenship.

In this light, these features of the banking system in Switzerland are dedicated to the service of mankind in the international arena, and I would like to commend those who help offer this safeguard of personal liberties. Three recent articles help describe the Swiss banking system in a more detailed fashion, and I insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the informational benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Canton (Ohio) Repository, Jan. 28, 1972]

SECRECY MISUNDERSTOOD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Howard Hughes autobiography mystery with its potential $650,000 fraud puts Swiss banks in the headlines again. And the reputable banks over there, like the Swiss Credit Bank now involved, bitterly and correctly resent this—and for good reasons.

Their justifiable fury centers on misconceptions about the Swiss Bank Secrecy Act. U.S.A. crooks, beware!

Switzerland's Wall Street is Zurich's Bahnhofstrasse, with Geneva now competing hard. It is commonly said that there are more banks in the nation than dentists. This is true. There are about 4,200 banking outlets, one for every 1,500 people. And many have functioned as shelters through Europe's Thirty Years' War, the Napoleonic conquests (including Napoleon's conquest of Switzerland), the Huguenot persecutions, the 1848 revolutions and Europe's last three major wars.

About one-fifth of the $22 billion bank deposits are from foreigners, mostly because of the worldwide confidence in the stability of the Swiss franc. It is completely backed by gold and instantly exchangeable for gold in Switzerland.

The Bank Secrecy Act, however, is merely a section of the nation's broad, salutary and humanitarian Liberty Laws. This legislation is dedicated to protecting the individual, the Swiss and foreigners alike, from the invasion of privacy and from harassment.

Hitler literally created them. The Liberty Laws were Switzerland's counterattack to the Nazi intrusions against German refugees in Switzerland and were codified in the early '30s.

Largely forgotten, the Nazis enacted a death penalty for any German found to have a foreign bank account. Hitler's Gestapo used every conceivable ruse to detect these. Switzerland's Bank Secrecy Act resulted within the Liberty Laws.

Today the law likewise protects refugees from Communist countries that, like the Nazis, constantly try to entrap them through bank deposits.

For example, the Swiss were incensed by the brutal Soviet reconquest of Hungary. To a man they said: "Es gefallt mir nicht!"—"I don't like it!" More than 200,000 Hungarians fled to Switzerland. Opening her doors Switzerland absorbed all 200,000—the largest per capita acceptance in the world. And the Swiss Ambassador to Vienna told me that in the first year after the Soviet reconquest of Czechoslovakia he issued Swiss entrance visas to Czechs at the year-long rate of 200 a day, with a 700 peak on some days. Switzerland granted political asylum to them all.

The Swiss defend the Bank Secrecy Act much as we do the Fifth Amendment in our Constitution, knowing it is abused for purposes not intended but that, in principle, the protection is immensely proper.

If a banker breaks the law, the maximum penalty is $4,000 and six months in jail. It would immediately kill any man's career in Swiss banking or Swiss business anywhere and no case has ever come to a Swiss federal court.

But here's where U.S. crooks, tax dodgers and others make their great mistake:

First the Bank Secrecy Act states that it does not apply when the bank has reason to believe, as in the Hughes case, that a swindle or other criminal activity may be involved. On such suspicion, all reputable Swiss banks cooperate vigorously and completely with the famous Nachrichtendienst, Switzerland's crack counterintelligence police, probably the best in the world.

Current treaties now being worked on by very able and effective American Ambassador to Switzerland Shelby Cullom Davis may result in the inclusion of U.S. tax evasion as well.

Second, the Bank Secrecy Act is entirely voluntary. There is not one word in the Swiss law that requires it.

Swiss banks, like ours, number each account for operational purposes. That's merely routine. The Bank Secrecy Act is entirely voluntary. You yourself must invoke it. You must notify the bank in writing that you

demand secrecy. Invoking this is utterly and completely your responsibility.

Thus the question immediately and properly arises in the U.S. Internal Revenue Service: What is this citizen hiding?

The IRS can, and does, ask the U.S. citizen to notify the bank to withdraw the secrecy and the bank will immediately do so. But if the U.S. citizen refuses, the IRS correctly presumes that the citizen is dealing in fraud, and his fat is in the fire.

Don't—don't—open a so-called numbered account in Switzerland. When you invoke the secrecy your troubles may begin as of that instant.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 21, 1972]

IN THE HUGHES BOOK MYSTERY—NEW FOCUS ON HOW SWISS BANKS WORK

ZURICH.—Controversy over an unpublished book is now laying bare some of the supposed secrets of a financial system that has long been a mystery to most Americans—the Swiss banking complex.

The view is widespread in the United States and elsewhere that Switzerland's bank accounts, operating behind a barrier of legal protection, are ideal hiding places for ill-gotten funds.

Main reason for this reputation: the well-known "numbered" accounts, where the actual name of a depositor is concealed and only a few top officials of the bank know his identity—which, under Swiss law, they must not reveal except in certain instances.

CASE OF THE "HUGHES" BOOK

Focusing a spotlight on this financial situation is the mystery surrounding an alleged autobiography of industrialist Howard Hughes, turned over by author Clifford Irving to McGraw-Hill, Inc., and "Life" magazine for publication.

It was Mr. Irving, Zurich authorities claim, who used Swiss banks to clear checks of hundreds of thousands of dollars made out by McGraw-Hill to "H. R. Hughes."

Just how do Swiss banks operate?

For one thing, big money movements are less likely to be questioned than in many other countries. The Swiss bank-secrecy law of 1934 keeps most of these transactions concealed even from Government authorities.

Almost anyone can open a bank account in Switzerland without too much formality. This can be done at the counter or by mail. If an account is opened by correspondence, the banks generally ask the new client to make a personal call as soon as feasible.

In order to open an account, the client must fill in a special form with name, address, date of birth, nationality, profession—and possibly also the names of any other persons who are authorized to act on his behalf. Foreigners are generally requested to show their passports. A signature card is made out in duplicate, giving the name or names of persons entitled to sign—and a sample of their signatures.

FOR GREATER SECRECY

The famous "numbered" accounts are used to increase discretion within the bank. They carry only a number and, often, a code word added. If a person wants to open a numbered account, he is directed to a private conference room to meet with a senior bank officer. Foreigners are sometimes asked for a letter of introduction from a well-known bank. Some banks ask for minimum deposits of $25,000 or more, and there are extra charges since numbered accounts cause additional work.

The existence of supposedly "super-discreet" numbered accounts has undoubtedly attracted large amounts of money from wealthy people around the world, even some dubious funds. Swiss bankers say that "dubious" clients often present excellent credentials from first-class banking addresses in the U.S. and elsewhere abroad. Yet, the numbered accounts make up only about 3 to 4 per cent of all Swiss accounts, and the sums deposited there are less than 10 per cent of total deposits, according to one estimate.

The main advantage of a numbered account is the extra security it offers against indiscreet talk by banking personnel. Only two or three very senior officials know the identity of the account holder. Movie stars, politicians, other well-known persons have long preferred to hold numbered accounts in Swiss banks.

"DUMMY" ACCOUNTS

The name of a numbered-account holder, however, is always known to the bank, Zurich sources insist. They are not anonymous accounts. It is possible that people who want to remain truly anonymous will deposit funds through "dummies," either local lawyers or other persons.

Switzerland's famous banking secrecy applies to regular and numbered accounts in exactly the same fashion. Secrecy is protected by law—the Bank Act of 1934—whose violation is subject to legal penalties. A bank official who breaks the secrecy provision is liable to a fine of up to $5,200 or to a prison term of up to six months, or both. In case of negligence by the bank, the penalty is a fine of up to $2,600.

WHEN CRIME IS CHARGED

Swiss banking secrecy, however, is not absolute—as shown in the Hughes-book controversy. The Swiss, it is true, refuse to cooperate with foreign governments in cases of political, military, foreign-exchange or tax-evasion offenses.

On the other hand, the banking-secrecy provisions do not protect anyone who is accused of ordinary criminal activity. In cases punishable under Swiss law, banks are required to release information.

Thus banking secrecy was lifted in the case of the Irving-Hughes controversy once Swiss officials made charges of fraud and forgery against Mr. and Mrs. Irving.

The Swiss, indeed, point out that in this case they have been able to move more quickly than authorities in the United States.

Zurich bankers also generally urge American clients not to violate U.S. regulations. Swiss banks will not buy or hold gold bullion for the account of U.S. citizens or residents, and point out that U.S. margin requirements must be observed by American customers using credit for security purchases.

TAX DODGERS

Tax evasion is not regarded as a criminal offense in Switzerland, and the Swiss refuse to co-operate with foreign authorities seeking to track down tax dodgers who hold their money in Swiss banks. This has been a source of irritation to U.S. and other officials.

But the Swiss Government is increasingly willing to help the U.S. in its fight against organized crime, when Swiss bank accounts are involved. However, there is no shift in the Swiss tradition that the rules of taxation and banking secrecy will not be changed just to please foreign governments.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1972]

SWISS BANKS AND SECRECY

IRVING HOAX HELPS DISPEL MYSTERY OF ACCOUNTS

(By Victor Lusinchi)

ZURICH, SWITZERLAND.—Edith Irving is not all villianous to the Swiss bankers she hoodwinked when playing out her accomplice role in the Howard Hughes "autobiography" hoax engineered by her husband, Clifford Irving.

The bankers are not prepared to assign Mrs. Irving, a fellow Swiss, a niche alongside the apple-splitting William Tell in Switzerland's gallery of national heroes. But they do say that she at least did them one big favor when, with great impartiality, she enmeshed all of the "Big Three" Swiss banks in the hoax.

"Americans should now know the Swiss secrecy is not a dodge for protecting crooks and that no crook is safe because he put his money into a Swiss bank."

This is the way officials and legal experts of the Swiss Credit Bank, the Swiss Bank Corporation and the Union Bank of Switzerland put their reasons for showing some gratitude toward Mrs. Irving.

Her activities, they say, with a mixture of conviction and hope, have served to dispel much of the misunderstanding over Swiss banking secrecy by driving home that Swiss law, does not prevent the banks from cooperating fully in the unmasking of criminals.

But even though the Credit Bank described the episode as a "publicity bargain for the Swiss banks," all the banks involved in the hoax wish they had never seen Mrs. Irving.

"We first learned from the papers that a Swiss bank was concerned," an official of the Swiss Bank Corporation said. "We were glad that it was over there" he commented with a rueful smile while pointing across the street to the Credit Bank facing Zurich's Paradeplatz.

The smile was rueful because it was not long before the Bank Corporation was dismayed to learn that Mrs. Irving, having posed at Credit Bank as Helga H. Hughes in order to collect $650,000 in checks made out by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Company to H.R. Hughes, had subsequently crossed the street to transfer most of this money to an account she had opened with it under the usurped identity of Hanna Rosenkranz.

While the two banks were both taken in by Mrs. Irving, they believe that their procedures and practices cannot be faulted. This view is fully supported at the Swiss Bankers Association in Basel, where an official said that nothing in dealings with Mrs. Irving pointed to a need for any changes in Swiss bank practices.

At Credit Bank, the association official said, there was no reason for the member of the customer relations staff who handled the opening of the "Helga R. Hughes" account to suspect that the Swiss passport presented as identification had been doctored.

"After all," he commented, "our bank employes are used to being shown a Swiss passport and they cannot be expected to detect a forgery that only an expert would catch."

This is precisely the argument advanced at the Credit Bank. But here it is also said that the "H. R. Hughes" checks were not credited to the phony Helga Hughes account before approval was received from the issuing bank in New York and McGraw-Hill had been debited for them without raising any questions.

Subsequently, when the fraud was suspected, officials said the woman teller at Credit Bank who dealt with Mrs. Irving, and had correctly recorded her passport, was able to remember the author's wife and describe what she wore.

"For all these reasons," the officials commented, "this is a textbook case that we could use as an example for our trainees."

Similar reasons are invoked at Swiss Bank Corporation to explain why no cause is seen for changing any of its practices in the light of Mrs. Irving's misdoings. There are no grounds, the officials say, to suspect that the bearer of the West German identification document was anyone but the Hanna Rosenkranz it named.

This is why Paul-Dieter Klingenberg, the bank's legal expert, is vociferously indignant because an indictment in the proceedings against the Irvings in New York alleges that Bank Corporation, on learning that the Hanna Rosenkranz identity had been usurped, wanted to help cover up the fraud by transferring the account under this name

to another branch in Zurich at the end of December.

Mr. Klingenberg angrily denied the charge, as did with equal indignation a few hours later Zurich's public prosecutor, Peter Veleff. It was not until Jan. 21, Mr. Klingenberg said, that the bank was to learn that the Hanna Rosenkranz it knew was someone else than she purported to be.

At the Union Bank, in a branch of which at Winterthur, about 20 miles north of Zurich, Mrs. Irving deposited $31,000, officials also see the Irving case as having no repercussions on Swiss banking practices. Here, too, the prevailing opinion is that these were not at fault and there is little more the banks can do to forestall criminals from taking chances.

The bankers all seem satisfied that the cooperation they have been giving Mr. Veleff in bringing to light Mrs. Irving's dealings with Swiss banks is not damaging their reputation for assuring maximum secrecy to their clients.

Individual bankers questioned in their offices lining Zurich's Bahnhofstrasse and Paradeplatz say that they have no reason to think that they are losing any business because the Irving affair has shown that there are limits to Swiss banking secrecy. The bankers' association assures that it has heard none of its members mention any disaffection of clients.

If the golden rule of Swiss banking secrecy has become a little tarnished, it can be only in the eyes of the dishonest, the bankers assert. "This would be all to the better," one official of a "Big Three" bank said, "because we are not in business to deal with criminals."

The lifting of the secrecy veil in the case of Mrs. Irving's dealings and the freezing of the funds she had on deposit presented no problem for the Swiss banks, since they acted in response to a criminal complaint filed in Switzerland for crimes committed in Switzerland with a Swiss citizen as the suspect.

If no crime has been committed in Switzerland, the trans-Atlantic cooperation that permitted the rapid tracing of the movement through Swiss bank accounts of the illegally gotten McGraw-Hill funds would not have been as easily established in the absence of a legal assistance treaty between the United States and Switzerland.

Initiated by the United States in the hope of getting an accord that would help trap American tax evaders and Mafia types who might be using secret Swiss bank accounts as hiding places for their funds, negotiations for a legal assistance treaty with Switzerland have been dragging on for more than two years.

Some diplomatic sources in Bern, the Swiss capital, believe that, on balance, the Irving affair should help the negotiations by having pointed up the advantages of cooperation. But there are bankers in Zurich who are skeptical.

These bankers say that the way the Irvings have been able to stay out of jail despite their confessions and Switzerland's request for Mrs. Irving's extradiction has opened the eyes of many Swiss to the great differences in the legal systems of the two countries. This has served, according to these bankers, to harden opinion against making any concessions that might serve only to "displace from the United States onto Switzerland the burden of catching American criminals."

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the death of a dear friend and beloved colleague, the Honorable James W. Trimble.

Jim Trimble represented the district in Arkansas which borders Oklahoma's Second District for many years, and he represented that district with honor, and ability and fidelity. He was a down-to-earth, sensible legislator with a great heart, who contributed in many ways to the advancement of the best interests of Arkansas and the entire Arkansas River Valley. He played a key role in the development of navigation on the Arkansas River, which is contributing so greatly to the economic development of both my district and the one he represented.

Jim Trimble leaves a host of friends who will remember him as one of the finest men ever to serve in the Congress. My family joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the Trimble family.

THE 197TH ANNIVERSARY OF PATRICK HENRY'S IMMORTAL SPEECH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on this date 197 years ago in St. John's Church of Richmond, Va., the Second Revolutionary Convention of Virginia met to make plans to defend their liberties. It was before this gathering that Patrick Henry made his famous speech the closing lines of which are so often quoted:

Gentleman may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. . . . Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

Today as in the 1770's the freedoms of Americans are under attack by tyrannical forces. At the earlier time when our forefathers pledged to each other their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, and placed their lives on the line so that future generations might have freedom, the oppression was imposed by England. Today the freedoms won for us through the blood of our forefathers are being whittled away by international satanic forces centralized by the United Nations Organization whose charter usurps our U.S. Constitution and whose assemblies have turned into propaganda halls making a mockery of its own charter and insulting the deliberative bodies of responsible governments.

The lamp of experience and the history of the past are just as valid and essential in guiding our steps today as they were in guiding the feet of our forefathers in the 1770's. And judging from the past, I desire to know what there has been in the conduct and operations of the United Nations Organization during the past 27 years to justify any hope that it will bring peace. How can an organization which rejects the Prince of Peace bring true peace? On the contrary, it has fostered and continues to promote the Communist style "peace"—a condition which exists when no opposition remains to Communist goals.

If we are to ever have genuine peace in our times, we must obey God's commandments and return to our proven theory of government under the U.S. Constitution. To help restore our Constitution, I have filed discharge petition No. 10 at the Clerk's desk where it awaits signatures of 218 Congressmen to bring up an immediate vote on H.R. 2632 to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations.

There can be no peace without freedom. Our forefathers who passed on to us stewardship of constitutional liberties demonstrated that they preferred death to life under tyranny.

One of my constituents, an extremely patriotic lady and a direct descendant of Patrick Henry, has written to me on the significance of Patrick Henry today and of the dire need for brave men of the caliber of that great American patriot who will stand up for America and freedom today as Patrick Henry did in 1775. And there were those who regarded Patrick Henry as an extremist.

I include the letter of Mrs. V. E. Minhinnette along with the stirring speech of her forebear in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 16, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: The true Spirit of '76 was released one hundred and ninety-seven years ago when Patrick Henry rose and announced to his countrymen that he preferred death on his feet as a free man to life on his knees as a slave. His cry to arms was epitomized in the immortal sentence, "Give me liberty or give me death."

With those words, Patrick Henry announced that he was willing, yes, eager, to risk his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor and, of course, that of his family for the noble, just, and Godly cause of freedom. He knew what he risked when he delivered his famous address, but he knew for a certainty what his fate and that of his countrymen would be should they fail to take decisive action against the tyrannical government under which they were forced to exist.

Today, those leaders of our country who bray about the Spirit of '76 have betrayed that spirit; they have bottled it and placed a cap upon it. The spirit to which they allude is that of 84—1984. Those Judases who are selling our birthright of freedom, won by men like Patrick Henry, for an eternity of slavery betray the American people.

The cry of our leaders today is Peace, Peace at any price. Peace at the price of righteousness, peace at the price of honor, peace at the price of respect, dignity, and Christian principles. Peace without freedom is slavery and, if achieved, hell on earth will be the lot of our people.

In the 1770's, the tyranny against our forefathers was directed from England; today it is directed toward our people from Washington, D.C. The guardians of our heritage of freedom have become its destroyers. The actions of our leaders amount to spitting upon the grave of every American who, through the annals of our history, pledged his all for our country. The internationalists who seek to yoke us together with the chains of world government are traitors to our Constitution and our people.

We are being ruled and manipulated by power hungry tyrants who are morally bankrupt and lack the integrity, courage, and honor of our past leaders. Where are the Patrick Henrys of today? Unless we have men, brave men, who will stand as a bulwark for freedom and who will stand for the rights and interests of the American people, instead

of prattling about the rights of the so-called World Community, then our country is surely doomed.

I would appreciate your inserting into the Congressional Record the famous address of Patrick Henry as a call to arms to those desiring to re-light the torch of freedom and once again release the Spirit of '76. As a statesman of another era said, "God, guts, and gun powder maintain liberty." We've got God, and we've still got gun-powder. We simply lack guts.

Sincerely and respectfully,

BABS MINHINNETTE.

PATRICK HENRY'S "WE MUST FIGHT" SPEECH' MARCH 23, 1775

Mr. HENRY. No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the house. But different men often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth *my* sentiments freely, and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony. The question before the house is one of awful moment to this country. For my own part, I consider it as nothing less than a question of freedom or slavery. And in proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our country. Should I keep back my opinions at such a time through fear of giving offense I should consider myself guilty of treason toward my country and of an act of disloyalty toward the majesty of Heaven which I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. President, it is natural for man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth—and listen to the song of the siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it might cost, *I* am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst and provide for it.

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to solace themselves and the house? Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir; it will prove a snare to your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with those warlike preparations which cover our waters and darken our land. Are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Have we shown ourselves so unwilling to be reconciled that force must be called in to win back our love? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation—the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, what means this martial array if its purpose be not to force us to submission? Can gentlemen assign any other possible motive for it? Has Great Britain any enemy in this quarter of the world to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. They are sent over to bind and rivet upon us those chains which the British Ministry have been so long forging. And what have we to oppose them? Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing. We have held the subject up in every light of which it is capable; but it has been all in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and humble supplication? What terms shall we find which have not been already exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, sir, deceive ourselves longer.

Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned—we have remonstrated—we have supplicated—we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrances have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne. In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation. *There is no longer any room for hope.* If we wish to be free—if we mean to be free—if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending—if we mean not basely to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been so long engaged, and which we have pledged ourselves never to abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained—we must fight! I repeat it, sir, we must fight!! An appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts is all that is left us!

They tell us, sir, that we are weak—unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be the next week, or the next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of Hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? Sir, we are not weak, if we make a proper use of those means which the God of nature hath placed in our power. Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late to retire from the contest. There is no retreat, but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged, their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable—and let it come!! I repeat it, sir, let it come!!!

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentleman may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms. Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it. Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

THE AMISH VERSUS WISCONSIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, Government officials at various levels have created unnecessary complications for the Amish people.

Some years ago, it was the State of Iowa; at the moment, State officials in Wisconsin are the culprits. This point was effectively made in an editorial of WBBM Radio, Chicago, Ill., on March 16, 1972.

