to say that I have known Colonel Kimmitt for a great number of years.

He is a very capable and courteous gentleman. I am sure that he will make an excellent secretary to the majority of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 3353. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum;

H.R. 483. An act to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7546. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired);

H.R. 11253. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; and

H.R. 15510. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 28, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1966

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee: because he trusteth in Thee.—Isaiah 26: 3.

O God, our Father, who art the creator of the world, the sustainer of life everywhere, and the companion of our way—touch Thou our lives with spirit-hand as we come to Thee in this our morning prayer. Facing the tasks of this new day we pray for wisdom to make wise choices, for strength to stand firm for what is good and just for all, and for courage to walk confidently in the way of Thy commandments.

We do not pray for release from burdens, but for renewed strength to carry them; not for an escape from problems, but for an increased power to meet them and to solve them; not for less work, but for greater faith to do our work without worry.

We pray for all who are working in the cause of justice and peace in our Nation and in our world. May the peace of Thy presence abide in all our hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7546. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired);

H.R. 11253. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; and

H.R. 15510. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1665. An act to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in special jurisdictional cases, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15662. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9424) entitled "An act to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction; to consolidate the authorities relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of the National Wildlife Refuge System; and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, and Mr. DOMINICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Arturo D. Lagasca, Jr.;

S. 2467. An act for the relief of Rosa Agostino;

S. 2513. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez;

S. 2543. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo;

S. 2587. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez;

S. 2754. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdez-Rodriguez;

S. 2757. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat;

S. 2762. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo);

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti);

S. 3016. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez;

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych;

S. 3300. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka);

S. 3353. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates;

S. 3566. An act for the relief of Wen Shi Yu; and

S. 3817. An act to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts.

UP WITH PEOPLE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a very interesting group of people here in our midst today. They are part of Moral Re-Armament. They are young, they are energetic, and they are on a mission that reaches around the world. I am reminded by the Speaker that I cannot tell you just where they are at this moment—but surely you can guess. Let me call to your attention these young people are one of the many groups in America giving a play called "Up With People." They have had two showings already; tonight is the last during this visit to Washington. If you ever want to hear "The Star-Spangled Banner" sung so that it makes you tingle from head to toe, gets you right on your feet—where you belong anyway—you want to go tonight and get your friends to go.

No payment is required. Your payment will be in your spread of their mission, which is really to save the world.

If you could once have the feeling they give you that there is hope for tomorrow's world, you would be fully repaid for your effort in going. Our generation is not going to be here forever. We need this trained, disciplined, fine youth. I commend to you the show tonight at the Statler.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PARADE ARTICLE ON THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the newspaper supplement Parade ran an article by me dealing with the proposed extension of the west front of the Capitol, which, as Members know, I have strongly opposed. I wrote the Parade article 6 weeks ago, and asked the editors at that time to submit any proposed changes in my text to me for approval before publication.

In spite of that request, however, Mr. Speaker, the article which appeared in the Sunday, September 25, issue of Parade had in fact been edited without either my knowledge or approval. One of the changes made was to refer to three members of the Commission for Extension of the Capitol as "three old men."

I have strongly opposed extension of the west front and will continue to oppose it. But I have never made any personal attack on the Speaker of the House or any other Member of Congress, and I would certainly never do so.

Actually, as I wrote the article and submitted it to Parade for publication, I had referred to Speaker McCORMACK and Senator DIRKSEN as "two determined senior Members of Congress."

Mr. Speaker, I regret the action of the editors of Parade in making this alteration in my article without my knowledge or approval, and I apologize sincerely to our beloved and respected Speaker for their action.

TO PROVIDE FOR TRANSFER OF PAINTINGS TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 3353, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there ought to be an explanation of the bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to explain it?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the chairman ought to explain it, and if I have any comments to add, I will do so later.

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill has to do with three paintings that were stolen from the Weimar Museum in Germany in 1922 by two German soldiers. They were brought to this country and acquired in New York by a man from Dayton, Ohio, in 1934. In 1946 his wife tried to ascertain the value of the paintings, and at that they came to the attention of the U.S. Government. The Government stepped in and confiscated the paintings. They did not cost our Government anything at all.

Under this bill they would be transferred back to the West German Government to be held in trust for the proper owners at the proper time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman has explained the bill. Weimar is in the area of Germany under the control of the German Democratic Republic. The paintings are to be transferred to the West German Government which, as I understand the law, would be the rightful owner because we do not recognize the East German Government. They would be held in trust until such time as the West German Government felt it was proper to return them to Weimar.

We have left that indefinite for a purpose. Unless there is a reunification of the Republic, the paintings would not be returned. Some discretion would be left to the West German Government, but they are really the property of the German Government, and the only government we recognize is the West German Government, the rightful owner. They were stolen. They were later confiscated as German property under the Alien Property Act during World War II.