The editorial follows:

THE AMISH VERSUS WISCONSIN

Do children belong to parents or to the State? That's the question before the United States Supreme Court in the case of an Amish family and its battle with the State of Wisconsin.

The Amish . . . a frugal, rural closed society . . . are threatened because they refuse to bend to the will of state law. The Amish people have their own ideas on education, and apparently they're not good enough for Wisconsin taste.

Two years ago the Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled that the Amish had a constitutional right to keep their children, who do not usually attend school after the eighth grade, out of public high school despite the state's compulsory education law. Still the Wisconsin Superintendent of Public Instruction is determined to press the issue, and is now appealing the case before the United States Supreme Court.

Perhaps it's not just the Amish educational system that rankles the Wisconsin authorities. Maybe it's the unconventional, anti-technological Amish lifestyle . . . and most important, perhaps it's the fact that it works. Educators say Amish children score well in achievement tests and are free from emotional stress. Too bad you can't say that about Chicago's public school children.

The Amish should be left alone. In fact, maybe we can learn something from them.

LAWRENCE C. ELLIOTT, NASHUA CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence C. Elliott, the father of 10 and an outstanding example of the finest qualities of good citizenship, was recently honored by the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce of Nashua, N.H., as their "Citizen of the Year." A more deserving individual would be difficult to find.

Larry Elliott has distinguished himself over the years as a hard worker, both in his business, as president of the Nashua Beef Co., and in community affairs where he has been most active in youth-oriented programs.

His contributions of time and money for the benefit of the youth of the community have demonstrated his dedication and unselfishness. He has faith in the younger generation, and that generation has in him an excellent example of good citizenship. Perhaps this example of dedicated public service, leadership, hard work, and concern for others is his most valuable contribution to Nashua and its youth.

The following is an excellent editorial, which recently appeared in the Nashua, N.H., Telegraph, lauding the accomplishments of this outstanding man:

CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

A Nashua father of 10 who has devoted much time and effort, and also money on

behalf of youth, was honored Wednesday night when he received the coveted Citizen of the Year award.

He is Lawrence C. (Larry) Elliott, a very popular choice with the more than 800 who gathered at the 46th annual dinner of the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce.

Of modest means in his youth but a hard worker, Larry is president of the Nashua Beef Company. He goes to work early and he labors until late if the occasion demands it. His diligence of effort is spread widely into other endeavors, largely to improve the welfare and conditions for Nashua's youngsters. He has done all these things—without fanfare.

He has said that if a youth is given half-a-chance, he will prove himself beyond expectations.

Larry has been a major booster for Bishop Guertin High School programs. It was through his leadership and generosity that an athletic field was developed, aptly named Elliott Field.

His concern for youths extends beyond Bishop Guertin High. He and his company sponsor a Little League baseball team and a Pop Warner football team, and a Junior Hockey team. He is active in the Junior Police program, a director of the Nashua Fresh Air Camp, and a member of the Advisory Board of St. Patrick's Community Center.

He is a director of River College here, and Nathaniel Hawthorne College in Antrim, and serves on the Advisory Board of Mount St. Mary Seminary and the N.H. Vocational-Technical College.

His public service, leadership and participation on behalf of youth through the years emphasize his dedication to helping improve the community.

It was a well-deserved recognition for the Chamber's selection. He and his wife (the former Shirley Canton) are the parents of 10 children.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the week of March 19 through 25, 1972, has been designated at National Future Homemakers of America Week. This is an excellent time to give these outstanding young people the recognition and praise they so rightfully deserve.

The Future Homemakers of America, first founded, in 1945, now has a membership of 550,000 in the United States with Texas claiming the largest membership with 70,000. This organization, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, American Home Economics Association, and the National and American Vocational Associations, has the overall goal to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living.

This goal is to be achieved by living up to the purposes set forth in the Constitution of the FHA: To promote the joys and satisfactions of homemaking; to strengthen the function of the family as a basic unit of society; to encourage democracy through cooperative action in the home and community; to become aware of the multiple roles of men and women in today's society; to improve national and international relations; to provide opportunities for decisionmaking and for assuming responsibility; to involve youth with adults in individual and group activities; and to develop interest in home economics, home economics careers, and related occupations.

This is an organization of fine young people. They are leaders today and will certainly be leaders of tomorrow. It is with pleasure that we should honor them this week.

Mr. Speaker, I have a personal commitment to the FHA, and that commitment came home this week as I received a letter from Jennifer Dujka, State president of the FHA, who attends East Bernard High School in my district.

I know this young lady to have strength of character and courage of conviction. Plus, she has a delightful singing voice.

In her letter to me, Jennifer looks back on this last year while she served as State president. Believe me, she has no regrets. Let me quote from her letter:

I am seriously disturbed by some of today's publicity given to the minority revolutionary young people seeking their kind of peace through drugs and total rejection to "the society." During my year as State FHA president, I have become even more convinced that most of the youth in America are capable, responsible and concerned citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I vote aye for the FHA—and for all the dedicated young people like Jennifer.

MAN'S FUTURE IN SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, in London, England, at Westminster School, Dr. Thomas O. Paine, former Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and presently vice president and group executive of the General Electric Corp., delivered the following address for the 1972 Tizard Memorial Lecture, entitled "Man's Future in Space":

MAN'S FUTURE IN SPACE

(By Thomas O. Paine)

INTRODUCTION

To be asked to present the 1972 Tizard Memorial Lecture is an honor and an opportunity for which I am most grateful. My topic, "Man's Future in Space", would, I believe, have intrigued Sir Henry Tizard. Although there are major differences between his development in the 1930's of the highly effective RAF fighter-director radar system of World War II, and our Apollo expeditions to the moon in the 1960's, he would recognize a number of common characteristics. He would understand the difficulties facing NASA in securing national decisions at the highest level involving complex technologies, major risks, and the allocation of large resources. He would appreciate, too, the problem of organizing dynamic government-university-industry teams capable of envisioning and constructing unprecedented systems and developing new operational techniques, while key components were still being designed and laboratory tested. He would be delighted with the technical achievements, particularly those involving the microwave technology he fostered, from radar mapping of the surfaces of Mars and Venus to color television of lunar exploration flashed around the world by communication satellites. Tizard would surely favor more cooperation in space among the western nations. I suspect he would also be interested in the varying perceptions of, and reactions to, the challenges and opportunities of space by scientists and engineers in the United States, the Soviet Union, Europe and Japan, and the characteristically different national aspirations expressed by their political leaders.

We would welcome today Tizard's superb technical judgment of the future value, pace, and goals of space technology, for he had a rare genius for selecting new frontiers of science and engineering capable of rapid advance with significant impact on world affairs. Although we can only speculate, I like to think that he would foresee continuing swift progress and an increasing importance in human affairs of space exploration and utilization. This I believe myself, and this is the thesis of my remarks today.

YEAR 1972 IN SPACE

Let's start our consideration of man's future in space with a quick out-of-this-world status report. As we meet here this afternoon the Soviet Spacecraft Mars 2 and 3 and the American Spacecraft Mariner 9 are in orbit above the dusty Red Planet transmitting their final scientific data to us across a hundred million miles. Other spacecraft beyond the sun are monitoring solar activity unobservable from earth to evaluate radiation hazards for next month's Apollo 16 expedition. Pioneer 10 is outward bound on a six hundred day passage through the Asteroid belt to a rendezvous with Jupiter in December, 1973. It will then be flung outward by Jupiter's gravity to become man's first spacecraft to leave the solar system forever, with a residual velocity at infinity of 23,500 miles per hour. (Incidentally, Pioneer 10 was launched twelve days ago with the record initial velocity of 31,413 miles per hour, which thrust it beyond lunar orbit in eleven hours, putting to shame our leisurely three-day Apollo lunar flights with their archaic 24,500 miles per hour translunar injection velocities). In orbit above the moon this afternoon are the Soviet Spacecraft Luna 19, launched five months ago on a photographic and gravimetric mission, and the Apollo 15 subsatellite ejected last August by the Spacecraft "Endeavor." On the lunar surface passive Laser-Ranging Retro-Reflectors are in place at Tranquillity Base, Fra Mauro Station and Hadley Station, by which terrestrial observatories are measuring the quarter million mile earth-moon distance to within less than one foot. Three nuclear-powered science stations are routinely transmitting lunar seismic, magnetic, electrical, and atmospheric data to earth from a triangulation network that extends from Surveyor Crater Station in the Sea of Storms to Fra Mauro and Hadley Stations. In earth orbit this afternoon dozens of satellites are engaged in a wide variety of space missions, including gravitational surveys, atmospheric and oceanographic research, propagation studies, magnetosphere and radiation belt charting, military surveillance, equipment testing, geodetic mapping, navigation, weather observation, global communication and Solar and Stellar Astronomy in wave lengths from infra red through gamma rays. The most recent of these is the European Space Research Organization's satellite TD-LA, launched two days ago on a high energy astronomy mission.

These examples just hit the highlights of this afternoon's out-of-this-world activities. Let's conclude our brief status report with a few census data from space. At the start of this year, the United States and the Soviet Union had launched between them a total of 1,425 space missions: 764 by the U.S. and

661 by the U.S.S.R.. Last year, the U.S. launched 53 spacecraft and the U.S.S.R. 109. Thus the two nations combined are now sending forth about three spacecraft per week, ranging in mission from pure science to commercial telecommunications, in payload from less than a hundred pounds to 150 tons, and in destination from earth orbit to the moon, Mars and Venus—and now across 420 million miles to Jupiter, and on out into the vast reaches of galactic space. Every part of our eight billion mile diameter solar system is now accessible to man's far-ranging spacecraft.

This represents remarkably rapid progress when you reflect that all of today's activities in space have been developed since Sputnick beeped its message of a new age less than fifteen years ago. Many then scoffed at the possibility of human space flight, but within four years Yuri Gagarin had become the first man to orbit our home planet, and eight years after that Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin and Mike Collins initiated human extra-terrestrial exploration on the lunar Sea of Tranquility. Today, seven Apollo expeditions have carried twenty astronauts around the moon, and eight have walked upon its ancient surface.

Will this rapid rate of technical advance continue? Where will it carry man in the next fifteen years? I hope you will pardon me if I speak to these questions in terms of the American post-Apollo program, of which I have some personal knowledge, and discuss probable Soviet and European space progress in relation to it.

THE 1970'S IN SPACE

In his first month in office, President Nixon called together the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, his Science Advisor, and me as Administrator of NASA to meet as a task group. Our assignment was to develop for the new Administration a definitive recommendation and plan for America's future in space. Two months after the first moon landing we reviewed the completed Space Task Group Report at a meeting with the President. Entitled "The Post-Apollo Space Program: Directions for the Future," it provided him with the basis for a definitive statement setting forth the elements of a balanced new space program as a continuing part of American life. The report has also furnished the basis for subsequent NASA budgets and congressional reviews, and for specific proposals to other nations to encourage broader international participation in the forefront of space development and utilization to the benefit of all.

The President approved NASA's plans for increasing international cooperation in space in an informal meeting with Secretary of State Rogers, Dr. Henry Kissinger and me aboard Air Force One as we flew over the Pacific to the splashdown of Apollo 11.

To initiate discussions I transmitted the U.S. post-Apollo plans to Academician M. V. Keldysh, the distinguished President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and suggested we explore potential U.S.-U.S.S.R. cooperative programs and joint missions. He responded favorably, and this exploration has made steady progress since. I also invited the western space nations to review U.S. plans for the 1970's and consider greatly expanding their already extensive cooperative programs with NASA. This involved a series of personal discussions and briefings with governmental and industrial leaders in the space capitals of the Western World, including London, Paris, Bonn, Madrid, Brussels, the Hague, Ottawa, Canberra, and Tokyo. Encouraging progress has also been made here. As a result I am optimistic that by 1975 American Astronauts and Soviet Cosmonauts may be flying together in space, and by the end of the 1970's it is quite possible that they will be joined in orbit by men and women from many nations, including Great Britain. To see how these predictions might be realized, let's review NASA's proposed post-Apollo program.

THE POST-APOLLO PROGRAM

1. The space shuttle and space tug

The basic foundation for all future space activities is the reliable, economical space shuttle launch vehicle. This reusable, vertical-take-off rocket ship will resemble in size and shape a DC–9 jet aircraft. It will be 120 feet long, with a 75 foot delta wing for horizontal landing on conventional airstrips, and will receive augmented thrust from a booster stage during launch and initial climb. It should weigh about 2,400 tons fully fueled with liquid hydrogen and oxygen, (about 80 of the weights of a Saturn V rocket).

The space shuttle will be able to carry into orbit, and return to earth, about 25 tons of cargo in a hold 15 feet in diameter by 60 feet long. It will be able to carry a dozen passengers, making space accessible to all phycially fit men and women without astronaut training.

The reusable Space Shuttle's principal advanatge, which will have a major impact on man's future in space, is a large reduction in the complexity and cost of space transportation. At the dawn of the space age it cost more than $100,000 to put a pound of payload into orbit. A Saturn V rocket does the job today for less than $1,000—a hundredfold reduction in ten years. By the end of the 1970's the Space Shuttle should achieve an additional tenfold improvement to attain about $100 per pound of orbital payload, exclusive of development costs. Beyond this NASA engineers foresee the possibility of another tenfold reduction in the 1980's, which could cut the cost of a round-trip to orbit to about $10 per pound of payload, approaching the price of today's long-distance jet fares.

Space Shuttle rocket planes should initiate routine airline-like roundtrips into orbit within ten years, carrying equipment, supplies, construction materials, experiment modules, fuel, spacecraft, and scientists and engineers from participating nations on a wide variety of missions. Shuttle flights will render obsolete all other launch vehicles for earth orbit, and bring about a new generation of low-cost space equipment designed to be repaired and resupplied. The shuttle is the first leg of a new cislunar space transportation system that will become operational in the 1980's. The other two elements are permanent space stations in earth and lunar orbits, and manned and automated space tugs for moving men and supplies between low earth orbit and other orbits in the earth-moon system. An advanced space tug modified for landing will shuttle between lunar orbit and lunar surface bases; eventually it will use propellant oxygen recovered from lunar rocks by a process now under development at Houston. One reason why future Apollo missions will be searching carefully for water on the moon is to provide a convenient lunar source of hydrogen and oxygen for space refueling. This would enormously simplify lunar transportation—you can imagine how much by considering the difficulty of transatlantic jet flights if the aircraft had to carry enough fuel for round trips.

In evaluating man's future in space, one must certainly consider the impact of these onrushing technical advances upon the reliability, economy and utility of space flight. Both the United States and the Soviet Union will build space shuttle systems, with common docking arrangements. This will increase space flight safety by providing effective fast rescue capability. NASA has invited the western space nations to participate in the development and use of the Space Shuttle, space tug, and space station systems of the future. In response, ELDO, the European Launcher Development Organization, and ESRO, the European Space Research Organization, have been exploring the possibility of Europe undertaking to develop the Space Tug by 1980. ELDO has already funded several one million dollar studies of space tug configurations by competing European industrial teams. The NASA proposal is expected to receive serious consideration in the next few months by the European Space Conference ministers who must make the final policy evaluation and budget decisions.

If they decide to accept the U.S. offer, scientists and engineers from all the Western space nations will be sharing in the most challenging space developments of the 1970's. In the 1980's they will be using the space shuttles, space tugs, and space stations of the new cislunar space transportation system to carry out advanced missions in the forefront of science and technology.

President Nixon's new budget contains $5,500 million for shuttle development, so the European response is expected by July as the NASA shuttle program picks up momentum. I cannot predict the outcome because there are many political complexities, but I personally hope very much that the European ministers will select the bold and forward looking course and accept NASA's invitation.

I have mentioned space stations, and would like to say a few words now about the pace of progress to be expected in this field following the Apollo program.

2. Skylabs and space stations

If all goes well, Astronauts John Young, Charlie Duke and Ken Mattingly will lift off from Cape Kennedy on April 16th aboard Apollo 16, bound for the apparently volcanic region of the moon near Descartes. The last Apollo mission will then be flown on December 6th by Astronauts Gene Cernan, Dr. Jack Schmitt and Ron Evans aboard Apollo 17. They will explore the rugged highland ridges and lowland valleys in the moon's Taurus-Littrow area, and emplace there the final Apollo Lunar Science Station. This includes an exciting new physical experiment being rushed to completion in time for transport to the moon aboard the last Apollo flight: a tidal gravimeter that will use earth-moon interactions to detect gravity waves in space.

After Apollo 17 the large Saturn V rocket's capabilities will be redirected to launch on April 30, 1973, Skylab 1, a 150 ton earth orbiting space station experiment. The next day a smaller Saturn 1B rocket will launch the Skylab 2 mission, consisting of an Apollo Command Service module with a three-man crew, who will rendezvous with the orbiting station and activate it for an initial 28-day weightless mission. They will be followed by Skylab 3 on July 30th bearing a fresh three-man crew to live and work for 56 weightless days aboard the orbiting Skylab, carrying out a variety of tasks from solar astronomy to multispectral earth resource studies. The final Skylab 4 mission Astronauts will reactivate the station on October 28th for another 56-day sojourn, which could be extended if no medical problems develop, and the oxygen, food and coffee hold out. If Skylab proceeds on schedule, men will be at work in space more than half the time during the last eight months of 1973; by the 1980's I expect that there will always be men living and working somewhere in space.

The 1973 Skylab Program should establish man's ability to live and work effectively under prolonged weightlessness. This will tell us whether artificial gravity is essential for future space stations and other lengthy missions. The Skylab Astronauts will have ample opportunity to swim about weightlessly inside their 10,000 cubic foot laboratory, and outside in space suits tending the cameras of their large solar telescopes.

Skylab's 235 nautical mile orbit will be inclined 55° to the equator, making possible scientific observations of our entire planet between 55° North and 55° South Latitudes. This includes North America south of Hud-

son Bay, Europe south of the Baltic Sea, and all of the continents in the Southern Hemisphere except Antarctica. From this mission should come valuable new knowledge in solar astronomy, astrophysics, weightless materials processing, earth resources, meteorology, oceanography, air and water pollution, geology, environmental sciences, medicine, and many other fields. In addition the Skylab mission will establish the design parameters, human factors, and operational requirements for the larger, permanently manned space stations of the future. These will be assembled in earth and lunar orbits from specialized modules carried aloft by space shuttles, and moved into designated position by space tugs.

The U.S. post-Apollo program does not now schedule a bigger and more permanent space station for the 1970's. The Soviet space program, which is estimated to be larger now than the U.S. program at its 1966 peak, or about twice the present NASA level, probably includes plans for a more advanced space station in the mid-1970's substantially larger and more permanent than the U.S. Skylab. This will be launched, assembled in orbit, and supported by large conventional rockets until the Soviet space shuttle becomes operational.

Although no timetable for the Soviet space station has been announced, the way will be prepared by the long duration Salyut/Soyuz missions expected soon. In addition Russian and American space experts have met in Houston and Moscow to study the feasibility of a joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. orbital flight in June, 1975. If approved by both nations, the mission would include rendezvous, docking, crew exchange, and joint flight of a Soviet Salyut/Soyuz Spacecraft and an American Apollo Command Service Module carrying a special docking adapter in place of the Lunar Module. The three cosmonauts and three astronauts would work together for several days, with one man at the controls of each spacecraft, leaving the other four free to move from one spacecraft to the other to conduct joint experiments. Although this program has not received final review and approval, the United States now has the surplus spacecraft and launch vehicles to carry out several such missions, and the Soviet Union also has the necessary equipment. The carrying out by astronauts and cosmonauts of such a mission would raise all of our hopes that the new frontier of space can be explored in peace by all mankind. In Antarctica Soviet scientists work at the American base and American scientists at the Soviet base; similar exchanges are in effect in our high energy physics laboratories. This open policy should also be pursued in the scientific space bases of the future.

The U.S. Skylab Program, the Soviet Salyut/Soyuz Program, the Soviet Space Station Program, and the proposed U.S.–U.S.S.R. joint space mission for 1975 will open orbital space for permanent occupation by man in the 1980's. This will involve the construction and operation of larger and more permanent workships, research stations, observatories and operational bases. Reliable and inexpensive roundtrip transportation between earth and orbit by space shuttle rocket planes will greatly accelerate the scale and utility of these permanent orbital installations. The motivations will range from scientific research to economic applications, and I would like to consider briefly now some of the potential scientific and economic returns.

SCIENTIFIC AND ECONOMIC RETURNS

Our initial observations from space have already greatly extended the breadth and depth of our understanding of man's total environment. Even America's first satellite, the small Explorer 2 launched in 1958, immediately relayed back surprising data on the radiation fields around the earth, leading to the discovery and mapping of the Van Allen radiation belts and the Earth's magnetosphere. Since then, many new scientific observations have been made from space of the earth, moon, planets, sun, stars, other astrophysical objects, and the fields and particles of interplanetary space. We are now routinely examining the universe around us from space platforms that record wave lengths of radiation which have never penetrated the earth's atmosphere to ground based observatories. Our direct exploration of the moon has opened to view new chapters of the early history of the formation and evolution of our solar system three to five thousand million years ago. We have mapped most of the Moon and Mars in detail, inspected the Martian moons, and Soviet landers have reached the surfaces of Venus and Mars. The X-ray, Ultra-Violet and Infra-Red sky has been charted, and a new insight gained into solar processes at these wavelengths. The new 1,038 pound ESRO TD-1A satellite should further extend these observations, including measurements in the gamma ray spectrum of the sun, stars and galaxies.

International cooperation has made other significant contributions to scientific returns from space. In December 1970, the Italian-American cooperative program launched the first Small Astronomy Satellite from the Italian launch platform off the coast of Kenya. Named "Uhuru" (the Swahili word for "freedom"), it has mapped more than a hundred X-ray sources, including a number of apparent extragalactic sources. About half of the X-ray sources show rapidly changing frequencies and intensities, like the Pulsars discovered by British Radio Astronomers in 1968, although they emit no pulsed radio waves. Several of these unusual new pulsing sources appear to involve binary systems. These may provide our best opportunity to observe the elusive "black holes" in space—superdense objects with gravity fields so high that no radiation can escape. The Small Astronomy Satellite's new chart of X-ray sources suggests a new distribution of matter in the Universe, differing from that derived from terrestial telescope studies. Some of the new X-ray sources have been correlated with quasars, Seyfert galaxies, and dense galaxy clusters. The enormous energy released by these remarkable objects is as little understood today as nuclear energy was fifty years ago; elucidation of these processes could have equally significant impact.

While new scientific results from Orbiting Solar and Astronomical Observatories are increasing our wonder and understanding of the universe around us, space observations of our neighboring planets and the moon are changing our concepts of our home planet, earth.

MARS

It is too early to review and interpret for you this afternoon all of the exciting information Mariner 9 is sending back from Mars. The notion of Mars as a dead planet on the basis of the moon-like photos sent back in 1969 by Mariners 6 and 7 has been replaced in recent weeks with a recognition that Mars has been recently active internally. The planet's active crust includes the largest volcano yet discovered in the solar system: Nix Olympica, twice the size of Mauna Loa, in Hawaii, the earth's largest. Features have been mapped with a close resemblance to terrestial water erosion, including tributary streams and alluvial fans. This is baffling on a planet with a present atmospheric pressure so low that water sublimes directly from the solid to the gaseous state without liquifying. It has been hypothesized that Mars may pass through a 50,000 years cycle due to precession of the equinox in which the changing tilt of the poles might release sufficient glacial polar water to permit liquid water. A puzzling white area in the bottom of an equatorial crater might represent a salt layer left by evaporating water. The recent planet-wide dust storm and the presence of silica sand also indicate an active planet. It is simply too early to do more than speculate about the possible meaning of the many unexpected features revealed in the superb photographs that Mariner 9 is returning from Mars. Additional mapping information will be added by data from the Soviet Mars 2 and 3 spacecraft, which have transmitted images together with temperature, moisture and surface brightness readings, (including temperatures as high as 0°F). All we can say this afternoon is that Mars is far more interesting than had been supposed, and that our latest observations have increased the prospects for finding some form of life there.

The first unmanned U.S. spacecraft to land on Mars and search for life will be the Viking, scheduled to touch down on the Fourth of July, 1976. The Soviet Mars 3 descent module which landed last December 2nd may have been damaged upon landing by the severe dust storm then raging. Its data transmissions ceased after several minutes, with only 20 tantalizing seconds of television transmission, which was insufficient to form a picture. The Viking lander will be larger than Mars 3 and land with only 13 g impact rather than 500 g. It will carry sensitive instruments for television, meteorology, atmosphere and surface analysis, seismic sensing, magnetic measurements and life detection by several means. The optimum landing site for the search for life will be carefully selected from the detailed maps provided by Mariner 9 and Mars 2 and 3. The Soviets may dispatch additional landers in the 1974 and 1976 opportunities.

THE MOON

Although we now have far more information on the moon as a result of Apollo expeditions and Soviet Luna missions, as many questions have been raised as answers found, and the moon remains nearly as puzzling as Mars. The moon is relatively cold and inactive now, but it has had an active history, including melting, differentiation, lava flows, stratification down to 65 kilometers, impact cratering, and erosion. The heat flux from the interior of the moon measured at Hadley Station is unexpectedly high, as is the concentration of radioactive elements detected from orbit in Mare Imbrium. Strong evidence for an early internal magnetic field is puzzling, and so are the discharged "Mascon" gravity anomalies underlying the smaller Maria.

The evidence does suggest that the moon was probably not captured by, or fissioned from earth. It appears to have been formed by accretion of planetisimals and space debris orbiting the early earth about 4.6 thousand million years ago, about the time the solar system itself was formed. There is evidence for melting on the moon about 500 million years after it formed, and lava flows into the Maria 500 to 1000 million years after that. For the past 3 to 3.5 thousand million years, however, except for impact craters, the moon appears to have preserved intact for our study the ancient history of our earth and solar system.

Seismic observations on the moon are revealing unexpected features, including the fact that 80% of the moonquakes are occurring in one place 800 kilometers below the surface. Their periodicity suggests tidal stresses from earth as the triggering mechanism. Our expeditions have revealed a wealth of new information, but we have just barely scratched the lunar surface.

OTHER PLANETS

Although American and Russian spacecraft have flown to Venus, and a Soviet capsule has landed on its surface, little is yet known about this cloud-covered planet. Surface conditions are hardly hospitable, with a temperature in the range of molten lead, and a carbon dioxide atmosphere surface pressure equal to that at a depth of several thousand

feet in the ocean. Next year another Mariner will fly by Venus, then continue on into Mercury to give us our first view of that small planet's scorched surface. At the end of 1973 we will receive Pioneer's report on mammoth Jupiter and its satellites, if the spacecraft survives its two-years passage through the asteroid belt. As we learn more about the moon and the planets, their origin, history, present status, and active processes, we are deepening our understanding of our own earth; this is awakening a new interest on the part of many people in terrestrial processes.

THE EARTH'S BIOSPHERE

Some commentators on current trends trace the present wave of increased ecological concern to the remarkable new perspective of our tiny planet transmitted to us by moon-bound Apollo Astronauts. Inspired by this new view of earth, the poet Archibald MacLeish wrote:

"To see the earth as it truly is, small, and blue, and beautiful, in that eternal silence where it floats . . ."

This struck a responsive note in many minds. The forbidding barrenness reported by our first probes to other worlds reinforced our concern for preserving the earth's thin biosphere, wherein all life that we know of exists.

The Earth Resources Technology Satellite Program will soon make available powerful new scientific and economic tools for studying the earth's biosphere and its vital processes. Nearly completed are two 1800 pound satellites planned for polar orbit 575 miles above the earth. These will transmit television and radiometric observations in four spectral regions covering the entire planet. The specific wave lengths have been selected from multi-spectral photographic studies made by aircraft and Apollo flights over "ground truth" test areas. The observations are not only able to discriminate between different agricultural crops, but can detect plant diseases, insect infestation, drought damage, poor fertilization, and similar problems. Successful examples range from corn mold in America to coffee tree blight in Brazil and Palm tree disease in India. Throughout the annual growing seasons in the northern and southern hemispheres Earth Resources Satellites will be able to monitor man's food supply and the natural phenomena which affect it.

Together Weather Satellites and Earth Resources Satellites will track the total fresh water resources of the planet. The water will be followed as it evaporates from the oceans, condenses into clouds, falls as rain, ice or snow, runs down the valleys, passes through hydroelectric plants and out onto irrigated plains or into the rivers and seas. Estimates of the savings that can be realized from more efficient operation of hydro projects suggest that this alone could pay for the entire Earth Resources Satellite Program. Global resource models in large computerized information systems will receive satellite data from space tracking networks, store and process the information, and provide displays and printouts of planetary resources, their status and trends. For the first time, the fields, the forests, the fisheries and the mineral resources of earth will be comprehensible on a planetary scale, and global information made available for the more enlightened use and protection of our biosphere by man.

Important technical contributions will be made to this program by the Skylab Astronauts, who will use their five months in orbit next year to select and calibrate remote sensing equipment, extend multispectral observations into thirteen spectral bands, and operate active micro-wave sensors with larger power outputs and antenna sizes than automated satellites can yet carry. Phenomena to be studied from Skylab include ocean wave conditions, sea and lake ice, snow cover, clouds, rainfall, flooding. urban heat and pollution, seasonal vegetation changes, geological formations, and soil moisture, types and textures.

Specific goals of the Earth Resources Program include a detailed land use map of the United States, classification and charting of U.S. geological and soil features, a current agricultural map of the U.S., and the development of advanced computerized image storage, processing, pattern recognition, and display networks. These will analyze and make available to specialists in many fields the vast quantity of valuable new information collected by this program.

Questions may arise over the ownership, distribution and use of global space observations. These extremely promising technological advances should encourage world leaders to face these questions and make appropriate institutional advances so that all men can derive maximum advantage from these powerful new tools of the space age. Perhaps it is optimistic to suggest that technical advances can transform politicians into statesmen, but there are few precedents. We have reached effective international agreements whereby all nations now have access to continuous meterological information from Weather Satellites. Every destructive typhoon and hurricane in our planet's atmosphere is now tracked with precision from space, with resultant great savings in life and property. Moscow and Washington are linked by the "Cold Line" which routinely exchanges global weather satellite data from U.S. and U.S.S.R. spacecraft. Similar institutional progress has been made among nations for the use of Communication Satellites. Effective national, regional and international organizations have been formed to create and operate compatible comsat networks. These are now providing reliable and low-cost voice, data and television communication all around the world. Navigation and air traffic control satellite systems should follow similar lines (allowing, of course, for some inevitable initial confusion).

The great economic and social value of earth orbiting application satellites are already apparent, although their full potential is not yet appreciated. Men on every continent regularly use these services today; shares can be bought in the enterprises that provide them. We must not, however, overlook the equal value of the new information about the earth's origin, history, environment, and destiny that our more basic lunar and planetary scientific programs are providing. Already studies of radiative energy transport in the atmosphere of Mars have contributed to terrestrial meteorology; lunar geological surveys have provided new clues to the early formation and structure of earth. The line between science and application in this rapidly advancing area is continually shifting and new scientific understanding of such questions as the origin of the Ice Ages might be of incalculable human importance.

CONCLUSION

My remarks today have ranged widely across the solar system, and beyond. We have reviewed some highlights of man's first fifteen years in space, and considered his impressive achievements to date. We have looked ahead to assess his potential future in light of the great opportunities we can foresee for a continuing swift pace of technological advance. A few of the valuable returns already realized and potential future values have been mentioned.

I have offered you some optimistic predictions of the rate of progress we should expect upon space missions and programs already underway or scheduled, and expressed my strong personal hope that the 1970's in space will be characterized by more widespread international cooperation and participation. There are grounds for optimism here. I have no doubt that the Soviet Union's rapid thrust forward in space will continue and even accelerate with the growth of the Russian economy. The United States program will not move forward so purposefully and massively, but within the normal give and take of the democratic budget process I expect NASA to continue to carry out an excellent program at the annual $3 to $3.5 thousand million dollar level to which I cut back after the moon landing. I thought this was a supportable budget level in 1969, and I still think so. I believe that the NASA budget will increase steadily later in the decade. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. space budgets are modest in relation to their gross national products; including military space programs the percentages are about half percent for the U.S. and two percent for the U.S.S.R. The returns from space are justifying these expenditures in many ways, from new science and technology to economic services to greater international stability. We are awaiting a decision on future European direction and pace. In addition to the values I have listed, there are other considerations, involving more basic human values, that I believe will continue to spur us on.

The opening of vast new areas for human exploration is a rare event; it occurred last in the fifteenth century on the Atlantic coast of Europe with the bold oceanic voyages of Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French and English seamen. Their adventurous trips beyond their traditional horizons eliminated "terra incognita" from the globe, and brought to Europe a broad world view which has vitalized western civilization ever since. Not all nations participated then, nor will they now. I believe we are in the initial stages of a new movement which will carry mankind beyond its present world view to a broader three-dimensional perspective embracing all of the space within the earth-moon system and beyond.

I am certain that by the end of this century men and women will be living and working in extraterrestrial space stations and in small colonies on the moon. The first few will have reached Mars. By then the first children will have been born outside the earth's biosphere and terrestrial life will be adapting itself to new worlds. A new sociology of extraterrestrial societies will evolve to suit growing communities of scientists, engineers and spacemen striving to create new human habitats in novel environments beyond earth. Perhaps history will repeat itself and once again the advanced social structures and governmental compacts evolved in new worlds will demonstrate new social possibilities to the old.

I use the analogy of the European settlement of new continents advisedly. The orbital space a few hundred miles above the continents of earth is in a real sense another continent, vast in extent, free of atmosphere, gravity, and national boundaries, overlooking all of earth below. Permanent structures will be built there in which work of great social, scientific and economic value will be carried out. Already three cargoes per week are being exported up to this new continent, and to maintain a balance of payments, we are importing back to earth valuable services of many kinds: meteorological, communication, geodetic, navigation, defense, and exciting new scientific research. Within a few years these services will be greatly expanded and significant new services added in earth resources, air traffic control, direct continental television broadcast and other areas. If some of the advances I have predicted do not occur on the timetable I projected, they will come later. They are inevitable.

Beyond earth orbital space, but increasingly within our reach, lie other new worlds to be explored and occupied: on the moon, and eventually on Mars. The power to modern technology will make life in these areas far safer and more comfortable than it was for

our ancestors wresting a marginal living from the hostile wilderness of America or Australia. The tall new ships to sail the three dimensional seas of space are under construction; the dangers are reasonably well charted; the wind and tide are fair for our voyage; new terrae incognitae call. Let me conclude this memorial to Sir Henry Tizard then, with these lines from Tennyson:

"Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows, for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the Western stars, until I die."

MASS TRANSIT AND THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the privilege of presenting my views on mass transportation funding to the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee of Public Works. In particular, I addressed myself to the need to make a portion of the Highway Trust Fund available for such funding.

Our policy of considering the various modes of transportation as separate and distinct entities is extremely short-sighted and, as I point out in my testimony, ends up injuring the favored modes as well as the disfavored.

Mr. Speaker, I include my testimony at the conclusion of my remarks:

THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mrs. ABZUG. Chairman Kluczynski, my colleagues on the Public Works Committee, it is indeed a pleasure to come before you today to present my views on the crying need to expand the uses to which the Highway Trust Fund is put.

According to the 1970 census, 73.5 percent of Americans—about 150 million people—live in urban areas; in addition, a substantial number of the remaining 26.5 percent commute to urban areas to earn their living. These people must be moved around—from office to office as well as between home and office—and they must move either in privately owned automobiles or in some form of public or semi-public mass transportation.

To far too great an extent, our national transportation policies have ignored the need to move *people* in favor of the need to move *goods*, and have ignored the need to move people and goods *within* urban areas in favor of the need to move people and goods *between* urban areas. The transportation situation in our urban areas is at a crisis level, and we must take giant steps to deal with it as soon as is humanly possible.

Existing mass transit facilities are, for the most part, unable to keep up with the demands made upon them. The facilities are old and subject to frequent breakdowns; the systems are uncoordinated and do not cover adequately either the central cities or the suburbs.

Our urban mass transit systems are not only unable to engage in needed construction and maintenance activities, but also unable to meet their day-to-day operating costs. As a result, fares are going up and up; in New York City, for example, mass transit fares have gone from 15 cents to 35 cents over the last 13 years, and they show every likelihood of climbing still further in the near future. This money is being taken from those who can least afford it—working men and women. Our failure to give adequate financial aid to mass transit, which is as much of an essential service for working people as is police protection, takes food out of their mouths and clothing from their backs. To add insult to injury, they must endure inhuman conditions just to get to and from work each day.

As if this were not bad enough, our failure to make mass transit attractive to potential riders who *can* afford cars leaves them willing to suffer through the noise, smoke and frustration of rush hour traffic, not to mention the agony of finding parking space at a reasonable price once they get where they are going. If people are willing to travel on the Long Island Expressway during the evening rush hour on a hot summer day—and tens of thousands are—then we have failed to meet our responsibilities with regard to mass transportation.

For transportation in and around crowded urban areas, autos are extremely inefficient. Per person carried, they take up far more space, use more of our dwindling supply of gasoline, create far more air and noise pollution, and create more congestion than mass transit facilities. Unfortunately—and largely as a result of the transportation policies of the federal government—state and local governments have been doing far more building of highways than of mass transit facilities.

Purely and simply, the reason for this is *money*. The Highway Trust Fund, created by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, receives most revenues from federal excise taxes on motor fuels motor vehicles, and related products. Since its creation, the trust fund has received over $50 billion in such funds and has expended about $46 billion solely on highways. In the last ten years, expenditures from the fund have averaged about $4 billion annually. For highways in the interstate system, the federal share is 90 percent; for most other federally-aided highways, the federal share is 70 percent.

Mass transit, on the other hand, has been a poor step-child when it comes to federal help. Under the Urban Mass Transit Act, the total amount of funding authorized for both construction grants *and* loans is less than $3½ billion; for Fiscal Year 1972, only $900 million was appropriated and, believe it or not, the Administration has impounded $300 million of even that paltry sum.

The message of this comparison cannot be lost on anyone, and is certainly clear to state and local officials; build more highways, especially superhighways, and we in Washington will pay almost the entire bill; build mass transit facilities, and you are on your own.

It has been apparent for some time that this sort of policy, if allowed to continue, will strangle our central cities and, in the process, strangle the rest of our nation as well. As Secretary Volpe noted in his presentation last week, in speaking of his home state, Massachusetts:

"New highways across the State allow trucks to get from the New York border to within 10 miles of Boston in 2½ hours instead of 7 hours. When they get near Boston, however, it takes them an hour or more to go that additional distance because of the congestion."

My own home area, New York City, is much more crowded than Boston, and it faces a correspondingly more acute situation. The policy of encouraging long-distance highways over urban roads and/or mass transit facilities has hurt urban and suburban dwellers for many years; now, it has reached the point where it is severely injuring the long-haul truckers for whom the interstate system was designed. Thus, use of money from the Highway Trust Fund is entirely appropriated for the construction and operation of urban mass transit systems, for unless vast sums of money are spent on such systems, the traffic congestion in and around the urban centers of commerce will render the entire interstate system useless for business purposes.

There are those who say that the money which comes from highway use taxes should go back to the highways and no other place. By the same token, of course, we could argue that the revenue from liquor taxes should be used to build distilleries, bars and liquor stores. Furthermore, though there was some disagreement on the point, Secretary Volpe indicated that there was more than enough money in the Trust Fund and due to come into the Trust Fund to cover the cost of completing the interstate system, even if a substantial proportion of it were to be applied to mass transit programs.

A number of proposals for putting some of the money in the Highway Trust Fund into mass transportation have been advanced. Some, including the Administration, have suggested creating a single fund for both highway and mass transit programs; some have suggested earmarking a portion of the Highway fund for mass transit without changing its basic designation and purpose; some have suggested a form of revenue sharing under which funds for "transportation" are given to localities and states who then decide for themselves how the money should be spent. I am not going to suggest any one of these plans as the answer at this time: what I am trying to say is that we must stop looking upon the Highway Trust Fund as a sacred cow and start being realistic as to our transportation needs.

MAYOR CARTER

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Matthew G. Carter is an individual whose beliefs and hopes for the betterment of our society, whose concern for the needs of all individuals from all walks of life, and whose insight into the problems confronting our suburban communities today have been respected and appreciated by a large number of New Jersey's citizens. He has served, specifically, as a positive source of leadership, direction, and confidence to the people of Montclair.

The enclosed editorial from the Montclair Times best expresses this man's deep devotion to the people whom he has so honorably served:

MAYOR SERVED MONTCLAIR WELL

Mayor Matthew G. Carter in 8 years as a member of the Town Commission has served the community well. His departure in May from the governing board will be regretted. His decision not to seek a third term as announced last week is understandable.

The people of Montclair have shown upon at least 3 occasions how they feel about Matthew G. Carter.

In 1964 he received the greatest number of votes among candidates seeking election to the Town Commission.

After serving as Vice Mayor and Director of Public Works, he received in 1968 for the second time the greatest number of votes among Commission candidates. This total, which had exceeded his previous tally by 1,003 votes, can be considered a personal

tribute to the first black member of a Montclair governing board.

The 1968 election results brought him additional honor as the first black mayor of a large New Jersey community.

Three and a half years later Montclair residents in concert with those in the rest of Essex County received still another opportunity of registering opinions of Matthew G. Carter.

He sought a seat as a member of the New Jersey Senate. Though unsuccessful throughout the county, Mayor Carter received even more votes here than in Commission elections.

Mayor Carter can point with pride to many tangible accomplishments during his 8 years in office.

Among these are: activities designed to assure adequate water supplies; pioneer application for funds for a federally assisted code enforcement program; advancement of the Lackawanna Plaza Urban Renewal Project, and continuing efforts to improve housing, education, economic development, minority opportunities, fair housing and self-help programs.

Mayor Carter should derive even greater satisfaction from the influences he exerted toward the development of amicable solutions of potentially explosive problems.

These influences resulted from his background as a Christian minister and as a professional with the National Board of the Young Men's Christian Association.

When the town was confronted with issues that threatened to polarize opinion, everyone in the community, whether black or white, could turn for rationally-developed, calm and logical thought to a man who earned universal respect because of his deep and abiding understanding and liking for his fellow men.

Those seeking election to the governing board in May and all interested in furthering Montclair as a community would do well to adopt Mayor Matthew G. Carter's personal philosophy insofar as the goals of local government are concerned:

"The aim is to give leadership to all the people, on the one hand urging intelligent rather than emotional weighing of items, while spearheading the fight for human rights on the other. The community, as a whole, has a right to expect peace and protection of the law."

MARINE MAMMALS PROTECTION ACT

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 of this year, the House passed, by a vote of 362 to 10, much needed legislation to protect our ocean mammals from the slaughter which has threatened their very continued existence.