It seems to me that this legislation is fair and equitable, and that it would be right to return this stolen property, which was stolen not in wartime but in peacetime, the paintings being the rightful property of the rightful German Government.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C. App., sec. 39), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of subsections (a) through (d) of this section, the Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer the three paintings vested under Vesting Order Numbered 8107, dated January 28, 1947, to the Federal Republic of Germany, to be held in trust for eventual transfer to the Weimar Museum, Weimar, State of Thuringia, Germany, in accord with the terms of an agreement to be made between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12543) was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 307]

Adair	Ford, William D.	Murray
Albert	Fulton, Tenn.	Nedzi
Anderson, Ill.	Gathings	O'Konski
Andrews, Glenn	Giaimo	Olsen, Mont.
Aspinall	Gilligan	Philbin
Beckworth	Gray	Pirnie
Berry	Greigg	Poage
Boggs	Griffiths	Pool
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Bray	Halleck	Reid, Ill.
Brock	Hansen, Idaho	Reifel
Callaway	Hébert	Reinecke
Carter	Herlong	Resnick
Celler	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Clausen, Don H.	Holland	Robison
Clevenger	Howard	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Irwin	Roncalio
Craley	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
Daddario	Keogh	Scott
Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Shipley
Derwinski	Kluczynski	Skubitz
Dickinson	Kupferman	Stephens
Donohue	Landrum	Sweeney
Dorn	McClory	Teague, Tex.
Duncan, Oreg.	McVicker	Toll
Dyal	Mailliard	Tuten
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Ala.	Van Deerlin
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Vanik
Evans, Colo.	Mathias	Waggonner
Farbstein	Meeds	Walker, Miss.
Farnsley	Michel	White, Idaho
Fascell	Miller	Whitten
Fino	Monagan	Wilson, Charles H.
Fisher	Morrison	Wright
Flynt	Morse	
	Moss	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 325 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LABOR

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the House met at 11 o'clock this morning, some witnesses who were subpenaed last week have come here and have not yet had an opportunity to testify. In order that they may be heard and not compelled to stay overnight at an added expense, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

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

There was no objection.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 15111), with Mr. BROOKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had 3 hours and 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] had 2 hours and 29 minutes remaining.

Before the Committee rose, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] had agreed to limit further general debate to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and the minority.

Accordingly, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it gives me more than the usual pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], who has been one of the finest members of any committee of this House for many years.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. This bill asks the Congress to reiterate its support for the concept of a direct, frontal attack upon the effects of poverty on the young and the old in our society. We have long as a nation tried to deal with the symptoms of poverty by providing numerous welfare programs, dependent allowances, medical services, low-cost housing, and the like. These were measures which principally dealt with the immediate physical needs of the poor, and we have neglected until this program was enacted in 1964 to formulate a comprehensive program which is directed to the individual and his rightful expectations for the future.

If there is any central theme which I find embodied in the Economic Opportunity Act, it is the concept that the poor can be provided with help from the Federal Government which serves to motivate them to help themselves. This is the philosophy of this act, which I believe deserves our fullest support, and which, in the long run, will be the most meaningful type of program to help eradicate the demoralizing effect that poverty has upon the young child, the teenager, and the able-bodied adult who is out of work.

Every program under this act is designed to focus on what can be done to help the individual become a contributing member of his society, and what can be done to make his or her ability to compete in this rough-and-tumble world more equal.

Beginning from the poor child, age 4 and 5, we have given thousands of these youngsters that necessary additional help so that when they are ready to begin in the first grade, they will have had this social, educational and cultural experience to enable them to compete with the child from the average middle class family. This is the Headstart program which has made almost a revolutionary impact on our educational system. I like to label this program as "Operation Catch-up," for that is really all that we are providing these deprived children. If you are thinking of voting against H.R. 15111, I ask you to consider what you are doing to further reduce the ability of these children to rise above the chains of poverty in which their families and very likely generations of their forebears have been entrapped. In this bill, we are asking for your support of the Headstart program, and the $352 million which we have provided is minimal if we are to meet this great challenge and opportunity to change the course of the lives of these innocent young children.

The teenage youngster has a program to stimulate his interest in continuing in school and to demonstrate to him through actual job experiences that an adequate education is absolutely necessary to secure full employment in this highly technological world. A substantial portion of this program which is authorized at $496 million is payment to the youth for actual services rendered to the school in which he is enrolled, or to a public or private agency to whom services of various kinds are rendered. So much of the pressure placed upon a teenager to quit school comes from the demands made upon him in his own home, because of the dire needs of other members of his family and the total lack of adequate financial resources. The ability to earn his keep while going to school is an important answer that we provide thousands of these young people who are upon the critical threshold of their future. What shall it be? Like that of their parents, of desperate need, minimal income, and underemployment? Or shall the youngster have the chance his parents did not have to complete his education, and perhaps even continue on to further pursuits and qualify for a job opportunity that is consistent with his ability and talents?

Even for the dropout, shall his life be an empty vacuum of idleness and little productive contribution? Or shall he be given another chance, with a comprehensive program such as we have organized under the Economic Opportunity Act in our Job Corps centers?

For the adult poor, we have provided funds to continue the adult basic education, legal services, work experience, and small business loans.

The entire emphasis of this war on poverty is upon expanding the poor person's conception of what he can attain in life, and open up the abundant vistas of opportunity that are available in our society for those who are properly educated and trained.