The worldwide population of marine mammals has been thinning at an alarming rate, plummeting by the hundreds of thousands within the past decade alone. Some animals—a few species of whale most notably—have been all but decimated. Many stretches of open sea and coastal waters once teeming with mammalian life are now barren of it.

I was pleased by the House action of March 9, in passing a strengthened version of the once rejected Marine Mammals Protection Act, and I only regret that official congressional business back in my district kept me from voting for this bill which I have so long advocated.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a "Voice of Democracy" contest. The contest theme this year was "My Responsibility to Freedom." The following is the winning speech from Missouri, as delivered by Lynette Richarz of St. Charles, Mo.:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

How many times do you take for granted the things in your everyday life? How often do you take cokes or hamburgers or sight or hearing for granted? We're like this, aren't we? We can't seem to realize how vitally important something is until it's no longer there.

Imagine how frightening it would be to be engulfed in the total darkness of the blind person. Imagine never being able to see the beauties of nature, like the red, yellow, and brown leaves of an oak tree preparing itself for winter, or the soft pastels of a rainbow as it tells of the end of a rainstorm. Imagine never being able to glimpse a loved one's face, to see the look of love in his eyes. Imagine never being able to run or dance or skip or jump, or even to take a single unsupported step.

Just like you, I too rarely think of the many things I have to be thankful for. Only when it's no longer there is something truly valued for its worth. Will it be that way with freedom?

Freedom is a privilege, you know. It's a gift like sight and hearing and tasting. Isn't it strange that after all the wars fought to preserve it that so many people can nonchalantly accept freedom as their right and at the same time try to deprive others of their right to freedom? This is how it is, though.

Some young draft dodgers expect all the rights of freedom, but they refuse to protect freedom for others. The college radical burns down the campus ROTC building in a protest against war and violence. At the same time, he limits the freedom of the majority of the students who choose ROTC.

As a citizen of the world—though a young one—it's my responsibility to cultivate a genuine understanding and appreciation of the true worth of freedom. As a young American I believe that I can fulfill my personal responsibility to freedom right now. Tomorrow may be too late.

I can do this by respecting the basic human freedom of others as well as my own right to freedom. If John or Carol wants to express views on a controversial issue, who am I to close my mind to them simply because their ideas happen to differ from mine? If I want others to respect my right to freedom, so also must I respect theirs. For freedom has to be a two-way street, or there is no freedom. So also is it with a person of another race, creed, or religion. Any discrimination I might have against another human being merely because he may look different or believe in different ideals is in direct violation of that person's freedom.

Clearly then, until the vital role that freedom plays in human existence is fully understood and appreciated, many people will continue to exploit it. As one individual, I can't expect to change the whole world's thinking, but I can shoulder my part of the responsibility. Until I can say to each and every person I meet, "I respect you as a human being with the same unalienable rights to freedom that I have," I will not have fulfilled my responsibility. But I want to start right now to fulfill that responsibility and so I say to you as I will say to everyone I meet, "I respect you. I respect the freedom you have as a fellow human being."

R. E. OLDS

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday, March 20, I expressed in the House my hope that Ransom Eli Olds, one of our great automotive pioneers, might be honored by the issuance of a commemorative stamp.

The city of Lansing, Mich., is particularly proud of Mr. Olds' many accomplishments for it was there that he was born and educated, started his experiments with steam and internal combustion engines, and established his most successful business ventures. It is, therefore, understandable that Lansing is anxious that Mr. Olds' achievements in automobile production which literally put the world on wheels be recognized, and I am pleased to include in the RECORD the resolution recently adopted unanimously by the Lansing City Council urging that the Postmaster General issue a commemorative stamp in behalf of R. E. Olds:

RESOLUTION

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

Whereas, August marks the 75th Anniversary of gasoline automobile production in America . . . and the world, and

Whereas Ransom Eli Olds of Lansing, Michigan emerged as the first automotive production genius whose early feats astounded the world and inspired the effort to put the world on wheels, and

Whereas Ransom E. Olds was the Father of the Automobile as the following facts proved:

In 1886 he built the first "horseless carriage."

In 1894 he brought out his first automobile with gasoline engine power.

In 1897 he organized the Olds Motor Vehicle Company, the first ever organized for the purpose of manufacturing an automobile.

He was the first man to produce automobiles in quantities.

The first automobile builder to produce a car sturdy and dependable enough to make cross-country run.

He was the first to advertise an automobile nationally (Saturday Evening Post 1902).

And he was the first to build a side entrance car.

Therefore be it resolved that in connection with the 75th Anniversary of gasoline automobile production in America, that the Lansing City Council go on record urging the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp honoring Ransom Eli Olds in recognition of his contribution to the automotive industry.

And be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be sent to Postmaster General Klassen, Congressman Charles E. Chamberlain, and Senator Philip Hart, Senator Robert Griffin and the latter then be urged to contact the Postmaster General, urge his consideration of the request.

SOUND TRADE POLICIES

HON. ARTHUR A. LINK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) for his efforts in pointing out the advantages that accrue from sound trade policies. If we are to understand and move toward resolving present domestic economic problems, we must be aware of the consequences of our actions on the interrelated world economy. Congressman GIBBONS has provided us with a view of at least part of that interrelated picture in this series of special orders on trade.

I will briefly sketch the important role of American agricultural exports and then point out some elements that are essential to the maintenance and improvement of our present healthy export situation.

American farmers supply about one-fifth of the world's agricultural exports. This makes us the world's largest exporter of farm products. These exports are a significant portion of the total value of U.S. production: Almost 17 percent of total fruit production; 33 percent of the value of cotton and corn; 42 percent of tobacco; and more than 60 percent of wheat and soybean production are exported. Overall, exports provide about one-seventh of U.S. farm income. The above figures point out the important contribution our agricultural exports make toward our trade balance and thus our balance of payments. To cite an example, in 1970 we exported $7.8 billion in agricultural products.

Although our food imports reduced the net figure somewhat, it is important to note that our agricultural trade balance was slightly over half of our overall trade balance. This is because, unlike some sectors of our economy, U.S. food and fiber producers are technologically progressive and competitive; there has been no pattern of American investment in competitive foreign farm ventures.

The importance of agricultural exports to both farm income and as a key element in our trade balance point to the need to work toward resolving difficulties that at present serve to curtail trade.

Last November, as a representative of the House Agriculture Committee, I attended a Conference on Agriculture Trade and Market Development in London. We talked a good deal about the European Economic Community, the trade problems created by its common agricultural policy, and about the implications of the expansion of the community in 1973. At present, while Japan is our largest overseas customer, nearly 20 percent of our agricultural trade is with EEC countries. We cannot hope to negotiate more favorable terms for our exports to the ECC if we adopt more restrictive trade policies. Indeed, agricultural exports would suffer more than any other category of exports as a result of retaliation should the United States adopt more restrictive trade policies. If, on the other hand, we move toward fairer access terms in the community, we will see expanded agricultural exports.

Our exports to Japan are also a concern to me. At present, the Japanese are moving toward fairer trade policies. On April 1, for example, the Japanese Government will remove its tariff on soybeans and establish a duty-free quota on feeder cattle. These actions will contribute to increased agricultural exports which cannot continue in the event of restrictive moves on the part of the United States.

In summary, American agricultural exports contribute much toward a favorable balance of trade and have a substantial impact on farm income. In view of this, it is clearly in our interest to move toward expanding trade, and not fall into shortsighted efforts that curtail trade.

NEXT STEPS IN LIMITING STRATEGIC ARMS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Scoville, Jr., chairman of the Strategic Weapons Committee of the Federation of American Scientists, has written two more informative articles concerning strategic nuclear weaponry. One appeared in the March 1972 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and suggests that we:

First . . . wrap up the best possible ABM limitation at an early date . . . Second . . . have the U.S. and the Soviet Union authorities reach an understanding to stop for a short time all further strategic offensive weapons programs . . .

Scoville discusses the practical difficulties that this across-the-board moratorium might cause. But he is convinced that these can be surmounted. Given his experience in and knowledge of these matters we must give Scoville's proposal our close attention. The article follows:

[From the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Mar. 1972]

NEXT STEPS IN LIMITING STRATEGIC ARMS

(Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

For more than two years, we have been trying to reach an agreement on specific limitations of individuals systems by using the pressure and bargaining chips of escalating weapons programs. Success, however, has eluded us. Why not try a new approach? Herbert Scoville, Jr., is chairman of the Strategic Weapons Committee of the Federation of American Scientists.

Formal SALT negotiations began more than two years ago, and preliminary discussions several years before that. Yet, to date, no specific limitations on strategic armaments have resulted; in fact, arms buildups on both sides have accelerated. In May of 1971, in a joint U.S.-USSR statement, President Nixon announced that the two nations had "agreed to concentrate this year on working out an agreement for the limitation of the deployment of antiballistic missile systems (ABMs)" and that "together with concluding an agreement to limit ABMs, they will agree on certain measures with respect to the limitation of offensive strategic weapons." With this high-level support, the negotiators returned to Helsinki in July, but no agreement was reached, and the talks were resumed in Vienna on Nov. 15 and recessed on Feb. 4, to be continued in Helsinki at the end of March. Meanwhile, President Nixon will be going to Moscow in May 1972 to enhance "the prospects for world peace." While retaining the goal of an early agreement, he stated on October 14, 1971, that if it were not achieved, strategic arms limitations would certainly be a topic for discussion in Moscow. Thus, despite hopes for a limitation last year, it appears quite possible that nothing will be firmly concluded until May—or maybe even later.

Since July 1969, when the present Administration agreed to proceed with SALT, there have been major increases in the strategic force levels of both the USSR and the United States (see table). The Soviets are reported to have increased the size of their ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) force from about 1,000 to more than 1,500, and the number of their SLBMs (submarine-launched ballistic missiles) from about 60 to nearly 400, and more are under construction. The United States in turn has completed the testing of MIRV systems (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle) for both Poseidon and Minuteman III, and begun their deployment so that already the total number of strategic warheads has been increased approximately 50 per cent, from about 2,500 to 3,800. This number will reach 7,000 in a few years. If these programs continue at the current rates for the next six months, the Soviets could lay down the keels for an additional five submarines with 80 missiles and begin deployment of 50 to 100 more ICBMs. They could at any time start testing their first MIRVs which could threaten Minuteman. The United States, in turn, might have begun conversions for the deployment of an additional 100 to 200 ICBM and 400 to 640 SLBM warheads. Simultaneously, the Russians have resumed construction on their ABM around Moscow, and the United States is deploying its Safeguard system. This continued offensive and defensive weapons race, while the SALT talks proceed, adds to the security of neither side. Furthermore, since it is unlikely that either nation will, in the initial argument, be willing to destroy already deployed weapons, it only serves to raise the level of any limit which might be finally agreed to.

Unfortunately, despite President Nixon's November 12 report of "significant progress in the discussion on limitation of defensive weapons," there still seem to be problems in realizing a firm agreement, even on ABMs. The United States is reported to be seeking a ceiling of 300 interceptors if they are in defense of missile sites, and of 100 if they are in defense of urban areas. Since the United States is deploying the former type of system and the Soviets the latter, this would leave an imbalance between the two countries which may be very difficult for the Soviets to accept. A willingness to compromise by one or, perhaps, both sides is necessary. This could be a serious stumbling block in the negotiation. The best solution would be to keep ABMs at the lowest possible level, although if both sides were allowed to have 300, it would still be a very useful agreement.

There are also likely to be problems in defining limits of ABM radars, the most critical item in this area. It is important that neither nation be allowed to deploy a net of radars which can provide coverage of a large fraction of the country. Such deployment might be foreclosed by restricting the locations at which ABM radars would be deployed, and perhaps also by limiting the number of radars which each side could

have. Although it may be rather difficult to work out all these details, there should be no insuperable problems in reaching an agreement by May on ABMs.

In the offensive weapons area the problems to be overcome are significantly greater. The United States would very much like to bring the Soviet ICBM, particularly the SS–9, and the SLBM programs to a halt. The Russians, in turn, would like to have the Americans cease the Poseidon and Minuteman III conversion programs. They probably are also reluctant to limit significantly any of their offensive deployments without placing any restrictions on our FBS (forward-based systems) which have a capability of nuclear attack on the Soviet Union.

All of these areas involve complicated negotiations which may require protracted time. More than two years have already passed at SALT, but, from President Nixon's statement that "we are beginning now [November 12, 1971] to move into discussion of offensive weapons," it appears that we have only scraped the surface. Meanwhile, new weapons programs continue apace and, as the negotiations proceed, force levels continue to rise, making an eventual agreement more difficult to reach. It is probably already politically unacceptable to the Soviets to halt their MIRV program with the United States so far in the lead. At some point, the number of Soviet ICBMs will so far exceed the Americans' that it may be politically difficult to agree on a ceiling on launchers, even though the United States might have several times as many warheads. Already there are many outcries from the uninformed about American inferiority.

For more than two years, we have been trying to reach an agreement on specific limitations of individual systems by using the pressure and bargaining chips of escalating weapons programs. Success, however, has eluded us. Why not try a new approach?

First, let's wrap up the best possible ABM limitation at an early date. According to President Nixon's statement, this can be done.

Second, as a parallel step, let's have the U.S. and Soviet authorities reach an understanding to stop for a short fixed time all further strategic offensive weapons programs right where they are now.

Then, as a follow-on to this first phase of SALT, the delegations from both countries could sit down in this atmosphere of temporary restraint and negotiate which programs on each side would be allowed to resume.

STRATEGIC MISSILE FORCES

	United States					U.S.S.R. (Missiles and warheads[2])	
	Missiles		Warheads[1]				
	July 1969	January 1972	July 1969	January 1972		July 1969	January 1972
ICBM's:					ICBM's:		
Titans	54	54	54	54	SS–9's	180	280
Minutemen	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,400	SS–11's, 13's	630	1,050
					SS–7's, 8's	220	220
SLBM's:					SLBM's:		
Poseidon		80		960	Y class	32	384
Polaris	656	576	1,552	1,424	Old	30	30
					(3 SLBM/sub.)		
Totals	1,710	1,710	2,606	3,838		1,092	1,964

[1] When the Minuteman III and Polaris-Poseidon conversion programs are completed (about 1976), the U.S. will have more than 7,000 MIRV warheads.

[2] No tests of the Soviet MIRV's which could threaten Minuteman have yet been reported. They have tested missiles with 3 multiple warheads and these could be now in process of deployment.

Note: The Soviets had under construction, in 1971, 30 new large silos which could hold the SS–9 size missiles, and 60 smaller silos which could hold the SS–11. They also have under construction about 16 more Y-class submarines capable of launching 256 SLBM's. They have also tested a longer range SLBM (the present range is similar to the first generation Polaris), but this may require modification of the present Y-class submarines.

This would satisfy President Nixon's desire to restrict offensive as well as defensive weapons. It would be the same procedure that he has used with strong public support in his fight on inflation. He instituted a complete wage and price freeze for a 90-day period (Phase I), during which procedures were developed for allowing, during Phase II, limited increases that would not produce inflationary pressures. This approach was finally adopted when the standard piecemeal labor-industry bargaining procedures had failed to halt a runaway rise in the cost of living. Why not try this same approach with SALT, which has not only failed to stop the offensive weapons buildup but has also been used to justify new programs?

If all ongoing programs of both the United States and the USSR were halted now, our two countries would be frozen in a posture of mutual strategic deterrence. The security on both sides would clearly be greater than if each side were allowed to proceed unilaterally with the many new developments which are in process or possible. Starting from this stable position, it might then be feasible to negotiate what programs or actions might be carried forth to futher strengthen this position.

Such actions could, in some cases, involve proceeding with deployments which are now under way or research and development on certain new systems. On the other hand, in some areas it might be possible to agree on reductions in existing forces. For example, the United States could proceed with development and testing of a single warhead for the Poseidon missile as a potential replacement for the current MIRVs. When available, we could actually deploy it in submarines modified to handle Poseidon missiles. Since the single warhead in Poseidon could be replaced by MIRVs in a short time, this would provide added confidence that American security could not be threatend by a sudden ABM deployment. At the same time it would not arouse Soviet fears of a U.S. first strike as would be the case if MIRVs were actually deployed. The Soviets, in turn, might be allowed to complete their present SLBM program, thereby strengthening this key element in a secure deterrent force. Both sides might agree to phase out and reduce the numbers of land-based ICBMs which in time could become vulnerable and obsolete and create an incentive toward a first strike.

Hopefully, many presently ongoing programs would not be resumed at all. In such a climate, there would be little excuse for the Russians to continue building additional ICBM sites, although to harden existing ones without increasing the total number might be justifiable. Similarly, the United States could cease deploying additional MIRVed missiles since Soviet ABMs would be limited and future threats to our Minuteman silos reduced. Many new development programs could be restricted to the early laboratory phases since, in a situation of frozen stable deterrence, they would not be needed. Many decisions in the direction of restraint that would be very difficult or impossible in a dynamic situation would be greatly simplified in a static one.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES

The institution of such an across-the-board freeze does, however, present a number of practical difficulties which must be faced. First, it is extremely difficult to stop, on short notice, construction programs and, perhaps to a lesser extent, testing programs which are in progress, particularly if such a halt may be only temporary. This could considerably increase the cost and create many management and labor problems when, and if, the programs are to be resumed. It might be necessary to allow construction already under way to proceed during the Phase I period of the freeze. Provided that this phase were kept short—let us say 90 days—the increase in force levels would not be very significant. It would be essential, however, that during this period both nations halt all new starts. A similar type of arrangement might be worked out for testing; for example, nations would be allowed to continue work with previously tested models, but would not be permitted to start new test programs.

Such a freeze would bring the Soviet SS-9, or similar large missile programs, to a halt and leave them with between 280 and 310 launchers, depending on how one deals with the problem of sites under construction. In submarines, the Russians would be restricted to somewhere between 23 and 42 of the Polaris type Y-class vessels. They would be left without having a tested MIRV system which could threaten Minuteman. The United States on the other hand, would be restricted to the conversion of 100-300 Minuteman missiles to Minuteman III, and of 5–16 Polaris submarines to Poseidon. We would have available two tested MIRV systems, but the accuracies of these are not considered sufficiently good to permit their use as first-strike weapons. No new intercontinental bombers could be built, and the U.S. B–1 program would be put into abeyance until the negotiators had decided whether this should be allowed to proceed.

While all the details of a complete freeze could not be verified, we could be confident that the Soviets could not secretly carry out, even during a much longer period than a 90-day Phase I, any programs that could significantly affect our deterrent. New deployments of both land- and sea-based missiles can be adequately monitored by U.S. unilateral capabilities. Long-range tests of missiles can likewise be observed, and major changes in the type of missile launched would be apparent. If ongoing construction were frozen during Phase I, some work could be carried out which might escape notice, but this could not have any significant effect during a three-month period. During Phase I, one of the first tasks of the negotiators would be to examine those actions which might be difficult to verify and which, if continued unilaterally for long periods in a secret program, could have an important effect on security.

Some procedures would have to be instituted to ensure that stalling on the Phase II negotiations was not allowed to place either nation in an unfavorable position. Since the freeze would be mutual, it would put both countries under obligation to abide by its terms, and any failure to do so would automatically allow the other nation to act unilaterally. An action in response to a violation could be much stronger than one taken in the absence of any understanding. In the static situation of a freeze, where both sides have a secure deterrent, it would probably be easier to control the desire for new weapons programs than in the dynamic situation where both sides are continuously developing and deploying new weapons.

BARGAINING CHIP

Once an understanding had been reached on which programs would be removed from the freeze and allowed to resume, the negotiators could put in firm treaty language those limitations which are still in effect. These should be easier to define in a situation where nothing was changing than one which was in a constant state of flux. The bargaining chip would be the threat of a breakdown in the fixed, secure, stable position, a much more satisfactory chip than new and unnecessary weapons programs.

Arms control negotiations could then move on relatively easily to areas beyond SALT. With many ideas for new technological developments in delivery systems restrained to the laboratory or to the minds of the scientists, a comprhensive nuclear test ban would be a logical move as a next step. Without the stimuli of continuing new systems developments, it would be hard to justify continued nuclear weapons testing in either the United States or the USSR. Both sides might see the advantage of placing a lid once and for all on continuing advances when they already have designs for an entire spectrum of nuclear weapons available.

A start might also be made toward placing restrictions on antisubmarine warfare, which, once ABMs are limited, would be the only potential long-term threat to the submarine-based deterrent. Limitations on forward-based nuclear delivery systems in support of our allies and on Soviet intermediate-range and medium-range ballistic missiles could be sought as key ingredients in reducing the risk of a nuclear holocaust in Europe. In time, we might move toward reducing the numbers of our land-based ICBMs, which could be perceived as vulnerable, and thus an incentive towards a first strike.

President Nixon might consummate this dramatic new approach of a complete freeze on offensive strategic weapons on his trip to Moscow in May. This could be done simultaneously with the announcement of an agreement limiting ABMs. The groundwork for such action could, of course, be prepared by the SALT delegation between now and then. The Senate indicated concurrence with this type of action when, a year ago, it passed, by a vote of 72 to 6, a resolution (S–211) proposing a moratorium on new weapons deployments pending the negotiation of a SALT agreement. A freeze of this nature would represent the most significant step toward controlling the nuclear arms race in our times.

The second article appeared in the March 25 issue of the New Republic. Scoville's analysis of the relative strengths of the U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals is one of the best I have seen. It follows:

LAIRD'S LATEST ALARMS

(By Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

"The Soviet Union is continuing to create strategic capabilities beyond a level which, by any reasonable standards, already seems sufficient." So said President Nixon in his State of the World message on February 9. The point can be conceded. The Soviets have strategic forces well beyond those needed to deter a US attack, even if our strategic arsenals continue to increase at a high rate.