I firmly believe that the success of this program is dependent on keeping it within one agency. Let us not succumb to the argument that existing established bureaucracy can do a better job merely because they have existed longer and because logically these are programs properly under their jurisdiction. The fact is that the old establishment did not come forth with any new vigorous attack upon the root causes and effects of poverty, while this new act has stirred the conscience of America. Let us not return to the quiet tranquility of proven but ineffectual ways and dampen the spirit and hopes of the poor who for the first time see that their future can be improved. This is what the poverty program is all about and I urge that you give your support to this great humanitarian cause.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, as recorded on page 23779 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement which I made was challenged in a colloquy. The statement was:

> In Evansville, Ind., the staffs of denominational schools were augmented by personnel reimbursed by the Federal antipoverty program. In Evansville-Vanderbergh County 183 persons were to receive employment in the schools during the school year and 62 through the summer. Of these, 138 and 21, respectively, were to work in parochial schools.

I stated, when challenged, that this was contained in an article in an Evansville paper of March 14. My footnote was in error. It was instead contained in an article in the Evansville Press of Wednesday, March 10, 1965, entitled "Catholics Get Break in Poverty War." Perhaps it should be said in passing that I have heretofore attempted to avoid pointing an accusing finger at any particular religious group, and had not intended to identify the group in this case. Since the challenge makes it necessary, I underline again the fact that many of the OEO grants have been made to Protestant and Jewish religious organizations.

I shall insert the article in question at this point in the RECORD, having already asked permission to do so:

[From the Evansville Press, Mar. 10, 1965]

CATHOLICS GET BREAK IN POVERTY WAR

(By Mel Runge)

Catholics are taking advantage of the war-on-poverty program to bolster meager administrative staffs at their schools and charities in Evansville.

At least one parochial school official has admitted privately that the anti-poverty law is being viewed as the doorway to a form of federal aid for parochial schools.

This fact was brought to light in a survey conducted to learn what the 16- to 21-year-olds will do who are to be hired under the work-training section of the war-on-poverty program.

The city has requested $415,315.25 from the Labor Department to operate the work-training program for six months. Cost of the program for a year is more than $700,000.

Through this program local government agencies and non-profit social groups may hire potential high school dropouts part time during the school year and nearly full time during summer months. Goal of the program is to keep the youths in school.

The youths' salaries will be paid by the federal government with the local community footing 10 per cent of the costs through services and equipment.

Schools of Evansville-Vanderburgh County—according to the request Mayor Frank McDonald took to Washington three weeks ago—will employ 183 boys and girls during the school year and 62 through the summer.

Of this total, a study shows, Catholic schools will use 138 of the youths during the school year and 21 during the summer.

Father James Deneen, Catholic schools superintendent, said the youths are greatly needed because of the 21 Catholic schools in Vanderburgh County only two have a secretary.

Father Deneen said there is "a tremendous amount" of office work for the youths at the schools. The work is presently either done by volunteers, teachers and typing students or not done at all, he added.

He also noted there are shortages among Catholic school cafeteria personnel and that a great deal of monitoring and cleanup is done by nuns, which "we believe is inefficient use of nuns."

Besides the schools, Catholic Charities will hire 31 boys and girls during the winter and 16 during the summer.

Fourteen of the youths will be employed at the St. Vincent dePaul salvage store to repair small appliances and clothing. Others will be used as recreation aides and office assistants.

The largest single employer will be the city, with 101 winter positions and 389 summer.

Most of these are divided between the Works Board and Park Department. The board plans to use the youths on weed crews and street and highway projects as well as maintenance, clerical and other jobs.

The Park Department will assign 17 boys to caring for flower beds along city boulevards.

The county will employ 16 in the winter and 19 during the summer. These youths will be used by various county agencies.

The auditor's office, for instance, will hire four girls, both winter and summer, to handle the "numerous new jobs the state has assigned us," Deputy Auditor Lewis Volpe said.

"We believe this is the way we can accomplish our new responsibilities at a minimum cost and still follow the policy of giving the youths training in office procedure," he added.

Community council will have 25 youths, most of whom will be assigned to various social agency members of the council, according to Director Carl Martin.

The Recreation Commission will hire 146 during the summer to increase the number of supervisory personnel at city playgrounds and to assist life guards at local swimming pools.

Mesker Zoo will hire six boys during the summer. "I hope one of the six will decide to stay in school to become an animal man," says Zoo Director Frank Thompson.

Thompson said there would be a lot of work for the youths outside, cleaning up and cutting grass. "But I will also train them in basic zoology and wild animal husbandry," he added.

"There is a big shortage of supervisory personnel in the zoo world and I believe that if I can convince one of the youths to study for the field our portion of the program will be a tremendous success," Thompson explained.

The antipoverty law says the youths must not be employed to replace regular personnel. To this the Labor Department has added a rule that the youths must be paid the minimum wage of $1.25 an hour.

The minimum wage rule threatened to hamper the program not only in Evansville, but throughout the county where government units and social groups are not paying some regular workers this amount.

Mrs. Joan Bowers, director of the Mayor's Human Relations Commission, said Evansville will get around the problem with a bookkeeping procedure whereby the youths will be paid $1.25 for only a portion of the hours they work. The remaining working hours will be considered "counseling" time for which the youths will not be paid.