But what President Nixon's message did not say is that the US is also building forces greater than needed to deter a Soviet attack and prevent us or our allies from being coerced. The administration policy of "sufficiency" is only superiority in another cloak.

We are now placing MIRVs (multiple warheads which can be aimed at individual targets) on a large fraction of our land- and seabased ballistic missiles. Secretary Laird reports that during the past year we added warheads to our missile force at the rate of almost three a day. MIRV deployment as an alternative to building more missile launchers has long had strong support by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and most of those who are now leading the hue and cry about Russian superiority in missile launchers are ignoring this warhead expansion. Our total offensive force loadings will, according to Secretary Laird, increase between mid-1971 and mid-1972 from 4700 to 5700 weapons while, during the same period, the Russians will only add 400 new weapons to their stockpile of 2100. At this rate, it will be a long time before they catch up.

All elements of our strategic forces are being improved far beyond the requirements of "sufficiency." We are deploying a new generation of missiles in both our land- and sea-based launchers when no current threat requires them. We are planning to build still more advanced missile submarines (ULMS) before there is any conceivable danger to the existing ones. We are building a new bomber, the B–1, years before the B–52s will become obsolete. We are deploying an ABM defense of Minuteman missiles which is not needed to preserve our deterrent, and is, moreover, inadequate and poorly designed to protect these missiles if the Soviets do develop a MIRVed ICBM force.

Over and over again, Secretary Laird and other Defense officials have stressed the *momentum* of the Soviet strategic build-up as justification for these additional weapons on the part of the US. On January 25, Laird prefaced his request for supplemental appropriations in this fiscal year with the statement: "These funds will be used for programs that we need to start now to meet defense requirements as a result of the Soviet weapons momentum."

What is this "momentum"? In his Annual Report of February 15, Laird described the Soviet strategic weapons developments which presumably worry him the most. The following item by item analysis of all of these leaves some doubt as to whether his concern is warranted.

CONTINUED DEPLOYMENT OF ICBMS

The increase in Soviet landbased ICBMs has in the past always been cited as the dominating element in the threat. The Russians now have 1520 ICBM launchers as compared to 1054 US launchers. Though some 100 new Soviet silos have been identified for new or modified ICBM systems, the build-up has been slowing down. Indeed, Mr. Nixon in his State of the World message noted that the USSR added only 80 ICBMs last year, compared to 256 the previous year. Secretary Laird now projects an increase of only 30 between November 1, 1971 and mid-1972, and points out that the SS–9, SS–11 and SS–13 programs may be over. So the "momentum" in total numbers of Soviet ICBM launchers seems to be petering out.

What about the large ICBMs—the SS–9s which were most feared as potential first strike threats to our Minuteman deterrent? Here, the pace has slowed even more dramatically. In August, 1969, the Soviets were reported to have more than 275 SS–9s operational or under construction, and Secretary Laird predicted an increase of 50 or more per year in then justifying the need for the Safeguard ABM. Now, two-and-a-half years later, he reports that there are only about 300 of these large type ICBMs operational or under construction—hardly a cause for new alarm this year or requiring major increases in funds for new US strategic weapon systems. Included in this Soviet total are the same 30 new large launchers that were first reported under construction a year ago. No new Soviet missile has been tested for these launchers even a year later, and even if a new missile were to be deployed in them, it would not signify any increase in previously estimated threats we've always assumed. The SS–9 is capable of launching any MIRV system the Soviets chose to develop. If they need a different missile to have a MIRV to threaten Minuteman, then our previous worries were greatly exaggerated. It is rumored that the Russians may accept a ceiling on large missiles at SALT (Strategic Arms Limitations Talks). If so, that would publicly commit them to *halt a program they have almost stopped unilaterally.*

Secretary Laird also refers to extensive testing since 1965 of a modification of the SS–9 which would permit it to be fired on a depressed trajectory or used as a fractional orbit bombardment system (FOBS). This was mentioned years ago by Secretary McNamara and is not provocation for increased concern today. Such a system would be less effective than the basic SS–9 in destroying our Minuteman missiles.

MIRVS

The Russian MIRV program is *now* behind where it was said to be in 1969 by the administration. At that time, Mr. Nixon and defense officials reported that the Soviets had been testing a multiple reentry vehicle system which had a "footprint" that appeared to threaten our Minuteman silos. Now Secretary Laird states that, "while the Soviets probably have not tested MIRV missiles thus far, they have conducted many tests of the SS–9 with multiple reentry vehicles (MRVs) since flight testing began in August 1968. The last MRV tests were in late 1970." What kind of "momentum" is this? The testing of a MRV on the small SS–11 ICBM, or even the deployment of MRVs as recently reported by Laird, subsequent to his report to Congress, calls for no panic. All authorities have conceded that MRVs, whether on the SS–9s or SS–11s, do not endanger our Minuteman. Cries of alarm for three years cannot alter the fact that there is no present evidence that the Soviets have started a MIRV program.

The President correctly states that the Russians have the basic technological ability to develop MIRVs, and this can be the only explanation for Secretary Laird's prediction that the "Soviet MIRV capability could be achieved next year." But there is no factual evidence to support such an estimate since testing has not begun. It would appear that Laird's prediction is even less valid and even more misleading than those made in 1969. For although the Soviets *could* being testing at any time, it would almost certainly be more than three years before they could deploy any system that could even marginally threaten Minuteman. With the limited number of large missiles that will be available to the Soviets in the near future, such a MIRV system would have to disperse accurately six or more warheads per missile. This *is* within the payload capability of the SS–9, but a very long time would be required before it could be developed, tested, and deployed in significant quantities.

SUBMARINE MISSILES

The Soviets have during the last three years been building up their submarine ballistic missile force. They have 25 operational Y-class submarines, each with 16 missiles; they are turning out additional submarines at the rate of 9 to 10 a year as compared with the eight a year estimated earlier. When all those now under construction are completed, however, they will only have achieved approximate numerical parity with the US. They will still be below the total Western forces, since the French and the British also have small missile submarine fleets. More important, President Nixon recently said that "our missiles have longer range and are being equipped with multiple independently targetable warheads. Moreover, our submarines are now superior in quality." This year, as last year, authorities have referred to a new long-range Soviet submarine missile, but it has been reported that this missile could not be fired from the Y-class submarines unless these are modified.

Since missile submarines are primarily deterrent weapons and cannot be used to attack either the Minuteman or Polaris portions of

the US deterrent, it is hard to see how this Russian build-up would justify adding to US strategic forces. Our submarine strategic forces are "highly survivable," says Mr. Laird, and while there are indications that the Soviets are attempting to establish an area surveillance system and associated ASW (anti-submarine warfare) strike forces, they do not as yet have this capability. Other officials have testified that they have not been able to identify any developments that indicate a Soviet threat to our seabased missile deterrent.

None of the reported Soviet weapons programs require the construction on a crash basis of a new submarine missile system (ULMS), which may cost tens of billions of dollars and may be designed to cope with the wrong threat. This is not security; it is insanity.

STRATEGIC BOMBERS

Both the President and Secretary Laird have warned of a new Soviet supersonic bomber. What they have in mind is a medium-range aircraft, probably primarily designed for use in Eurasian situations and of little direct threat to the continental US. Laird reports "a probability that it has a capability for inflight refueling. With refueling it could reach virtually all US targets." He does not say whether these bombers could ever get back to Russia, if they were used against such targets. Again, the development of this type of Soviet bomber, about which we have known for several years, does not require expanded US programs in response. We now have an overwhelming quantitative and qualitative lead in strategic bombers.

ABMS

Laird also reports that "construction of the Moscow ABM system has resumed and testing of an improved ABM missile continues." He referred to this resumption last year and to the testing back in 1969. Nevertheless, Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has just said that the Moscow system, even with improved radars and more and better interceptors, could still be saturated by a very small part of our total missile force. It does not, therefore, endanger our deterrent. The U.S. has apparently been seeking at SALT, ABM limitations at levels *greater* than the present Moscow system, so it is hard to believe that the administration is really worried about the Moscow ABMs. Furthermore, the Soviets have been eager for an agreement to limit ABMs, and President Nixon has expressed optimism that this can be achieved at an early date, so the long-term danger from ABMs may never develop. If the SALT negotiations break down, the Soviet ABM program still does not warrant increases in U.S. strategic force levels for many years. We have ample lead time to put into effect any necessary countermeasures.

The deployment of a widespread space tracking system that would enable the Russians to predict the position of near-earth orbit satellites is described by Secretary Laird as a Soviet research and development effort worth mention. Presumably this system is composed of the same surveillance radars that a year ago he sought to associate with a Soviet ABM system. Apparently, the association is no longer considered quite so valid, and the fears generated in some quarters in past years are no longer as great. A space tracking system is not a major security threat; the U.S. has had one for more than 10 years.

In sum, in its current round of budget requests the administration has been crying wolf: it has not come forth with a single new development in the last year that in any way demonstrates a new threat to our strategic deterrent. The Soviet ICBM program is winding down and its MIRV program is many years behind original predictions. Only in the area of submarine missile deterrent systems has the Soviet program continued to roll forward, and here the U.S. is more than one generation ahead. The Russian strategic weapons programs are continuing, but their momentum is faltering.

In contrast, we have been moving forward with increasing speed on all fronts. We are deploying MIRVs rapidly so as to increase our force loadings at the rate of 1000 warheads per year. We are developing new guidance systems for these MIRVs. We are deploying a new model ICBM, Minuteman III, and modifying our submarines to fire the new Poseidon missile with a payload four times as large as the Polaris. We are not building any additional missile launchers, but no one has seriously adovcated our increasing these for many years. We have a far more extensive anti-submarine warfare program both in terms of deployment and in terms of research and development than the Soviet Union. We are proposing to commit large sums to a new missile submarine (ULMS), though our present system is far superior to the Soviet Union's. We are building a new intercontinental bomber. We are proceeding with an expanded ABM deployment and carrying out extensive research and development on next generation systems. Restraint in U.S. weapons programs is hard to find. The administration ought to drop the double standard by which it evaluates U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons.

CHARLES RENTZ—AN INSPIRATION TO ALL

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the March 9 issue of the Democrat-Reporter of Linden, Ala., featured an article about Charles Rentz, a valued friend and constituent of mine. There is justified concern in this Nation for the welfare and condition of handicapped persons, and I would commend the following article and the inspiration of Charles Rentz to my colleagues and others:

CHARLES RENTZ ". . . AN INSPIRATION TO ALL OF US" WILL RECEIVE AWARD FROM ALABAMA GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE

Charles Rentz, Marengo County Circuit Court Clerk and Register, has been chosen to receive the 1972 Handicapped Alabamian award from the Alabama's Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

In a letter from W. Gene Kerlin executive secretary of the committee, Kerlin stated, "We are very impressed with your accomplishments and we want to honor you in our highest fashion. You are an inspiration to all of us and we are very proud of you."

The award will be presented to Rentz Friday, June 9 at a luncheon meeting of the Alabama Association of Circuit Court Clerks and Registers. The meeting will be in Florence.

Each county in the state nominates an individual for the award and the committee makes the final selection.

John Neel, editor of Ala-West magazine, captured the philosophy of Charles Rentz on paper. Here are some impressions the Sumter County editor had of the man and politician, Charles Rentz:

If you doubt that the human spirit, guided and strengthened by God, is capable of magnificient accomplishments, consider Charles E. Rentz of Linden.

It is no overstatement to describe what this man has done and what he is as magnificient.

You notice immediately that physically Rentz lacks much of what most of us take for granted. Both his arms end in stubs at about the elbow, and he doesn't have any legs much below the knees. His right leg terminates at about knee level in a small malformed foot. The left leg, shorter than the right, has only a small appendage that would have been a foot had prenatal development proceeded as it should.

Thus handicapped, Charles Rentz came into the world in 1902 at Myrtlewood. The neighbors, seeing the pathetic looking little fellow, probably shook their heads and concluded that he didn't have a chance to make his way in a tough, competitive world.

It was an obvious conclusion, but it turned out to be wrong, for the boy's physical shortcomings were counterbalanced by some powerful plus factors.

One plus—and a tremendous one—was the truly remarkable wisdom and courage of his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Sandy Rentz. Another was the willingness of his three brothers and one sister (he was next to the youngest), friends and teachers to accept him on more or less equal terms. Still another was his good fortune (a wise choice) in his wife and friends.

The key factor, of course, has been the burning spirit and determination of Rentz himself, his everlasting positive approach to all situations.

Through it all has been woven the fabric of God's love and concern—and His very real, practical help.

Today Rentz is the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Marengo County. He was first elected to the office in 1946 after running and being defeated in 1934 and 1938. He has since been reelected five consecutive times.

More importantly, Rentz has a wife and three daughters, a lovely home, a host of friends, and many other things that have enriched his life.

Remarkably, he can capably perform almost any physical maneuver that he needs for his day-to-day life. He drives his own car, which he himself modified with special controls. He moves confidently on his crutches, even up and down stairs, and rolls efficiently around his office on an ordinary office chair. He can dial a telephone, type, use an adding machine, play chords on a piano. His no-hands dexterity even makes it possible for him to dress himself, down to almost the final detail, being stopped only by the topmost button on his shirt. He can even put on his tie.

He keeps the family's huge lawn mowed with his riding mower. And if it or any other machine around the house or office breaks down, he is generally able to make the needed repairs himself, manipulating wrenches and other tools by holding them between his two shortened arms.

The quality of his no-hands handwriting is superb. Seldom does anyone around Linden need any fancy writing done that they don't bring it to Charles Rentz. He places pen or pencil between the padded ends of his arms and moves from the shoulders. Not as fast as the ordinary way, but the result is beautiful.

In short, Rentz has conquered his physical limitations. Refusing to be bound by them, he has soared above and beyond.

That physical overcoming is amazing enough to shame the ordinary griper and rationalizer into humble silence and renewed dedication. And to inspire those who struggle with their own handicaps, of whatever nature and whatever degree.

The thing about this man that impresses even more than his prodigious practical achievements, however, is the spirit which enables him to do the things that he does. The spirit which keeps him looking up in gratitude to God rather than down in bitterness to where his hands and feet should be.

"He is the happiest person I have ever seen in my life," Charles' wife Wittie says simply. "I have never seen him really blue. I have seen him quiet, when something was on his

mind. But it is usually something wrong at the office or some misunderstanding with someone."

Rentz's refusal to feel sorry for himself, to even give bitterness the time of day, is built upon something his mother taught him.

"One of the reasons I never allowed myself to question why?" he said, "was that if anyone ever had a religious mother, I did. She always taught me that the 'why's' of the Lord's work are never to be questioned."

He loves Paul's statement in the fourth chapter of Phillipians: "for I have learned, in whatsover state I am, therewith to be content," and, two verses down: "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me."

"My entire life is built upon my faith in my Creator, who has endowed me with so many blessings," says Rentz.

His faith is not just lip service, either. Growing up, he took part in family prayers each night, and he and Wittie (and their daughters before they grew up and married) read the Bible and pray together at breakfast each morning. Charles has been tithing since he began earning a living (before becoming Circuit Clerk he worked as a gravel checker, service station man, automobile salesman, insurance salesman, bookkeeper and during World War II, chief clerk of the Marengo Wage Price and Rationing Board of the office of Price Administration.

For more than 35 years, he has taught a Sunday School class at the Linden Methodist Church, and he has been doing lay speaking for more than 25 years.

"I don't think I would be stretching it to say that I have sung at 500 funerals," Rentz said. "All over the county and outside."

Rentz has a fine singing voice, sang with a quartet for some six years. He met his wife at an all-day singing in Choctaw County. One of his few regrets about the course of his life is that he did not take voice lessons from a school teacher who lived in Myrtlewood and boarded with the family.

"I thought it was sissy, and I wouldn't do it," he said, "and I am sorry that I didn't".

Rentz is active in professional and civic affairs as well as church work. He has served as president of the State Circuit Clerks and Registers' Association in 1958–59 and served on the organization's Legislative Committee. He was president of the Linden Lions Club in 1966–67 and is a member of the Nanafalia Lodge No. 35. His talks to church and civic groups often take him away from home. He has several out-of-state talks scheduled this fall. He makes as many of these inspirational talks as he is able, for he feels it is his duty to share his faith with others.

Charles Rentz has done so much, when he might have done so little. Who could have blamed him if he had spent his life in a wheelchair, allowing others to support him?

Well, Rentz would say that God wouldn't have liked him to be that way, nor would his parents. He himself, of course, would never allow himself to give up in such a manner.

But had his early years been shaped differently, perhaps he would not have been the kind of person who as he said, was taught that "can't" was not in the dictionary.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 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?

OKLAHOMA VFW WINNER MAKES ELOQUENT PLEA

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we frequently hear criticism of today's youth, and doubtless some of the harsh words about certain actions are deserved. But we all too often fail to praise the millions of young people who are already fine citizens and who will be capable and effective leaders in the future of our country.

One outstanding young man is Kerry Holton, of Muskogee, Okla. Kerry delivered the winning speech in the Oklahoma Veteran's of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest, and I feel his words vividly and accurately represent the sense of heritage and responsibility felt by the vast majority of our Nation's young people.

It is a privilege to represent such constituents and a pleasure to share with you Kerry Holton's speech, "My Responsibility to Freedom":

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

Freedom. A prized possession. So valuable to the human race, that men have sacrificed their very lives for that one thing—that one abstract feeling of freedom. But in America, freedom is not just an abstract feeling, it is the concrete foundation of our existence. The chance to live and rule one's own life. The opportunity to live to the utmost—a free man, that's what it's all about. To Americans, however, freedom carries something more than just a privilege. Responsibility is always coupled with privileges.

As I look around me, and really catch a true picture of America, I can't help but remind myself of our fight for independence and my direct responsibility to it. If you get right down to it, I am living here today because of certain years in American History 1776 . . . 1865. If it were not for Mr. Washington, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Lincoln, and so many other founding fathers of this nation, I would not be living in freedom today. Where would I be today if thousands of men had not fought for the preservation of this country, on countless battlefields, war after war. Just stop and think—great men have preserved America for almost 200 years, just for me, just because I'm an American. Many have died to keep this nation alive for their posterity—and we are the ones they died for. We definitely have the obligation to preserve American Freedom for future generations. We must keep alive those privileges which only we as citizens have.

I believe one of the most important responsibilities I have to freedom is simply to use those freedoms. Do we buy a new pair of shoes just to leave them locked up in the closet? Do we buy food just to let it rot and spoil? No, of course not. We didn't receive freedom just to store in the attic.

We received freedom to use. Because we are Americans, we have several opportunities directly resulting from our American freedoms.

American freedom has come to us because of the determination of men throughout our nation's history. Because of the hard-fought freedom, which we enjoy today, we have many precious opportunities.

Have you ever realized what the last four letters in the word American spell? I can. I can—in America and it is only made possible through my American Freedom. We ought to be proud, that we live in America, and we ought to get the most we can out of its opportunities.

We need to ask ourselves:

Would I be a responsible American . . .

If I did not care about its future?

If I made no attempt to preserve this great nation for those yet unborn?

Would I be a responsible American . . .

If I did not use my freedoms?

If I turned my back on the golden opportunities which only can be found in America?

We cannot escape our responsibilities. America will only be as good as we make it and as we preserve it. We must keep America great, as it was given us. Now, the responsibility is ours . . . to keep America just that way!

MILK PRICES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Butz recently announced that the support price for manufacturing milk will be continued at $4.93 a hundredweight for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1972. At the same time he announced that the purchase prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—for cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk to carry out the support program will also remain unchanged.

It should be noted that with these purchase prices the average price received by farmers for manufacturing milk during the present marketing year will be about $4.88 a hundredweight, 5 cents below the announced support price. In fact, as shown on the following table, dairy farmers received less than the announced supoprt price in 8 of the first 11 months of the present marketing year:

MANUFACTURING MILK

[Dollars per hundredweight]

	Support price	Average price received by farmers[1]	Deviation from support price
April 1971	$4.93	$4.84	−0.09
May 1971	4.93	4.81	−.12
June 1971	4.93	4.81	−.12
July 1971	4.93	4.81	−.12
August 1971	4.93	4.80	−.13
September 1971	4.93	4.82	−.11
October 1971	4.93	4.85	−.08
November 1971	4.93	4.89	−.04
December 1971	4.93	4.97	+.04
January 1972	4.93	5.01	+.08
February 1972	4.93	5.01	+.08

[1] Adjusted to annual average milk fat test of 3.67 percent.

The increased price during the last 3 months is largely a seasonal condition, reflecting the fact that milk production is at its lowest level during this period. With no change in CCC purchase prices,

it is anticipated that the price received by farmers for milk during the coming marketing year will actually average several cents less than the announced support price.

If the Secretary of Agriculture is not willing to increase the support level for the coming marketing year, and I have indicated on more than one occasion that I think he should—at the very least he ought to increase the CCC purchase price for cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk enough to guarantee our dairy farmers a price for their milk at least equal to the announced support price.

Mr. Speaker, what many of us are concerned about when we ask for increased price supports and an increase in the CCC purchase price of dairy products is the fact that farmers are the victims of inflation just as much as anyone else. Their problem is that without action from the Secretary of Agriculture, they have almost no way to hurdle these inflationary pressures.

During the current marketing year, inflationary cost increases absorbed by dairy farmers have caused the $4.93 a hundredweight price support level for milk to decline from 85 percent of parity on April 1971 to 79 percent of parity at the present time. For that reason I introduced legislation along with 27 cosponsors to require the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust the support price quarterly to reflect any increases in the parity price of milk. If this legislation had been in effect during the past year, for example, the support price for milk would have increased three times to maintain the support level at 85 percent of parity—with increases to $5.04 a hundredweight on July 1, to $5.08 on October 1, and to $5.11 on January 1.