The counsel for the Office of Economic Opportunity has himself stated that about 6 percent of the grants for OEO were made to church groups. In a telecast on CBS on Sunday, March 27, 1966, Stuart Novins reported that 10 percent of our poverty program projects are now in the hands of church or related groups. Included are projects of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Alabama an additional minute.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, by virtue of the testimony of Sargent Shriver and of his chief counsel and of many other witnesses, by virtue of the large number of grants, which I included in the RECORD yesterday in my speech beginning on page 23777, which I refer to the attention of the Members, there is no question but that grants are being made to church organizations and contracts are being made with them. Concern over this fact has been expressed by such publications as the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and many others and by prominent church leaders. The courts in recent years in a series of decisions reflected their interpretation of the first amendment would not leave room for this kind of grant. I must respectfully insist, therefore, that the OEO and the Congress are building a house of cards which will, by a court decision, come tumbling down, if the OEO persists in making grants to and contracts with churches and other religious organizations.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SEWERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a newspaper column published in Washington on Sunday, September 25, written by Evans and Novak, and dealing with politics in the State of Iowa, says that "sewers and bridges, not L.B.J. and the war, are the political fundamentals in Iowa."

The article goes further to say:

Sewers are a major element in President Johnson's calculated plan to make a new art form out of the time-honored political pork barrel. Aided by master political planner Lawrence F. O'Brien, the Postmaster General, Mr. Johnson has worked overtime to instruct the new Democrat Congressman elected 2 years ago on how to "service" their districts. New sewers are a vital ingredient.

In the first place, Postmaster General O'Brien ought to be spending his time improving the abominable mail service instead of disregarding the Hatch Act by sending employees from his Department to work in the campaign of a Democrat congressional candidate. Incidentally, an outraged electorate defeated O'Brien's handpicked candidate despite all the administration favors and disregard of the Hatch Act.

Does anyone really believe—Lyndon Johnson, O'Brien, or anyone else—that Iowans are such dupes and political pawns that they can be bought with sewers that are paid for with their own tax dollars?

And in connection with "L.B.J. and the war," does anyone really believe that Iowans value sewers more than they do the blood of their young men?

Mr. Chairman, I resent this shameful indictment of the intelligence of the citizens of Iowa. Every political candidate in the State, Democrat or Republican, ought to be outraged by this article.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my great pleasure and privilege to yield to one of the most hard working members of the Committee on Education and Labor, and of the Subcommittee on the War on Poverty, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, since I follow our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who is concerned about politics, I cannot help remembering the debate of yesterday in which it was charged that the poverty program was conceived in politics.

Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps it was. Perhaps, if politics is a concern with what happens to people, perhaps, if good politics is an active concern for programs that alleviate the problems of people that they cannot alleviate for themselves, then perhaps the poverty program was conceived in politics, and perhaps that is the highest accolade that can be paid to the poverty program.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at what happened in the last year to this program that, admittedly was conceived in that kind of politics—in a deep concern for people.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the minority and seen in the press that there have been some untoward incidents, there have been some errors in administration and judgment here in Washington, and this was to be expected.

But, Mr. Chairman, what happened in the field—where the action is? Perhaps as many as 15 percent of 30 to 35 million Americans who are afflicted with endemic, structured poverty benefited from these programs.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single one of the programs that has not made itself felt in the communities of America across the face of our land. The real problem is that the programs have worked, have raised hopes and expectations—but were utterly insufficient to the need and the demand. Few of them have met the demand of more than 10 or 15 percent of those who want and need help.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most successful program of them all has been Project Headstart, and here the great problem is that Headstart has only served about 6 percent of 2.25 million children who desperately need this help in order to make a success of their public school careers.

The poverty program has been a smashing success. The American people want it. It fulfills a national need.

Mr. Chairman, naturally the question follows: "Can we afford it?"

Mr. Chairman, is there a Member of this House who would say that with a gross national product for this year in excess of $750 billion our Nation cannot

afford to devote one quarter of 1 percent of this tremendous, dynamic productivity, unprecedented in our history, to the problem of endemic and structured poverty?

Mr. Chairman, is there a single Member in this House who would aver that we cannot afford less than 2 percent of our $100 billion Federal budget in the effort to eliminate poverty in the midst of affluence and plenty?

Is there a Member of this House who would allege that we cannot afford to expend on our poverty war effort over 1 year's time what we spend on our Vietnam war effort each month?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, one might ask, Do we need the poverty program in a time of an enormous affluence and prosperity, in a time when our economy is admittedly heated up, at a time when we have virtually a "war" economy? Will not such an economy provide jobs for all? Will not the forces of burgeoning demand for labor, and limited supply, in and of themselves, solve the unemployment, and hence, the poverty problem?

Mr. Chairman, despite the unprecedented, sustained economic growth and prosperity over the last 4 years, the economic forces of supply and demand are not in themselves providing adequate job opportunities for large numbers of our people.

Yet it is a self-evident principle that the scourge of poverty in great measure reflects who is employed and who is not employed, who is able to earn income from work and who is not, who is able to provide for a family and who is not. Yet when one examines this superheated economy, one would expect that it would create jobs which would be available to all, but the conventional economic wisdom simply has to be cast to the four winds.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the Members what happened in the last year.

In August 1965, overall white unemployment stood at the rate of 4.1 percent, and overall Negro unemployment stood at its traditional level of approximately twice the white rate, or 7.7 percent.

Mr. Chairman, what happened in the last year? White unemployment went down from 4.1 percent to 3.1 percent; while at the same time Negro unemployment in this superheated war economy, went up from 7.7 percent to 8.3 percent, or to about 2⅔ times the white unemployment rate.

Mr. Chairman, 1 year ago white teenage unemployment stood at the rate of about 12 percent, and Negro teenage unemployment stood at the traditional rate of a little less than twice that much, or 22 percent.