The events of the last year, and particularly the last few weeks make abundantly clear the need for the enactment of my bill which would allow our dairy farmers to at least meet their increased costs of production during the year.

LET US FREEZE GOVERNMENT, TOO

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent, Mr. J. L. Feeney of Northridge, Calif., sent me a copy of an advertisement sponsored by the National Association of Life Underwriters. It is short and to the point, and I would like to share its important message with my colleagues:

LET US FREEZE GOVERNMENT, TOO

A MESSAGE ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS

Under the current program of controls and freezes, you are:

Asking working men and women to make sacrifices in holding down prices.

Asking businessmen to make sacrifices in holding down prices.

What sacrifices will government make? Government surely doesn't want to ask others to make sacrifices it isn't prepared to make itself. If your program to control inflation is to succeed, government must do two things:

1. Cut federal spending.
2. Restrain the creation of money through the Federal Reserve System.

It is unfair to control the economic decisions of people—while letting federal spending run rampant. Government must do its part—it, too, must show self-discipline.

To halt inflation, federal government spending must be frozen—better yet—CUT, and the money supply restrained. Economic controls deal with the results of inflation. Frozen or reduced spending is one sure way to reduce inflationary pressures. As wage and price increases are deferred, so too should spending for new federal programs be deferred.

It is also time for Congress and all agencies of government to evaluate existing programs by their measurable results and get rid of the deadwood programs that have a proven record of ineffectiveness. Congress too seldom reviews the need for legislation previously enacted.

Will you, Mr. President and members of Congress, face up to these needs?

Only you have the authority to investigate, hold hearings, ask questions and sit in judgment of these spending questions.

If you don't know where and how to stop spending, then you should set up the proper mechanism to find the answers.

If the citizens of the United States must struggle under economic controls then government should, in all equity, restrain its own actions, with emphasis on reduced spending and a restrained money supply.

It is time for government to cooperate with the American taxpayer in this fight against inflation.

Mr. President and members of Congress, the responsibility is yours.

THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1972

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a number of us introduced a bill we call the Agricultural Labor Relations Act.

The purpose of this bill is to recognize, protect, and regulate the right of farm employees to bargain collectively. I believe we do it in a way that constitutes a reasonable compromise between the interests of the farmers and the workers.

Taking into account the 6-month backlog of the National Labor Relations Board, we decided to establish an independent Agricultural Relations Board of three members serving 5-year terms, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Very briefly, the bill requires 20-day written notice of intent to strike. The employer can then invoke a 40-day mediation period during which the Federal Mediation Service shall attempt to resolve the dispute. If the dispute is not resolved within the first 20 days, the Mediation Service shall submit a list of five names from which both parties shall agree on one to serve as a special referee. The referee shall recommend a settlement not less than 5 days before the 40-day period expires. If the union accepts the referee's recommendations, they are binding on the employer. If not, the union may strike.

A similar procedure, with the positions of the union and the employer reversed, applies to a threatened lockout.

The bill provides for fair employee elections to choose a union. It authorizes the negotiation of a 7-day union shop and requires nonpreferential hiring. It prohibits secondary boycotts, but permits informational picketing.

This is the best arrangement we have been able to develop, but I do not claim it is the ultimate answer, or even that it is the best possible answer for 1972. We will certainly be open to suggestions and to constructive amendments.

BUSING

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made two proposals designed to halt temporarily, and. ultimately, to eliminate completely, the ordering by Federal courts of massive busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance in public schools.

With his announcement of last Thursday night, and with the two legislative measures he sent to the Congress on Friday, President Nixon became the first Chief Executive to make any proposal to stop busing, and I salute him for his initiative.

His first proposal is for a moratorium on any new court orders requiring massive busing for racial balance. This moratorium extends to July 1, 1973.

The second, and more comprehensive proposal, is the Equal Educational Opportunities Act, which provides for an increase in funds to provide truly equal education in all of our Nation's schools and lays the groundwork for establishment of a nationwide neighborhood schools policy.

This second measure also provides a means of relief for school districts already suffering under the burden of massive busing, by providing a clause permitting the reopening of proceedings in courts to eliminate currently required cross-busing plans and fashion alternate desegregation plans complying with the neighborhood school provisions of this act.

While I applaud the President's initiative in this issue, I see a danger in extending the moratorium beyond the conclusion of this Congress and through another school year.

I believe the net effect of so long a moratorium would be to lessen the urgency of passing the companion equal opportunities legislation, and thus leave school districts already under court order to bus with no relief for another full school term.

I believe we would do better to extend the moratorium only to August 1, 1972. This would give the Congress ample time to consider and act on the President's Equal Education Opportunity Act, and it would give local school districts sufficient time to prepare desegregation

plans for the coming school year along the more reasonable lines set forth in the President's legislation.

It has been speculated that these bills may not stand the test of constitutionality in the courts, and this is all the more reason for immediate action on these proposals. For if the courts rule these measures unconstitutional, then we will see beyond doubt the need for passage of a constitutional amendment such as the one that I have proposed, to prohibit cross-busing.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has reached agreement on a new revenue-sharing plan—a plan that promises to break free from the Federal Treasury $5.3 billion for distribution to State and local governments this year. It is a cheering sign for the country's Governors and mayors. Beset with financial problems unparalleled in recent memory, the States and cities these men govern need assistance desperately. State taxes, even though they have climbed to levels undreamed of even a few years ago, still cannot raise enough revenue. And local property taxes are so burdensome that homeowners everywhere are on the verge of revolt. Sources of revenue for many States and cities—indeed, for most of them—are withering away.

The rationale behind the Ways and Means Committee's revenue-sharing plan, like the rationale behind the rival plans that the committee has already dismissed, is quite simple: first, giving the States and cities a welcome new source of income, and second, giving them a chance to decide how to spend at least some of the Federal tax money their citizens pay. Governments must now grope through an almost impenetrable thicket of rules, regulations, guidelines, standards ad nauseam before receiving Federal grants—even the most routine grants, let alone the major ones. Applications are sometimes ensnarled in redtape for years.

Any unit of government, however big or however small, would be eligible for assistance under the committee's plan. Massachusetts, my home State, stands to receive $179.4 million—$75 million for the State itself; $104.4 million for its local communities.

I urge the promptest possible action on this legislation.

It should be among the very highest priorities of this Congress.

The New York Times today published an article on the revenue-sharing plan, and I commend the article to my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1972]

HOUSE COMMITTEE AGREES ON REVENUE-SHARING BILL

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The House Ways and Means Committee reached agreement today on a revenue-sharing bill. This new system of Federal financial aid to state and local governments, termed revolutionary by the Nixon Administration, thus cleared its first and possibly highest Congressional hurdle.

The committee's bill would give much less money to the states than the Administration's original proposal, but much more to local governments, particularly large cities.

The bill differs in many other ways from the Administration's proposal, but the Administration said it was happy with the bill because it embodied the fundamental idea of handing over to state and local governments, for use with relatively few restrictions, money that had been raised through Federal tax collections.

SUM OF $5.3 BILLION PROVIDED

In all, the committee's bill provides $5.3-billion for this year. Of this, the states would receive $1.8-billion, compared with the $2.8-billion they would have received under the Administration's proposal.

It was considered likely that the bill would reach the House floor for debate and probable approval by the end of April.

There was little basis for guessing the fate of the bill in the Senate. But the pressure for approval from the nation's Governors, Mayors and county officials, many of whom are already budgeting on the assumption that the money will be forthcoming, was certain to be great.

The basic idea behind revenue sharing is not only to give financial help to state and local governments but also to remove from the Federal Government's hands the responsibility and power for setting detailed standards and requirements for the spending of Federal aid funds by these governments.

The Ways and Means Committee bill concerns only one portion, though the most important one, of the broad program of revenue sharing proposed by the Administration.

This portion is what was originally known as general revenue sharing because the Administration wanted the money turned over to the lower levels of government with no restrictions on the public purposes for which it could be used.

FUNDS ALREADY BUDGETED

The other portions of the Administration's original plan were called special revenue sharing because the money could be spent only for specified purposes, such as manpower training or urban development. Congress has taken almost no action on special revenue sharing.

The money for special revenue sharing was to have come essentially from funds already budgeted by the Federal Government for use in specific aid programs to the states or localities.

The general revenue sharing money was to have been new money, not previously budgeted or earmarked for any purpose.

That is why general revenue sharing is regarded as the most important part of the program.

Technically, the committee did not actually approve the bill today. It reached agreement in principle and asked its staff to draft a complete new bill for the committee to vote on right after the Congressional Easter recess.

Ways and Means traditionally operates this way, and major changes in the agreed-on language are rare.

Among the committee's decisions today was one to give at least some money to every local governmental unit, however small, so long as it was a unit organized for general purposes and not for a single purpose. An example of a single-purpose district would be a school district or a sewer district.

Originally, the committee planned to cut off aid to local governments serving populations of less than 2,500.

The committee's bill contains no restrictions on the uses a state government may make of the revenue-sharing money.

For local governments, the bill contains a list of authorized purposes for which the money may be used. The list is shorter than the one contained in the alternative revenue-sharing bill sponsored by the committee's chairman, Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas.

In the committee's bill, there are actually two lists of authorized purposes, one covering capital outlays and the other covering spending for maintenance and operation.

Capital outlays would be permitted for sewage collection and treatment facilities, refuse disposal systems and public transit systems. Regularly recurring capital expenditures, such as routine replacement of buses, would not be a permissible capital expenditure.

As for maintenance and operation, revenue-sharing money could be used for public safety programs, including police and fire protection and building inspections; for environmental improvement, including sewage and garbage collection and disposal, and for public transportation.

Mr. Mills' bill had included youth, recreation and health programs and financial administration among the permissible maintenance and operation outlays. Capital expenditures for urban renewal and for the acquisition of open space would also have been permitted.

The main issue that the committee had to decide today was the formula for splitting up the shared revenues among the local governments with each state.

It decided on a complex set of alternatives that would give governors and state legislatures some leeway but by no means complete discretion.

DETAILS OF COMMITTEE BILL

Other important details include the following:

The bill contains prohibitions against use of any of the money for programs that discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex.

No Congressional action on appropriations would be required, either this year or subsequently, under the bill. The bill, once passed, would constitute what amounts to a permanent appropriation, for each of the five years the revenue-sharing program would be in effect.

A formula is included that is designed to make sure that state governments cannot reduce the financial aid they give to localities out of funds other than the revenue-sharing money.

A separate formula is designed to keep localities from transferring their own tax money out of the programs for which revenue-sharing funds are available and into other programs for which it is not.

The committee approved a system under which the Federal Government would collect state income taxes for the states, if desired. The system would include payroll withholding.

COMMENTS ON H.R. 11896

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, sometime next week we will be taking up H.R. 11896, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972.

This bill breaks new ground in a number of important areas, and I think it is safe to say that the bill represents a major breakthrough in the water pollution field.

Much debate will undoubtedly be had on the advisability of a "national goal" versus a "national policy" approach—as in S. 2770—to the effluent, no discharge deadline of 1985. In my own view, however, the most important provision in the bill is the part that deals with the nuts and bolts of eliminating pollution; namely, sewage treatment works construction. Title II of H.R. 11896 provides for a 60–75 percent Federal share of the cost of the treatment works. Treatment works is defined so as to cover all aspects of the treatment system, including sewage collection systems, which have not hitherto been included in treatment works grants.

The importance of this inclusion cannot be ignored because experience has shown that the collector sewers are often the single most expensive part of the treatment system. In that respect the Muskie bill (S. 2770) is a crushing blow to the heavily burdened taxpayers of Long Island, and for that matter, the country as a whole, because it fails to include collector sewers in the waste treatment grants.

Eighteen billion dollars is authorized for construction of these projects over the next 3 fiscal years. In addition, $2,750 million is authorized for reimbursement to State and local governments for projects whose Federal share was prefinanced by them because sufficient Federal money was not available.

It is such construction which will enable us to reach "no discharge" of pollutants. I urge your support.

WHO GETS THE CONSUMER BEEF DOLLAR?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there is a continuing controversy between consumer and producer advocates over the price of beef.

In an effort to explain why there should be such a difference in the price of beef to the producer and the over-the-counter price, Don Kendall, Associated Press farm writer, tells what happens to the beef dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is information from which we can all profit. I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Who gets the consumer beef dollar?

Allen Baker, a marketing specialist for the department's Economic Research Service, provided a breakdown of beef costs using figures for the fourth quarter of 1971, which included part but not all of the recent uptrend in cattle and beef prices.

A 1,000-lb. choice-grade live steer is sold by a farmer or feedlot operator for $327.79, or about 33 cents per pound, not including transportation or any marketing charges involved.

The packing company, which bought the animal, slaughters the steer and converts it into so-called carcass weight. By this time the steer has been divested of hide, internal organs and other byproducts which are not classified as red meat.

At this point, the packing company has a beef carcass weighing only 620 pounds. The carcass is sold on the wholesale market for $340.10, or about 55 cents per pound for the net remaining weight.

Meantime, the meat packer has sold the byproducts, including the hide, tongue, tripe and liver, weighing a total of 193 pounds, for $20.65. That amount is deducted by economists from the $327.79 paid the farmer to arrive at an adjusted "farm value" for the red meat of $307.14.

The carcass sold by the wholesaler for $340.10 to a supermarket chain, a large hotel or perhaps a small independent grocery store now must be transported, cut up, packaged and, in the case of hamburger, ground up for consumers.

During this process, the retailer trims the 620-pound carcass of excess bone, fat and other waste material. That leaves 463 pounds of beef cuts from the original carcass.

But, on the average, there is a 5-per-cent reduction in the retail cuts from spoilage and theft. That leaves 439 pounds of beef available for retail sale to consumers.

The prices of the cuts vary widely, from about 69 cents a pound for hamburger nationally last December, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to more than $2 a pound for the more prized steaks.

All told, the original 1,000-lb. steer was reduced to 439 pounds of meat selling for $468.40 total or about $1.07 per pound. That's more than three times the original on-the-hoof cost per pound of the live steer.

According to the breakdown, and allowing for the $20.65 received by the meat packer for byproducts, there was a markup of $161.26 from the time the steer left the feedlot until it ended up in shopping carts as red meat.

NATIONAL WOMEN IN EDUCATION DAY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution calling upon the President to designate May 21 as "National Women in Education Day." In a time of vigorous public debate over issues of widespread importance, the great majority of our Nation's women are pursuing educational and community service goals which will better enable them to exercise their franchise and the leadership which they have gained through responsible use of their vote.

In an effort to encourage women to continue their educational pursuits, Aware International—Association for Women's Active Return to Education—has offered scholarships for both part-time and full-time study to women beyond the usual college age. This year, Aware International is celebrating its seventh year of distinguished service and activity.

It is a privilege to commend this effect to my colleagues by offering a resolution calling for observance of "National Women in Education Day."

H.J. RES. 1127

Authorizing the President to proclaim annually the day of May 21 as "National Women in Education Day."

Whereas, it is recognized that a complex, technological society such as the United States requires expanded knowledge, acquired both formally and through experience, by all its citizens;

Whereas, the genius and skill of our Nation's youth is dependent in great measure upon the wisdom and technical knowledge of the Nation's women during the critical formative years;

Whereas, historically women have had less opportunity than men to participate to their own full educational potential;

Whereas, the women of the Nation have continually and persistently, at a cost of great personal sacrifice in many instances, expended energy, money, and time in acquiring advanced education from the Nation's great institutions of learning;

Whereas, further achievements by women will be encouraged by recognition of the contributions of the educated women of this Nation; Now, therfore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating May 21 of each year "National Women in Education Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE?

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention several times in the past 4 years to the deplorable conduct of Federal Judge Robert E. Tehan.

This information has been brought to the attention of the House Judiciary Committee but I have no information that anything has been done by way of checking into the situation.

I have today received a copy of a letter sent to Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee which makes additional allegations of misconduct in the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit.

In addition, I have written to Chairman CELLER with a request to know what has been done in this area, as well as what has happened to his committee's investigation into the grand jury charges against Judge Otto Kerner, an investigation the chairman said he ordered more than 3 months ago.

I include the copy of the letter to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee which I received today and which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

CRUMPACKER, ABRAHAMSON & REED,
Hammond, Ind., March 23, 1972.

EMANUEL CELLER, Esq.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am writing to you as the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee as well as to the other members of the Committee to bring to your attention the most sordid chronicle of misfeasance in contemporary federal judicial history. Would you please refer to my letter to the Attorney General under date of September 8, 1970, with memorandum attached (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 23, pages 31084–31086), and to the Woodmar Realty Company's correspondence and "Peti-

tion for investigation into and impeachment of Milwaukee Federal Judge Robert E. Tehan" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 12, pages 15409–15414).

Each member of the Committee and the Committee's staff were furnished with copies of these documents. These documents contain serious, accurate, unrefuted allegations of judicial corruption in the administration of a federal court trust, i.e., the 29-year Woodmar Realty Company reorganization in the Hammond, Indiana, federal district court. As of the present date, a much-needed bill of impeachment has not been drafted or approved by the Committee. To my knowledge, the staff has not conducted its preliminary investigation of these charges, as petitioned. Nor has it acted on Senator John J. Williams' call in April, 1970, on the floor of the Senate, for Judge Tehan's resignation or removal from the bench for his failure to file or pay either state or federal income taxes for nine years before being appointed.

The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention more recently discovered patterns of judicial misconduct in the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit (Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin) involving the Woodmar Realty Company case and other cases. Last December, another Seventh Circuit Federal Judge, Otto Kerner, was indicted for alleged tax evasion, bribery, perjury, mail fraud, and conspiracy. Judge Tehan's tax evasions and corrupt misconduct on the bench are far more flagrant than Judge Kerner's. It is now apparent that Judge Tehan and the present Chief Judge of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Luther M. Swygert, have been engaged in a unique exchange of intra-circuit jurisdictions. Neither judge had been handling out-of-state trial assignments, but in a handful of cases either embarrassing to or directly challenging their integrity, they in effect swapped cases. They presided over each other's "problems," helped keep the lids on each other's scandals, and saw that there were "favorable" decisions for each other's cronies. These cases are tracked throughout with footprints of judicial vindictiveness and dereliction, cronyism, and other serious irregularities.

The Woodmar Realty Company, which I represent, was stripped of all its valuable assets ($25,000,000 according to present tax assessor's records) during the time we were in Federal Court. Milwaukee Federal Judge Robert E. Tehan was first assigned to the Woodmar case in Hammond in *December of 1957* by his political henchman and Chief Judge of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, F. Ryan Duffy. Thereafter, and from year to year, and over the protest of Woodmar's counsel, Judge Duffy's successor, Seventh Circuit Judge John S. Hastings, now retired, "temporarily" reassigned Judge Tehan to Hammond. Judge Tehan's last entry, *after 12 years,* was made on May 19, 1969.

Judge Tehan had come to Hammond, Indiana from Milwaukee, in December of 1957, and took possession of our company's $500,000 bank account and business affairs. We had courteously urged his colleague, Chief Judge F. Ryan Duffy, officiating with Judge Tehan in Milwaukee, to reassign a different Indiana Judge to our case. Our pleas and protests fell on deaf ears.

Judge Tehan had not ventured outside of Wisconsin on any other trial assignment. He was, thereafter, "reassigned," annually, to our case, over our protests, for the next ensuing twelve (12) years.

A former Lake County, Indiana Federal Judge (Luther M. Swygert) *who, likewise, had never been assigned to a trial outside of Indiana,* was simultaneously sent to Milwaukee by Chief Judge F. Ryan Duffy. Coincidentally, the Lake County, Indiana, Judge who then took over substantial court work of Judge Tehan's in the Eastern District of Wisconsin in Milwaukee was the same judge who had previously sat in our case for thirteen (13) years.

The circumstances under which the jurisdictions of the two Seventh Circuit Judges were switched by Judge F. Ryan Duffy and his successor, Judge John Hastings, on the appeals level, are *in part* as follows:

Judge Tehan, former chairman of a major Milwaukee County political party, reportedly had "overreacted" while on the bench, in favor of the United Auto Workers in the Kohler strike litigation. Again, in 1960, tax cases involving friends and political allies of Judge Tehan were in the offing and threatened to blow up in his face, along with the fact that Attorney Robert E. Tehan Jr.'s small law firm maintained a successful practice in his father's court and was being fed a number of lucrative bankruptcy cases by the court. If the Committee will also investigate the background and dispositions of the *Hayes, Margoles,* and *Cain* trials which were handled by Judge Swygert in Milwaukee in 1960–1961, as well as other 1960 tax cases in the Milwaukee Federal Court involving, for example, Judge Tehan's crony, Harry Kaminsky, and Edward Mesheski (Tehan's successor as head of the county party), it will be introduced to some of the other hanky-panky in the swapping of cases and related misfeasance in the federal court.

Hammond Federal Judge, Luther M. Swygert, also a former chairman of a major Lake County, Indiana, political party, had received a great deal of publicity in the local press when the Woodmar Realty Company's court-appointed fiduciaries' $287,000 fee claims came on for hearing in 1951. (They sought ⅜ of our net estate.)