What has happened in the last year of unprecedented affluence and labor scarcity in many segments of our economy? White teenage unemployment went down from 12 percent to 10 percent while at the same time Negro teenage unemployment went up from 22 percent to 26 percent, a little over 2½ times white teenage unemployment.

Unemployment for male whites over 21 now stands at the almost historic alltime low of 1.7 percent—what the economists characterize as frictional unemployment—really no unemployment at all—while unemployment for Negro males over 21 stands at the rate of 5.5 percent today, over three times the comparable white unemployment rate.

Never in recent history, never in the last generation has there been such an unfavorable relationship between Negro and white unemployment. The gap is not narrowing, the gap is growing.

Clearly we have still a problem of structured, built-in, inherited unemployment which will pursue us unto the generations unless we devise programs and projects which will lift this group in our society to the mainstream of full participation, full contribution, and final independence and self-sufficiency.

Now more than ever before in our newfound affluence and abundance, we can and must concentrate our resources, our energies and our ingenuity to lift and lead 35 million Americans out of the crippling grip of unrelenting permanent poverty.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, on July 9, 1965, a Los Angeles Times column read:

> Angry adult sponsors of the crash summer teen program, imperiled by the local antipoverty control dispute and resulting Federal fund tie-up, sent a demand for action to poverty chief Sargent Shriver in Washington.

This was a typical news story that could be read in any paper across the country about the war on poverty program.

Similar accounts of confusion and frustration were brought to the attention of the Members last year when the fiscal 1966 authorization bill was before us.

We were told that such dislocations were to be expected in a new program and that they would soon be ironed out.

In the Los Angeles Times of September 20, 1966, just last week, the Los Angeles City Council was reported to have found that of the 125 Headstart sites in the city, all but 4 do not meet Los Angeles municipal building and safety code regulations.

So we have all these children in unsafe buildings that could be damaged by earthquake or by fire and thus endangering the lives of the children we intend to help.

Mr. Chairman, may I say this: The confusion and frustration with the program has not been ironed out.

And it will not be until administrative changes are brought about to relieve the Office of Economic Opportunity of the impossible task it faces in juggling five major programs.

I am here to ask that you give some serious consideration to administrative amendments to be proposed during this debate.

I think none of us realized in 1964, when we enacted the Economic Opportunity Act, just how formidable a task we had taken on.

The Economic Opportunity Act was really experimental.

For the first time a single agency was to take on all the problems of the poor.

The ongoing programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Labor Department, and the Department of Agriculture were bypassed.

It is incredible that we could have expected OEO to perform such miracles.

There were dreams, that a few years of money would do the trick.

We know now how naive we really were.

We should recognize our error and reshape our legislative tools.

Mr. Chairman, human resources are being wasted and tragically wasted by the program in its present form. There is indeed a war within the war on poverty. It must be and can be ended if we have the patience and the wisdom to find the remedy. Poverty crusade, sponsored by my two colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and myself, was carefully drafted to meet the shortcomings of the present program.

The main thrust of our amendments would be to streamline the Office of Economic Opportunity. Certain programs such as adult education and Headstart would be shifted to the Office of Education. That is where they belong. This would mean that the programs remaining with OEO would gain sharper administrative focus.

The fact is that through the fiscal year 1966 $2.3 billion have been spent in the war on poverty. Neither the recipients nor the taxpayers have yet benefited in a manner commensurate with this amount. A single agency cannot possibly be expected to carry out efficiently an array of programs to meet the needs of all the deprived in this country.

Over 25 of OEO's most talented staff members have quit in recent months because of the impossible pressure. Mismanagement, as we all know, has been rampant. Those of us who voted against the Poverty Act in 1964 and 1966 I think to some extent at least have had our votes vindicated.

Let me recount for my colleagues the bewildering experience of the California State Office of Education in its attempt to have the OEO fund our State's very successful adult basic education program.

Some of the information was introduced into the record of the poverty hearings by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. I bring it up again because it has escaped the attention of many of those who must be made to realize that all of the poverty programs are in peril if such irresponsible administration should continue. OEO's stop-and-go approach has caused considerable confusion for States operating basic education programs. States have had difficulty in securing the money which OEO had promised them or pledged to them. Numerous provisions of allocations have caused administrative problems, disappointment, and expendi-

ture of State funds that will not now be reimbursable.

One of the States hardest hit by the OEO confusion has been California. In June 1965, OEO sent a memo to the California State Department of Education, as it did to all States, notifying them of the anticipated State allocation for 1966. According to that memo, California was to receive $1,809,725. Successive notification indicated the following changes:

On June 21, 1965, California was promised, as I said, $1,809,725. On November 9, 1965, this figure was changed to $1,622,008. And again, in January 1966, it was changed to $819,530. The final amount California received was less than half of the original estimate. OEO claimed that they had run short of funds, and this had to take the cuts.

If there were no funds available, where then did OEO come up with the $802,550 that they restored to California on February 25, 1966, after I and other Congressmen, including the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], lodged vociferous protests to OEO over their treatment of the State?

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctly, it was the Office of Education that sent out the original figures the gentleman referred to. I believe the gentleman was in error when he stated the OEO sent out those original figures.

Mr. BELL. It was my understanding that the OEO made the promise and the Office of Education then tried to get it. Then there was some information to the effect that maybe the Bureau of the Budget was involved in this too. But the point is that the OEO is primarily a coordinating agency, and it should coordinate.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BELL. The OEO claimed it was not responsible for the revised 1966 allocations. They charged the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education with that responsibility, as I have just indicated.

Mr. Chairman, the States cannot be expected to operate effectively under these circumstances. Months of planning the serious commitments are required for approval of State programs, not to mention the hours of time spent filling out mountains of forms and reports. Tremendous wastes and bitter frustrations are inevitable when funding promises are not kept. It is in the nature of the Economic Opportunity Act legislation that this would be the case.

Obviously, OEO must fight the war on several fronts. It must attempt to keep everyone happy. The result is when they become overcommitted in one program, another program must suffer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. They have in effect to rob Peter to pay Paul. It is my intention to sponsor an amendment to relocate the adult education program under the Office of Education. It is argued that the Office of Education already carries out the program, so why make a change?

Aimed at upgrading the ability of adults to get better jobs, the amendment would make several changes in the program and authorize the funding through the Commissioner of Education directly. My amendment does little more in substance than the adult education provisions of H.R. 15111, the bill before us.

I might add parenthetically, most of the educators throughout the country have been advocating this for some time now. Perhaps some of the Members have received letters from them urging that this adult education program be transferred out of the OEO to the Commissioner of Education.

The answer is simple and obvious. The Office of Education does now carry out the substance of this program, but the hitch is that the funding must pass through four agencies before it reaches the people who need help: OEO, the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Education, and the State education agencies, which must each consider the funds earmarked for the program.

There is simply no need for OEO in this program. My amendment is identical to the one passed by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee last week in its consideration of the poverty program. The Senate has already passed this change.

Aimed at upgrading the ability of adults to get better jobs, the amendment would make several changes in the present program and authorize the funding through the Commissioner of Education directly. My amendment does little more in substance than the adult education provisions of H.R. 15111, the bill before us. Its primary aim is administrative in nature. OEO would be less burdened with the paperwork and the Office of Education would be free to go ahead on the program.

Similarly, I will offer another amendment to place the Headstart program under the jurisdiction and direction of the Office of Education. Headstart has been hailed by all as the most successful program in the war on poverty. Unfortunately it is in danger of being stifled by the same administrative entanglements that curtailed California's adult education programs last year.

The comprehensive school program in the poverty crusade would substantially expand Headstart as it now exists.

The gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman QUIE, recognized the need for greater emphasis on preschool programs as far back as 1961. We should now see the wisdom in their foresight. The program must be rescued from the depths of bureaucracy.

An Iowa school superintendent, after months of waiting for Headstart funds, declared:

> We're getting to the point where we don't know if it is worth it.

A Michigan school superintendent was similarly frustrated when he was told that the heaps of reports and forms he had filled out for a Headstart program had been misinterpreted. The unfortunate part of the story was that his office was blamed for not filling out the report properly.

These incidents and hundreds more have hampered the program all over the country. The minority report on H.R. 15111 recounts many of the most unfortunate incidents. I hope the Members will take time to review the report from page 91.

America's poor need help. The poverty program as it is now structured can only produce confusion and bitterness.

The amendments I have outlined, along with others included in the poverty crusade, will bring order to an otherwise confused assault on poverty.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement and to point out that the examples the gentleman has given with reference to the frustration in the field of those educators who have been trying to implement the Headstart program are only a couple of examples of the many, many we have documented and referred to in our minority views.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. I also point out that in the opportunity crusade and in the gentleman's amendment specifically directed to Headstart we would double the amount of money available for Headstart and we would put the administration of the Headstart program under one Federal agency, the Office of Education. No longer would the local communities have to go to the OEO and the Office of Education to try to get a mix of funds and find out how much money they could expect from each.

A number of the local people tell us that under the Office of Education there has been a reasonably clear allocation of funds for Headstart. They have known what they could get.

There has been a problem on the local level with the boards of education not directing funds to Headstart as distinct from other programs eligible under the education program. But in the case of the OEO they have had great difficulty finding out whether they could get the funds.

There is some difference between the standards in the two programs, one under the Office of Education and the other under the OEO.

I would emphasize that the program which the gentleman in the well is advocating, administered through the Office of Education, would be through the States, the State educational agencies, to the local community action board. The local community action board would receive the funds from the State education agency and it could contract with private or public schools or private agencies to run the Headstart program.

This would clear the air. We would have one agency in Washington administering the entire Headstart preschool, early school program. It would go

through the State officials, so it would be coordinated with their program. It would go through community action, so that one agency could coordinate on the local level. The contracting could be done with various educational agencies and private agencies which could do the job.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15111 and especially in support of subsection 207(b) of title II of the Antipoverty Act as reported out of committee. This subsection, not included in the administration proposal, authorizes a $12.5 million program for the prevention of narcotic addiction and for noninstitutional rehabilitation of addicts, including training and job placement.

The uncontrolled growth of narcotic addiction in urban slum areas ranks as one of our most serious domestic problems. Far from coincidental, the sharply increasing prevalence of narcotics and the rising crime rate are symptomatic of each other. Every narcotic addict is an incipient criminal. The debilitating effects upon one's personal character and psyche, and the greatest expense of maintaining a habit are well known. All too often the end result is crime.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics has estimated that there are 60,000 active addicts in the United States, over one-half of whom live in the poverty areas of New York City, with the remainder being concentrated in various other urban population centers across the Nation. It is to prevent the self-perpetuation of this festering sore on the body of the Nation's cities, and to rehabilitate those already trapped in the vortex of narcotic self-dissipation, that the committee has set aside $12.5 million of section 207 funds.