On September 21, 1956, after suffering two nervous breakdowns and after consultations with Judge Duffy, the Hammond, Indiana, Federal Judge, Luther M. Swygert, had disqualified himself. He decided that, because he had been co-counsel with Donald C. Gardner (attorney for the Barrett Bondholders Protective Committee in the Woodmar reorganization in eleven (11) Barrett Bond foreclosure cases against Woodmar's real estate, prior to his getting on the bench in October of 1943, he could no longer, in *conscience,* sit in our case. *During the 13 years before he disqualified himself, much of our valuable real estate,* now worth over $25,000,000, was sold to insiders, including Donald C. Gardner, the Judge's former associate in the foreclosure cases against us. Neither Gardner nor Judge Swygert had made an accounting to their Barrett Bond owner-clients. Instead, they had them file lien claims against Woodmar's assets *for the entire face value of the bonds and coupons.*

The Indiana Federal Judge (Swygert) who thus disqualified himself *after 13 years,* was, at the time, a candidate for promotion to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Chicago—where Judge Kerner now sits. Five years after his disqualifying himself, his promotion was confirmed by the Senate (September, 1961).

The record discloses that the Lake County, Indiana, Federal Judge (Luther M. Swygert) who was sent up to Wisconsin in 1958 did not permit a hearing on a Barrett Bond lien claim during the thirteen (13) years that he had sat in our case. Later, the Federal Court of Appeals in Chicago, Judge Duffy dissenting, said that we could settle or try the 35-year-old outlawed municipal bond lien claims against what was left of our assets. (284 F. 2d 815). By that time the Court-appointed fiduciaries, including Donald C. Gardner, had scalped a substantial number of the defaulted City of Hammond Improvement Bonds (Barrett Bonds) for a few cents on the dollar and were getting ready to enjoy another windfall out of what was left of our assets in the Court's hands.

Notwithstanding the opinion and mandate of the Court of Appeals (284 F.2d 815), Milwaukee Federal Judge Robert E. Tehan, as Judge Swygert before him, didn't permit either a single settlement to be consumated or a single trial to be had on a lien claim. He struck all interrogatories and quashed all subpoenaes prepared by Woodmar for discovery purposes. Requests for hearings were ignored and denied.

Judge Tehan, ultimately, liberally rewarded one fiduciary (Davis) appointed by Judge Swygert with $123,000.00 of Woodmar's money for helping prevent Woodmar from either getting a hearing on, or effecting a settlement of, a lien claim. The attorneys who represented Judge Swygert's co-counsel, Donald C. Gardner, (*in state court criminal cases*) got $65,000.00 worth of checks signed by Judge Tehan on the Woodmar Realty Company's trust account in the Gary National Bank. Donald C. Gardner, Judge Swygert's co-counsel in the eleven (11) "class" Barrett Bond cases against our assets, resigned from the Indiana Bar in lieu of disbarment.

Judge Tehan also signed a $48,000.00 check payable to the Federal Registry at South Bend, in May of 1969, closing out our bank account. This was a malicious act, intended to impoverish Woodmar and thus prevent our being able to make any complaint. (The Court of Appeals, before Judge Swygert's promotion to that bench, had said that the residuary funds were ours. (284 F.2d 815).

Judge Cordell C. Pinkerton, who, as Hammond City Attorney, appeared before Judge Tehan in Hammond, is quoted on the front page of the July 25, 1971, Des Moines Sunday Register:

"Judge Cordell Pinkerton of the Lake Superior Court has been a witness to *what he believes is an example of legal robbery.*

"*It involves,* he says, *judges,* lawyers and the business and social establishment of the community and requires, he believes, varying degrees of naivete, apathy, lack of scruples *and outright crookedness.*"

The growing evidence of federal judicial misfeasance by Judges Tehan and Swygert in the aformentioned and other cases—the consequences of which continue to wreak serious hardships upon some of their victims—demands that an investigation by your Committee of these wrongdoings can no longer be pigeonholed if the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit is to be free of taint and corruption. Accordingly, I ask you and the other members of the House Judiciary Committee to direct your staff to now undertake a full, formal investigation of such official misconduct in all of its ramifications.

Necessarily, I am in a position to furnish all documents, papers, pleadings, correspondence, etc. which have accumulated over the 29-year-period that the so-called "reorganization" was officially pending.

Very truly yours,

OWEN W. CRUMPACKER.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest in which nearly 500,000 secondary school students participate.

I am very happy to report that this year the winning contestant for the State of Indiana was Mr. David Diamond of South Bend, Ind., a resident of my district.

Mr. Diamond's statement on behalf of the democracy is a very interesting one, and particularly pertinent in this election year when the people shall make their voice heard in the series of elections that are the characteristic feature of our democracy.

I would like to insert Mr. Diamond's speech in the RECORD at this point for the information and attention of my colleagues.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By David Diamond)

In 1816, Thomas Jefferson said, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Today, my responsibility to freedom can only be fulfilled if I remember Jefferson's words, and try my hardest to uphold them, every day of my life.

I look around, and everywhere I see newspapers, magazines, books, and pamphlets crying out to be read, and they are read, by a great number of people. But that number is small compared to the number of people who say, "I'll read it tomorrow," or "I'm not interested in that stuff," or "Leave that to people who understand it."

I look around, and I see important social, political, and economic issues waiting to be analyzed, discussed, and decided upon; and they are analyzed, discussed, and decided upon by a great number of people. But that number is small compared to the number of people who say, "I'll decide tomorrow," or "I'm not interested" or "Leave that to people who understand it."

You see, what people who say this sort of thing don't seem to realize is that freedom is not having things decided for you; freedom is not ignoring important issues; freedom is not putting off actions which perpetuate your awareness of current events. Freedom can only be lost, never gained when a person falls into rut of apathy, unenlightenment, and just plain ignorance.

It's not a hard rut to sidestep, but it calls for constant attention. It calls for interest: for wanting to know what's going on. It calls for enlightenment: and that means reading those books and magazines, and listening and forming opinions about current issues. Finally, it calls for knowledge, because it doesn't do much good to be interested; it doesn't do much good to read and discuss, if you don't understand.

In a democracy, the people choose leaders, decide policy, and run the government. It's done that way because of a love for a thing called freedom. But people can retain that freedom only as long as they choose good leaders, decide on sound policy, and run the government efficiently. And they can only do these things when they are interested, enlightened, and knowledgeable.

My responsibility to freedom is to enlighten myself and others, so that, as Jefferson said ". . . tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

ANOTHER HUGE CORN CROP?

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, failure to implement a food reserve policy in this country causes unneeded loss of income to farmers and unnecessary variations in the supply of basic foods. When the administration opposed a feed grain reserve policy last fall, following the production of a huge surplus of grain, they set the stage for dislocations in both the grain and meat markets. With so much corn in surplus, livestock is being held back to be fed more grain and temporarily there is less meat than consumers would buy, but this will be followed by a big increase in the amount of excess fats to be carried on livestock marketed later this year. The grain producers lost, the consumers will not gain anything and it represents a failure of the Government to do what is needed which individuals cannot do for themselves.

An excellent editorial touching on these matters was printed in the Des Moines Register of Monday, March 20, 1972. It speaks for itself and is as follows:

ANOTHER HUGE CORN CROP?

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's planting intentions report is bad news for farmers and for Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz. The survey, taken Mar. 1, indicates that farmers will reduce corn acreage by only 8 per cent this year as compared with 1971.

With average weather conditions this would result in another huge corn crop this year, probably well above 5 billion bushels. (Last year's record crop was 5.5 million bushels.) This would depress prices of feed grains and encourage further expansion in livestock output. It would reduce commercial farmers' net incomes.

(Because the demand for food is so inelastic in America, an increase in supply of food products causes prices received by farmers to decline more than enough to offset the larger volume of sales. A smaller national supply of grain and livestock nearly always brings in more money for the farmer than a large supply.)

In January a preliminary planting intentions report indicated that farmers were planning to cut corn acreage only about 4 per cent. After that news, Butz came out with more incentives for farmers to take part in the feed grain program. But these evidently have had little effect.

Butz has been making speeches right and left about how hard he is working to help the farmer. He says he will "raise Cain" in the farmer's interest and will "fight like a wounded steer" to help farmers get more income. He has said several times that he was going to spend a lot of government money to raise farm income—he said he was spending money "like a drunken sailor" to help agriculture.

A sensible feed grain supply management program would do more to help farmers than all this big political talk by Butz and all the government spending. Butz has the authority to set a corn and feed grain acreage allotment this year. He could accomplish more reduction in production by doing that than he will by the "set aside" plan.

Many farmers can set aside all the required acres and get all the payments without actually cutting corn production.

Secretary Butz also could help farmers by supporting the grain reserve bill, a piece of legislation which would give him more power to manage the supply of grains. This would permit the accumulation of a reserve to be used to stabilize market supply from year to year.

Considerable grain could be put in storage from the 1971 crop. If the 1972 crop should be another big one, more grain could be put in reserve. Then a sharp cutback in output in 1973 could be safely planned for.

A well-managed grain supply stabilization program could help maintain commercial farm income at a high level, without Butz spending money like a drunken sailor. It would be a program to help farmers gain income through the market.

ACCIDENTAL POISONINGS—ARE WE DOING ENOUGH?

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, despite their continued presence in our society, some social problems draw relatively little public attention. The problem of accidental poisonings is a prime example. Although we know thousands of innocent children are needlessly injured each year, most poisonings occur quietly within the confines of the home.

Since March 19–25 marks the Nation's 11th annual observance of National Poison Prevention Week, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight some encouraging new developments in the area of poison prevention and also to suggest how we can continue working to protect our most precious resource, our children.

The Congress, in December 1970, gave final approval to the Poison Prevention Packaging Act. The intent of the law is the protection of children from accidental ingestion of the most potentially toxic household substances through the use of special safety packaging. In effect, the package must be so designed that most children under 5 will be unable to open the container. The package must still permit normal access to adults.

Although the packaging industry is still working on the perfection of a variety of containers which will, at the same time, be safe, effective, and practical for mass manufacturing and distribution, the Food and Drug Administration already has announced that safety closures will be used on all aspirin products by this coming fall. Special packaging, under the law, will hopefully also become standard for such other product categories as furniture polishes, controlled prescription drugs and linaments, by yearend.

We all known intuitively that safety containers are not going to solve the accidental poisoning problem. Children, with their natural ingenuity, will find a way to open almost anything—given the time. The Packaging Act, written with this in mind, specifies that safety packaging must simply make it difficult for children under age 5 to open the container in a reasonable time. The regulations for aspirin, for instance, require that 85 percent of children tested be unable to open the container. Therefore, of a hypothetical 1,000 children, 150 may still open an aspirin container with possibly dangerous consequences.

How serious is this poisoning problem? The Poison Control Center for the city of Syracuse, N.Y., in my home district, received 1,080 phone calls for poison emergencies involving children under 5 during 1970. For the same year, 302 children under 5 were either treated or ad-

mitted to hospitals in Syracuse for poisoning symptoms. And seven deaths occurred during 1970 in the Syracuse area as a result of poisoning. An eighth death occurred in the neighborhood city of Auburn, N.Y.

Nationally, the Poison Control Centers received over 70,000 reports of accidental ingestions involving children under 5, with over 200 deaths registered. The Food and Drug Administration points out, in addition, that these are minimum figures, not reflecting cases treated privately by physicians or resolved by parents at home.

The problem is not new, nor has it been ignored, fortunately. The manufacturers of proprietary medicines—the household remedies used to treat minor ailments or symptoms—sought to perfect the development of an effective safety closures as early as 1950. In 1955, representatives of the industry met with the Food and Drug Administration and voluntarily agreed to limit the number of tablets in children's aspirin containers to a maximum of fifty 1¼-gram tablets. Also at that time, the warning, "Keep out of reach of children," was added to the package. By 1968, the industry reduced the contents of children's aspirin containers further, to 36 tablets, and an effective safety closure became a standard feature of children's aspiring packaging.

It is estimated that there are over 250,000 different types of products commonly used in homes throughout America. Of necessity, many of these are toxic in quantity, if accidentally ingested. They range from after shave lotion and bubble bath soaps to lighter fluid and fish bowl additives. The question is, why do children in some homes suffer accidental ingestions while children in other homes do not?

Safety experts agree that the basic answer lies in the degree of concern for safety exercised by parents in their homes. The less the concern, the greater the threat of accidents. Seen in this light, the problem of poisonings becomes one of educating parents to understand the importance of using and storing household products safely and wisely. To be effective, even safety closures must be properly sealed. Otherwise their special caps will do nothing to prevent a youngster from reaching the container's contents. Labels provide no protection unless consumers read the warning message and instructions for proper use. Responsibility for the prevention of accidents must always rest in large part with parents at home.

National Poison Prevention Week is one positive national program which attempts to promote greater awareness of the dangers of carelessness. Unfortunately, it only occurs once each year. For the past 6 years, the manufacturers of proprietary medicines have sponsored the Council on Family Health to promote the safe use of medicines and all household substances throughout the year.

The council is the only private, nonprofit organization in the country concerned chiefly with the problem of accidental poisonings among children. It is supported solely through the voluntary contributions of member drug companies. The council's program is designed to reach millions of families through materials distributed to newspapers and magazines, radio and television, community organizations and consumers themselves.

As part of the council's activities in connection with Poison Prevention Week, I understand that a public service film on the safe use of medicines was produced and distributed over the past 2 weeks to 300 television stations across the country. The color film, "Before You Take Medicines," was produced and distributed by the council in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Product Safety.

The council's basic messages for consumers are: For safety's sake, devote a degree of care and concern to the use of products in the home, especially medicines. When using medicines and other products, always carefully read their labels. Store all potentially dangerous substances well out of sight and reach of children. And, finally, attempt to instill in children a respect for the proper use of medicines—something which may help alleviate the country's current drug abuse problem.

Programs such as that of the Council on Family Health appear to be making a significant contribution to the cause of family safety. Aspirin products, because of their wide use in homes throughout America, are involved in a high percentage of poisoning cases among children under age 5. The National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers recently reported:

> The 1970 aspirin ingestion percentage of all reports showed a dramatic drop for children under five years of age and were 30 percent lower than the year 1969 . . . During the first six months of 1971, reports of aspirin ingestion are down another seven percent from the 1969 figures.

The Clearinghouse explains:

> The reason, and thus the credit, for this successful reduction of aspirin ingestions in children cannot be identified exactly but clearly can be shared between the voluntary industry limitation of 36–1¼ gr. aspirin to a bottle, the intensive campaigns of governmental and private organizations to make the public aware of the situation and some voluntary safety packaging during 1970.

However, we cannot afford to stop our efforts. Among children under the age of 14, accidents are still the largest single cause of death—15,200 deaths in 1970. One out of every three children who die in the United States, die of an accident. And accidents kill more children than the five leading fatal diseases combined.

As Dr. Jay M. Arena, president of the American Academy of Pediatrics and member of the Council on Family Health's Medical Advisory Board, has said:

> About 90 percent of the medicine practiced in this country is practiced by mothers of families. Yet we do precious little to train mothers to carry out the job which they are going to do anyhow, with or without training.

The problem of poisoning lacks the drama of automobile accidents or the excitement of home fires. Yet it exists throughout the year. Poison Prevention Week is an effective way of drawing major national attention to the poisoning problem. And the efforts of private organizations such as the Council on Family Health are invaluable in helping to eliminate carelessness, the root cause of most accidents.

I hope that the Government, private industry and all sectors of society can join together to finish the job of accident prevention, and to make the homes of America safer for our children.

WEST GERMANY BULLIED BY MOSCOW THREATS OF CONFRONTATION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about "detente" these days and in the current euphoric atmosphere we are tempted to accept the proposition that Soviet Communist leaders are a different breed from those of the 1950's and we need no longer be concerned that they will try to bully the world. We are admonished to negotiate—to open up dialog—to find bases for "mutually advantageous cooperation." To this end the President will visit Moscow in May.

It seems to me, however, that an article in the March 21 Washington Post betrays Leonid Brezhnev as the archetypical political bully and demonstrates that any effort at finesse on the part of the Soviets is purely for show or strategic gain.

In a major review of Soviet foreign policy, Brezhnev is quoted in the article by Robert G. Kaiser as saying:

> "We approach the forthcoming Soviet-American talks from businesslike, realistic positions," Brezhnev said. "We are fully aware of the importance of the state of Soviet-American relations for the life of the people of both countries, as well as for the entire international situation, for its further development in the direction of lasting peace or in the direction of growing military danger.
>
> That is why we consider it our duty to find such fields in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States that would make it possible, without retreating from the principles of our policy, to establish a certain degree of mutually advantageous cooperation in the interests of the peoples of both countries and the strengthening of universal peace.

Yet the same article, referring to the same speech, reports on Brezhnev's comment regarding the Moscow and Warsaw treaties pending before the West German Bundestag as follows:

> As for opponents of the Treaties in Bonn, Brezhnev said they should realize that they could either accept the drafts before them or face the consequences—there could be no renegotiation of any part of them. The Christian Democratic opposition has proposed renegotiation clauses referring to the permanence of German borders, because they fear the current wording assures the permanent division of Germany.

This is clearly a threat aimed at German opposition to the treaties. Brezhnev has said, in effect:

You must take what we give you or you get nothing.

He is known to have said the consequences will be renewal of "cold war" confrontations. And he has indicated a closed mind regarding any efforts at renegotiation.

If his talk of "lasting peace" and "strengthening universal peace" in reference to United States-Soviet relations had any sincerity behind it, he could not couple it with this kind of bullying threats against his neighbors to have his own way or else; and he would not be mixing so blatantly in internal German politics.

On the subject of negotiating with such people, a word to the wise should be sufficient—do not.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is fortunate to have the outstanding leadership of Comdr. Joseph L. Vicites during these critical times. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have very effectively presented to the Congress a reasonable and responsible program. National Commander in Chief Vicites, his fellow national officers, the outstanding State officers, and the splendid VFW Washington office work constantly for a strong America and in behalf of all our veterans. The VFW is especially active and effective in advocating adequate medical care for our veterans and in protecting our superb VA hospital system.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people, the following splendid address presented before our House Veterans Committee on March 7, 1972, by Hon. Joseph L. Vicites, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The address follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH L. VICITES, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

It is a great privilege for me and my comrades to appear before this distinguished Committee to present the current legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Each of us is aware, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of your Committee honor not only our organization, but all American veterans by permitting us to come here year after year.

We are deeply grateful for your understanding of our problems; the generosity you demonstrate; the intelligent and enlightened programs you initiate; and the support and assistance you invariably provide to veterans and their dependents.

In our opinion no other Congressional Committee is so completely dedicated to nonpartisan service and the purpose for which it functions.

As most of you know, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States had its de facto origin in 1899. Veterans of the Spanish-American War met almost simultaneously in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Columbus, Ohio, and Denver, Colorado, to discuss the plight of their comrades. They subsequently joined forces at a meeting in Denver, where Post No. One, of our organization still prospers, and carries on the work of its founders.

From that humble beginning, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has grown steadily—until today, we have one million, seven hundred thousand members.

This is the twentieth consecutive year in which we will have realized a substantial increase in our membership. In August, we expect to go to our National Convention in Minneapolis with one million, eight hundred thousand men; and a half million ladies in our Auxiliary.

Our many programs of service to the veteran and his dependents; to our communities; and to the nation, are principally responsible for this continued growth. These programs, however, do not function or produce results by themselves. Hard work and effective leadership, on every level, are essential to their success.

Many of the men who are responsible for this success are with me here this morning. They are the Department Commanders, their Staff officers, National Committee members, and Post and District Officers, who have come from all over this great nation, and from several foreign countries, to attend our annual Washington Conference. Many of them will be visiting with the members of your Committee throughout the day, as well as tonight at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Neither time nor the purpose of my appearance here will permit me to review the varied programs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. There is one, however, which both tradition and pride compel me to call to your attention. I refer to our annual Voice of Democracy Program.

This is a script-writing contest, annually participated in by high school students throughout our fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Pacific Areas, and the Panama Canal. The theme this year is: "My Responsibility to Freedom."

Five college scholarships, totaling $22,500, will be awarded to the winners of that competition at our banquet tonight. The first-place winner will deliver his or her speech, and receive the first prize of $10,000, to be used to further his or her education at the college or university of his or her choice.

Mr. Chairman, may I present the state and territorial winners to you and your Committee at this time. They are seated directly behind me, just a few rows back. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the product of resolutions officially adopted at our annual National Convention. Approximately three hundred such resolutions were approved at our most recent Convention, which was held in Dallas, Texas, August 13 to 20, 1971.

Immediately following that Convention, our National Legislative and National Security and Foreign Affairs Committees met here in Washington to review those resolutions. As a result of that meeting, a representative list of organizational mandates was selected, recommended, and approved by the various Committees, and by me as Commander-in-Chief, to make up our "Priority Legislative Program" for the current year. That program has been printed in an attractive brochure, and a copy has been furnished to each member of Congress, as well as other persons who have a responsibility to implement and carry out veterans programs.

It would be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a copy of the Digest of our National Convention Resolutions, adopted in Dallas, and a copy of the brochure containing our V.F.W. Priority Goals for the current year might be made a part of my remarks and incorporated in my statement.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I think there can be no doubt that the most pressing concern of my organization is the future of VA hospitals.

On the one hand, the Office of Management and Budget has been pursuing a policy of reduction for many years, with the design of cutting veterans' medical care to an average daily patient load of 60,000 by 1975. On the other, are the efforts of your Committee and organizations such as mine to frustrate this soulless indifference to the medical needs of those who fight our nation's wars.

As you know, this fiscal year, the Congress found it necessary to halt an attempt by the Office of Management and Budget to cut veterans medical care in VA hospitals from 86,000 to 79,000.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars deeply appreciates the tremendous effort made by this Committee to provide and maintain adequate funds and personnel for VA hospitals, in spite of the dollar signs which apparently run through the blood streams of the Office of Management and Budget, in so far as veterans are concerned.