Specifically, the programs envisioned will be made available to over 5,000 identifiable addicts and deter countless other patented users in fiscal 1967. Novel in their conception, these "new approach" experimental programs eschew the past futility of hospitalization and imprisonment. Rather, emphasis is placed on noninstitutional correction.

Statistics show that less than 3 percent of all addicts placed in the Federal hospital at Lexington, Ky., remain off drugs after release. It is patently obvious that new programs are required. Community action provides such a program.

Only if an addict is given a reason to quit, a hope for the future, can he then defeat his addiction. Title II provides this motivation in the form of a job, combined with education and training for the years subsequent.

The key to the entire program is coordination: coordination with other aspects of this act and coordination of employment with careful supervision and control to give the addict the support he needs. It is through this comprehensive approach based on new concepts of prevention, treatment, and cure that progress and success can be truly anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, of the total addicts in the United States, more than 50 percent are to be found in the New York City area. The 14th District of New Jersey, I am unhappy to say, has seen an alarming rise in narcotic addiction. I might point out that the district which I have the honor to represent is across the Hudson River from Manhattan. Local law enforcement officials and social workers in Hudson County are alarmed at the rise in narcotic addiction. And let me assure all Members of this House, the problem, while largest in the New York City metropolitan area, has leaped across State lines and is now a national problem which screams for national action.

Various psychiatric studies have revealed that hospitalization and imprisonment are totally inadequate as solutions to the problem of addiction. The committee therefore wants to foster new, noninstitutional approaches to addiction, dealing with it in the environment that breeds addiction. It is the community that produces the environmental factors which go to produce addiction. It is in the community, therefore, that potential addicts must be dissuaded and active addicts cured.

The programs to be developed under this title must focus on providing the user with powerful motivation to overcome the habit, in the form of a job combined with education and training that holds promise for a hopeful future.

This can be achieved by coordination with other programs under this act which offer useful work opportunities and experience.

This emphasis on work orientation would be structured and supervised to give the addict the support he needs to continue at work and away from drugs.

In undertaking to formulate and carry out these programs the committee expects the Director to consult with and rely heavily upon the experts in the U.S. Public Health Service and particularly the National Institute of Mental Health who have spent the last few years seeking more effective ways to approach treatment, rehabilitation, and prevention.

Mr. Chairman, this program seeks, within the modest sum of money allocated to it, to reach a segment of the population which is truly desperate, a group truly poverty stricken in every sense of that term.

The narcotics control program is a good one and one which is worthy of the support of Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 308]

Abbitt	Andrews, Glenn	Berry
Adair	Aspinall	Boggs
Albert	Baring	Bow
Anderson, Ill.		Brock
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Philbin
Callaway	Hanna	Pirnie
Carter	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Casey	Hansen, Iowa	Pool
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Clark	Hébert	Purcell
Clevenger	Herlong	Reifel
Cooley	Holifield	Resnick
Corman	Howard	Rivers, S.C.
Craley	Irwin	Rivers, Alaska
Daddario	Jones, Mo.	Robison
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Roncalio
Dickinson	Kirwan	St Germain
Donohue	Kluczynski	Scott
Dorn	Landrum	Senner
Duncan, Oreg.	Long, La.	Shipley
Dyal	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Edwards, Ala.	McVicker	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, La.	Mailliard	Steed
Ellsworth	Martin, Ala.	Stephens
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Farbstein	Mathias	Teague, Calif.
Farnsley	Meeds	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	Michel	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Miller	Toll
Fogarty	Monagan	Van Deerlin
Fulton, Tenn.	Morrison	Vanik
Giaimo	Morse	Walker, Miss.
Gilligan	Moss	White, Idaho
Gray	Murray	Whitten
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Wilson, Bob
Greigg	O'Konski	Wright
Griffiths	Olsen, Mont.	
Hagan, Ga.	O'Neill, Mass.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman (pro tempore) 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. 15111 and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called when 313 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROOKS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to spend a little time speaking about the operation of the so-called poverty war for the last 2 years. When this program was first initiated a great deal of time was spent on an attempt to define who the poor really were, and the figure of $3,000 income for a family of four became the benchmark. Michael Harrington wrote his book "The Other American," which really captured the imagination of the American people. They felt guilty over the fact that one-fifth of the Americans were poverty stricken. Since that time either there has been no evaluation of that criteria or else the studies have not been made available to the Members of Congress. Two years after the program's inception we should have complete and thorough information on who is poor.

Mr. Chairman, we have the figures on the ages of the one-fifth of the American people who are "poverty poor." But we do not know what made them poor, what keeps them poor, based upon the kind of thorough study one would expect at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a study going on now at the University of Wisconsin—and there may have been others which may have been in-house studies at the OEO, but they

evidently—if this has been done—kept it to themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would expect that when proponents of this bill come before you and ask for a continuation of this program and an expansion of it with an authorization of $1.75 billion, they should tell you more specifically who is poor, so that a more effective piece of legislation could be developed in order that we may eliminate poverty.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there has really been no effective evaluation of the manpower used in OEO; that is, the professionals who are highly paid, who are so much better paid on their poverty job than they were previous to their employment in OEO.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no evaluation of the programs themselves, and the effect which they had upon poor people.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned yesterday in a quote from Sar Levitan, we hear words bandied about by Mr. Shriver, and others in OEO that the program has affected so many people, but so far no one has been pointed out and identified one person who is no longer in poverty because of this poverty program.