Your Subcommittee on Hospitals, headed by Chairman David Satterfield, produced undeniable evidence that the VA medical care system needed more, instead of less, personnel and services.

The House Appropriations Committee agreed, and added over two hundred million dollars to this year's VA budget to prevent such a cut.

Even more important, the House Appropriations Committee wrote into the bill a prohibition against reduction, and that is now a part of the law. I quote from Public Law 92–78:

". . . the foregoing appropriation shall not be apportioned to provide for less than an average of 97,500 operating beds in Veterans Administration hospitals or furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average daily patient load of less than 85,500 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1972."

In spite of this clear and legal Congressional mandate, I am advised that the Veterans Administration is taking care of only 83,000 patients, and cannot possibly care for the authorized number of 85,500 average daily patient load during this fiscal year. Obviously, the Office of Management and Budget has found a way to circumvent the will of Congress.

Yet there are waiting lists at many VA hospitals; and the rejection rate in some of them is excessive—running as high as sixty percent. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply disturbed at this condition. And you may be sure, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, that we will expend every effort in support of your Committee and the Congress to see that this Congressional mandate is carried out.

We all know that the VA hospital system was created by the legislative acts of many Congresses, and the expenditure of many billions of dollars. It has been a vast and comprehensive undertaking by the official representatives of the people of this nation.

If I may summarize, for the record, the Veterans Administration is presently operating 166 hospitals; 202 outpatient clinics; 16 domiciliaries for elderly veterans; 76 nursing homes; 6 restoration centers; 3 blind rehabilitation centers; and 32 drug units.

This VA medical system, with its annual budget of approximately two billion dollars, took care of seven million of the nation's twenty-eight million veterans last year.

It is staffed by approximately 150,000 physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical health employees, on a full time basis. In addition there are about 83,000 private physicians who take care of veterans on a

fee-for-service arrangement in their local communities.

The Veterans Administration is also a major source of medical education, training, and research. For example, the VA system provides training for one-half of the third and fourth year medical students in the nation. During the past year alone it provided training for 53,000 individuals in 60 different categories of health sciences.

VA hospitals and clinics are affiliated with 81 medical schools; 51 dental schools; 287 nursing schools; and some 400 universities, colleges, and junior colleges which provide training for both professional and technical health workers.

In addition, the Veterans Administration has led the way in the field of medical research. It developed the cardiac pacemaker, and drugs for treating TB. Both veterans and non-veterans are reaping the benefits of this giant of the health care business.

My organization is gravely concerned for the Veterans Administration's future role should a national health care system be established. We are concerned because the Office of Management and Budget has indicated in correspondence with members of Congress that the future of the VA hospital system is connected with national health insurance proposals now under active consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is greatly encouraged by an article prepared by the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, entitled "No, to Takeover of VA" which appeared in the February, 1972 issue of our V.F.W. Magazine.

Congressman Mills stated, in the next to last paragraph: "I am convinced we should not recommend federal health care legislation until the Administration provides firm information as to plans for the future of the VA program."

It will be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a copy of the article by Congressman Mills, as it appeared in the February Issue of the V.F.W. Magazine may be made a part of my remarks at this point. Thank you. It is our fervent hope that the Congress will agree with him.

My organization is also deeply concerned over the status and the condition of our Vietnam Veterans. And, I am proud to report to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of this Committee, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars boasts approximately 450 thousand members who are veterans of that war.

Our boasting ceases, however, when we consider the fact that the unemployment rate among these young men remains excessively high, in spite of every effort to reduce it.

One of the most successful programs ever established by the Congress is the GI Bill. All veterans are grateful for it. The nation as a whole has profited by it.

Your Committee has developed and recommended a bill which carries out in greater part a priority goal of the V.F.W. for increased assistance to veterans taking education and training under the GI Bill. Your bill, as reported by this Committee, and approved by the House, will increase the rates for tuition, books, and fees by 14 percent.

It is noted too, that another provision in the bill proposes a 48 percent increase in on-the-job and apprenticeship training rates for jobless veterans under the GI Bill.

With no disrespect intended, Mr. Chairman, I note also that the distinguished ladies on your Committee appear to have struck a blow for "Women's Lib." A provision in H.R. 12828 accords women veterans the same status as male veterans, in so far as the veteran's spouse is concerned, under Veterans' Administration laws. We in the V.F.W. support this provision.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly supports the legislation pending in this Committee which would transfer the jurisdiction over national cemeteries to the Veterans' Administration. Our national cemetery system should be continued and expanded. Burial in a national cemetery is a perpetual honor. It should be every veteran's right.

Certainly it should be distinguished from a plot allowance, or other subsidy, which is nothing more than an economic benefit to the veteran's survivors.

We in the V.F.W. have long campaigned for at least one national cemetery in each state, so that every veteran who so desires may be laid to rest in a national cemetery reasonably near his home. We urge the enactment of legislation which will carry out this recommendation.

Another matter of great importance to our membership is that of keeping the Veterans' Administration intact. Every year there are attempts being made to transfer VA programs to other agencies. This year there seems to have been a movement in the Congress to diminish the Veterans' Administration's jurisdiction over veterans programs. The most conspicuous example is legislation establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. This legislation creates a Drug Czar who will have the power of life and death over the VA regarding the treatment of veterans suffering from drug addiction.

We applaud your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to exempt the VA from this legislation. We also applaud Congressman Satterfield who, as a member of the Commerce Committee, had language put in the bill which tells this Drug Czar, in effect, to leave the Veterans' Administration alone. Your Committee, Mr. Chairman, has already developed and reported a veterans drug bill, now pending in the Senate, which is the traditional and proper way to handle this problem in so far as veterans are concerned. I refer to H.R. 9265, which was endorsed by our Dallas Convention. This is the bill that the V.F.W. will be pressing the Senate to approve.

Our organization will be working closely with your Committee for cost of living increases in the compensation rates for the more than two million service connected disabled veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is as anxious to see the end of the Vietnam War as anyone, but we want that end to be an honorable one. For that reason we stand firmly behind the President on his eight-point proposal for peace in Indo-China to bring American POW's home.

We strongly oppose bills now pending in Congress which would grant amnesty to draft dodgers who have fled to foreign countries in order to avoid military duty in our armed forces. If these draft dodgers wish to return to this country now that the war is practically over, they should be prepared to suffer the consequences for their crimes. They should never be permitted to return as heroes.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I again express my sincere gratitude for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished Committee.

It is our hope that each of you will be with us tonight at our annual Congressional Banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, where we will be honoring one of your distinguished colleagues—the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania. He will be the ninth recipient of our V.F.W. Congressional Award for outstanding service to the nation.

The dinner will begin promptly at 7:00 P.M., with a reception beginning at 6:00 P.M.

Thank you for your attention.

MEASURING OUR DEFENSES

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the March issue of the Armed Forces Journal an editorial written by a Mr. James D. Hessman. The editorial made known a suggestion made several months ago by my colleague, the Honorable WALTER E. POWELL, of Ohio, for the Congress to conduct hearings open to television coverage on the current state of the defense capabilities of the United States. I am pleased to share this information with you:

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS

Too little attention has been paid, we think, to the eminently sensible suggestion made a few months back by Representative Walter E. Powell (R-Ohio) that Congress conduct nationally televised hearings on the deteriorating state of U.S. defense capabilities.

The time is now, we think, to hold such hearings. As Jack Anderson, CBS, the Washington Post, Daniel Ellsberg, and other friends of the military are fond of saying, the American people have a right to know what is going on. We might add that the Democratic and Republican national conventions also have a right to know what is going on, and well in advance of the time they choose their candidates.

And what is going on is this: over the past seven years, while the United States has been sitting fat, dumb, and happy contemplating its Gross National Product, the Soviet Union has been moving steadily and inexorably forward, increasing its military power in every measurable category.

The USSR is and has been building ships, missiles, and aircraft at rates far, far in excess of what is needed for purely defensive purposes. Why? According to SecDef posture statements the Soviet Union in 1965 had 224 intercontinental ballistic missiles and 107 submarine-launched ballistic missiles. By mid-1972 the numbers will be 1,550 and 580, respectively. While this buildup was going on, the U.S. has been "reallocating priorities"—but not enough, according to several of those who would be Commander-in-Chief.

Other statistics are available: according to Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, by mid-1972 the USSR will have 10,000 surface-to-air missile launchers, and the U.S. will have 839; the USSR will have 3,100 fighter-interceptors and the U.S. will have 593; the USSR will have 64 ABM launchers and the U.S. will have none.

What have we done, by the way, to improve our defenses? Well, we decided, by one vote in a divided Senate, to build a limited ABM. Remember just prior to WWII when the draft was extended—also by a one-vote margin?

Let's look at the Navy: according to the authoritative International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), the Soviet Union has 295 submarines, the U.S. only 99. Except for carriers (the USSR has none and the U.S. has 16—average age 18), surface combatant fleets are about equal. Or would be, were it not for the fact that some 60 Soviet submarines and about 130 surface ships and patrol boats are armed with ship-busting cruise missiles.

And the merchant marine: in 1958, according to the Maritime Administration, the U.S. fleet numbered 3,061 ships, compared to 774 ships in the Soviet fleet. By 1975, however, according to MarAd projections, there will be only 270 ships in the rapidly aging U.S.-flag fleet, but by 1980 the Soviet-flag

fleet will count an estimated 4,300 major vessels, aggregating 27-million deadweight tons.

And personnel: the USSR, says IISS, has 3,375,000 men in service. By mid-1973 U.S. active-duty strength will be 2,358,037—a gap of over 1-million men.

And geography: in recent years the USSR has entrenched itself in Egypt and other nations on the northern littoral of Africa, has cozied up to India, has established domain in the Eastern Mediterranean, and has clarified the neo-independent thinking of Czechoslovakia—has done everything expected of a Big Brother, in short, except come to the aid of Northern Ireland. American diplomatic ventures during the same time frame consisted of getting bounced out of Wheelus AFB in Libya (the USSR moved into the vacuum), sending troops to Southeast Asia and bringing them back again, and keeping the Washington Monument from being burned to the ground by student demonstrators.

You say we overstate the case? Well, perhaps. There's a lot of good things the U.S. has done, and a number of ways the USSR has bungled. And our military strength has improved—over the strenuous objections of some of our most esteemed legislators. We're MIRVing our missiles, modernizing our reduced forces, and getting more firepower per man.

But this begs the question. The Soviet Union is also MIRVing and modernizing, and doesn't seem worried that its military buildup has been financed at the expense of consumer programs.

The point is: by almost every quantifiable index of military strength the U.S. has been going down, down, down, and the Soviet Union has been going up, up, up.

This is something to worry about. We're also concerned about the so-called "domestic priorities," but survival, we say, must come first. Always.

Maybe Secretary Laird and Admiral Moorer and all the others are lying to us. We don't think so, but just to make sure we would like to see the case taken to the American people. We would like to see a select body, headed by Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John C. Stennis and House Armed Services Committee Chairman F. Edward Hebert, conduct open, nationally televised hearings on the nature of the Soviet threat and what the U.S. is doing about it. (We realize there could be some problems with classification, but we're also told by people who should know that this need present "no real difficulty.")

We think such astute critics of the Pentagon as Senator William Proxmire (who sometimes seems politically motivated, but at least usually knows what he's talking about) should be invited to participate. Proxmire and a very few knowledgeable others (underrated and underpublicized Representative Otis Pike, for example) do their homework well and would make the Joint Chiefs and other DoD spokesmen put up or shut up. Which is as it should be.

Other people we would like to see testify are Senator George McGovern (who advocates cutting the defense budget to $50-billion) and various spokesmen for MCPL (Members of Congress for Peace through Law), who say they also want a strong national defense, but who advocate scrapping virtually every new weapons program which comes along. These anti-military people may be right, though. They should be given a chance to prove their case—Prove it, not merely assert it, which is what they have been doing for years.

We think, in other words, they also should be made to put up or shut up.

It's presumptuous, maybe, to think that Congress actually would hold such hearings as we propose in this grandiose scheme, even if they do make sense. But why not? The Army-McCarthy hearings, closest thing we can think of as a precedent, also made sense, and they changed the mood of America for the better in an earlier and much less dangerous age.

The strangest bedfellows you could think of, in the wake of "The Selling of the Pentagon," are the Columbia Broadcasting System and Chairman Hebert. But who knows? CBS could make a star out of Bourbon Street's favorite son, and the two of them working together could end up putting this nation back on top where it belongs.

ECOLOGY—A "WILD" IDEA?

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this week, March 19–26, has been proclaimed "National Wildlife Week" by President Nixon. This marks the 35th annual observation of wildlife week, sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation and its 50-State affiliates.

The theme of National Wildlife Week 1972, "Ecology: A Wild Idea," is thought-provoking. As this year's national chairman, film star—ecologist, Robert Redford, put it:

> It may be a "wild" idea to believe we can reverse environmental destruction to . . . create a quality life for man, but this country was founded on the "wild" idea of independence, and not so long ago a "wild" idea took us to the moon. Ecology is another "wild" idea that will work.

As our forefathers met the challenge of taming the wilderness to found a new society, we today must meet the challenge of preserving a portion of this wilderness for generations yet unborn.

Posters publicizing this week's observance depict the American bald eagle, proud emblem of the United States, now threatened by extinction. Choice of this species, one of 101 listed by the Department of the Interior as "endangered," is particularly significant.

The bald eagle, symbolizing America on dollar bills and postage stamps, also stands for national strength, freedom, and quality of life.

Due largely to efforts of the National Wildlife Federation and other conservation-minded citizens, this great and noble bird, like the once-threatened whooping crane and American buffalo, is still extant.

It is appropriate this week that we pause to commend the National Wildlife Federation, its State affiliates, and nearly 3 million individual members working toward solutions to problems confronting man, wildlife, and the environment. It is also a meaningful time to contemplate our responsibilities to be wise stewards of the earth's resources. Recognizing that wildlife and human life are inseparable, that man and wildlife are dependent for survival upon common essentials, we can go forward together for the dual causes of resource conservation and environmental protection.

Activities of the Tennessee Conservation League, State affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation, and its members in conjunction with this year's observance are particularly praiseworthy. This year, the league distributed 1,400 kits containing environmental information to students in 147 school systems of the State. Such material should increase awareness among young Tennesseans of their tremendous natural heritage in the Volunteer State.

With continued able leadership of professional conservationists and a determination on the part of each of us to preserve and protect our natural resources, we can insure environmental quality, like other "wild" American ideas, will be achieved.

LESTER COWLE, 70, RETIRES

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 23, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, for many years, Lester Cowle has been a friend and servant to his fellowman. After 21 years of service at the Middlesex County Hospital in Waltham, he is retiring, but not quiting. Instead he will continue to assist the people of the hospital, both patient and staff, in a volunteer capacity. Lester Cowle's dedication to the care of others of all ages, is exemplary to the compassion which lies within us all. I respectfully request that all members read this fine case of charity and good will:

JACK OF ALL TRADES, LESTER COWLE, 70, RETIRES AT HOSPITAL

After 21 years, Lester Cowle has become more than an employee at Middlesex County Hospital in Waltham—more like an institution. Therefore, it seems only natural to him and his associates that when he retires this month, he will continue appearing regularly as a volunteer.

This is no "early retirement" for Cowle either—he just celebrated his 70th birthday.

Cowles likes people and finds his greatest pleasures in helping others. For the last several years his official title has been mailman at the hospital, but he expands his service to aide patients and staff whenever and however he can.

He will appear at 4 a.m. with a cup of coffee for a nurse on the night shift. He enjoys delivering newspapers to individual patients because it gives him a chance to get to know them. Recently he wrote a tobacco company all on his own and obtained free cigarettes for patients.

He figures that if he doesn't show up early for work, the other staff would worry about him—and he's probably right. Once he cut his leg quite badly, but he didn't want to have to stop long enough to have it looked after—he didn't want to be late for being early to work.

Besides his job, Cowle enjoys working "quietly" in political campaigns and has done so for many years on the local and county levels, for governor and U.S. Senator. "I like politics. It gets in your blood," he commented and then reminisced about the many friends he had made while campaigning. His past career includes serving for 32 years as chairman of the Maynard Democratic Council.

For many years Cowle was active in town affairs in Maynard where he worked for the Aspen Mills. He served as chairman of the town's Board of Health for 30 years. In that capacity, he brought patients to Middlesex

Council Hospital to be admitted. This is how his interest in the hospital developed.

Also while living in Maynard, Cowle headed up the National Youth Association during the time of President Roosevelt. This program paid young people for doing various jobs. But Cowle's position was strictly a public service—no salary. For 24 years he was active in the Fraternal Order of Eagles there.

Cowle's favorite job at the hospital was running a store for the patients. One could buy stamps, ice cream, cigarettes, candy, writing materials and other items. From the small profits, Cowle would buy candy for the children patients who looked on him as a cross between grandpa and Santa Claus. But the store was closed a number of years ago—replaced by vending machines which perhaps are efficient but lack the personal warmth Cowle radiates.

SCHOOLBUSING

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 22, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, although I was unable to participate in yesterday's discussion of schoolbusing under the special order of my good friend and colleague from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) I want to associate myself with the thrust of the remarks made by him and by my other colleagues who were able to obtain time to speak.

Although grave issues involving war and peace, economic stability, job opportunity and the future of our cities remain unresolved before Congress and the administration, none poses a greater threat to our basic institutions and to the hope for brotherhood among all Americans than the schoolbusing issue.

As this issue is developing, with impetus from the White House and Capitol Hill, it threatens to divide our society to a greater extent than we have seen in a century, and it threatens the basic principles of American democracy.

Let there be no doubt about what President Nixon has done with his proposal for a moratorium on schoolbusing, a limitation on the jurisdiction of the courts and a cynical attempt to return to the "separate but equal" docrine under the guise of a new cliche—"quality education."

Senator HUMPHREY, perhaps unintentionally in light of his recent about-face, described Mr. Nixon's maneuver aptly when he remarked last week that—

> The President has been able to get his finger up in the air and sense what's going on.

No doubt, the President determined that to take a strong antibusing stand would gain him political credit. But if sniffing the political winds and responding to fear and emotion as Mr. Nixon has done is to be the hallmark of national leadership in the United States, then the future of our Nation is in grave jeopardy.

If Congress aids and abets Mr. Nixon, it will be taking a giant stride toward fulfilling the Kerner Commission's dire prophecy of separate and unequal societies in this Nation. It will be helping to launch an unlawful and unwarranted invasion of the jurisdiction of our Federal courts and an insidious attack on the doctrine of separation of powers.

The record clearly shows that the courts have not ordered massive busing to achieve racial balance. As a matter of fact, Mr. Nixon's own appointee, Chief Justice Burger, laid down some very reasonable guidelines for busing in the Swann decision of April 20, 1971. The Chief Justice declared:

> Busing will not be allowed to significantly impinge on the educational process.

He went on to warn that—

> When the time or distance or travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process it would be considered unreasonable.

So how has the Court jeopardized the rights of anyone or threatened the quality of education?

What the President is clearly attempting to do is to erode the jurisdiction of the courts and the authority of the Constitution. If he succeeds, we will be seeing just a first step in the dismantling of the Bill of Rights.

The President's proposal to spend $2.5 billion for so-called quality education in disadvantaged areas is perhaps not as dangerous but equally fraudulent, for it really proposes nothing new in the way of funding for education program but relies primarily on funds already budgeted under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—and far below the authorized levels—plus funds under the school desegregation legislation.

If quality education meant something to this Administration other than a special code word, we would be dealing with budget requests for full funding of title I and all the other major education programs. Instead, the President's budget priorities continue to emphasize arms over education and subsidies for the rich over sustenance for the poor and hungry.

I think it vital for the forces of decency and fairness in Congress not to just react defensively to the President's proposals, but to move ahead by offering counter-proposals aimed at achieving comprehensive school integration, eliminating inequities in the quality of education within the States and from State to State, upgrading all levels of education with funding of education programs in line with real needs, and by enacting legislation to break down the housing patterns that perpetuate school segregation.

I have already introduced legislation in some of these areas and I will be offering additional bills in the next few weeks. I hope they will not only serve to continue the constructive dialog begun with Congressman STOKES' special order, but will help us establish a legislative program aimed at strengthening our society and its basic institutions, not destroying them as Richard Nixon and his associates would do.

SENATE—*Friday, March 24, 1972*

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Make us ready, O Lord, for the welcome of Him who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. May we receive the royal presence with open hearts, with palm branches of devotion and garlands of love. May we work as in the regal presence of the Creator and Ruler of all realms. Keep ever before us the kingdom of justice and peace on earth and the king who rules in might and splendor above all worlds.

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 23, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BEEF PRICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of talk, statements in the press, advertisements and what not, urging people not to buy beef because the price is too high.

I think the record should be made clear that, so far as the price of beef on the hoof is concerned, the price now, which averages somewhere around 35 or 36 cents is not out of line and certainly is not responsible for the prices which the consumers have to pay today.

The cost of manufacture, processing, and distribution—not the meat as such as it is sold over the counter—has made the difference in meat prices today as compared to 20 years ago.

In comparison with take-home pay, the price of meat has become consistently smaller as average family income has moved upward. In terms of dollars and cents, the average retail price of meat has advanced about 35 percent in the past 20 years, while personal disposable income of U.S. consumers has increased, on the average, by more than 100 percent in the same period.

Those who are complaining about the price of beef should compare the price of beef today with what it was, on the hoof, 20 years ago, and they will find that the price per hundredweight is actually lower today. What they should do