Mr. Chairman, we have all seen statistics cited that there are fewer people in poverty today than there were 2 years ago, and we all know that the economy has changed a great deal. Now there is a crying need for people to fill the jobs which are available. There is no reason for a person to be jobless if he or she has any marketable skills. This country could greatly reduce poverty through private enterprise, and private enterprise ought to be encouraged in every way possible since only through private enterprise and not Government will poverty be eliminated.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 309]

Abbitt	Downing	Irwin
Adair	Duncan, Oreg.	Jones, Mo.
Albert	Dyal	Keogh
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.	King, N.Y.
Andrews, Glenn	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
	Evins, Tenn.	Landrum
Aspinall	Farbstein	Leggett
Berry	Farnsley	Long, La.
Boggs	Findley	McClory
Bow	Fisher	McCulloch
Brock	Flynt	McVicker
Callaway	Fulton, Tenn.	Mailliard
Carter	Gathings	Martin, Ala.
Casey	Giaimo	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Gilligan	Mathias
Clevenger	Gray	Meeds
Conyers	Greigg	Michel
Cooley	Griffiths	Miller
Craley	Hagan, Ga.	Monagan
Daddario	Halleck	Morrison
Davis, Ga.	Hanna	Morse
de la Garza	Hansen, Idaho	Moss
Derwinski	Hansen, Iowa	Murray
Dickinson	Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi
Diggs	Hébert	O'Brien
Dingell	Herlong	O'Konski
Donohue	Holifield	Olsen, Mont.
Dorn	Howard	Philbin
Pirnie	Roncalio	Vanik
Poage	St Germain	Vivian
Pool	Scott	Walker, Miss.
Powell	Stephens	White, Idaho
Reifel	Sweeney	Whitten
Resnick	Teague, Tex.	Willis
Rivers, S.C.	Toll	Wright
Robison	Tupper	
Rogers, Tex.	Van Deerlin	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111) and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called when 321 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], who has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I notice again that many of the proponents of this legislation have been using the old excuse that this program is too new to tell what ought to be done and that we ought to wait. There is nothing that is absolutely new in this program that has not been tried by someone before, either by the Federal Government or some private group, but you would think it was all new and that everything was going well according to all of the releases and propaganda that OEO puts out. What I said was we need reliable information which we can depend on. I hope before any similar legislation comes before this House again such information will be in our hands before we begin working on this legislation. As I said yesterday, the hearings were completely devoid of expert witnesses that one would expect to hear from. They just did not appear before our committee and were not asked. When we go into the House again I will ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the article I quoted yesterday by Mr. Sari Levitan entitled "What Is Happening, Baby; Essential Research for the War on Poverty," may be placed at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEED FOR OBJECTIVE REPORTING AND EVALUATION

Unsupported claims of achievements and exaggerated official promises for the federal war on poverty regrettably have serious repercussions. Unfulfilled promises create frustration and disappointment among those who hope to benefit. Opponents have been quick to publicize unrealistic claims as evidence of the program's shortcomings.

Despite the deluge of inflated claims and the concerted attacks of the detractors, the war on poverty has actually enjoyed remarkable sustained public support—as evidenced by diverse public opinion polls covering the population at large and more sophisticated segments. According to an opinion survey conducted by the Chase Manhattan Bank last April, 9 of every 10 academic economists, my favorite group, supported the idea of a federal effort, and a majority approved the direction the program had taken. Although business economists, understandably, showed greater reserve, 76 percent supported the concept of an antipoverty war and 44 percent approved its operations.

If public support of the program is to be sustained, more reliable information than exists at present is urgently needed about the operations of the several measures comprising the antipoverty package. Such information would allow the public and Congress to rally behind programs that prove themselves and to drop activities that do not pass muster. It is not likely that the information necessary for evaluation will be forthcoming from government—either from Congress, the Office of Economic Opportunity, or other executive agencies.

Congressional hearings frequently illuminate program operations, partly through testimony by advocates and opponents, but more significantly through testimony of expert witnesses. With hardly any exceptions, the annual hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act have been devoid of the latter. Testimony before the appropriate Congressional Committees on EOA has been restricted almost exclusively to governmental witnesses and a few ideological supporters or opponents. As a result, the hearings in 1965 and 1966 offer very little meaningful information concerning program activities. To supplement the information obtained at the formal hearings, the House last year appropriated funds to the Committee on Education and Labor (the Committee responsible for the legislation) to investigate and study the anti-poverty program. The results of this investigation have never been revealed to the public and apparently not even to the members of the Committee.

Open critical appraisal of program operations is also not forthcoming from the executive agencies. These agencies necessarily advocate ongoing programs. Until a decision is made to scuttle—a rare occurrence—or modify a program, shortcomings revealed by internal research are normally classified as "administratively restricted," which means that the documents are not made available either to Congress or to the public. An expanding practice fraught with danger is the government contracting with private consulting firms and academic institutions for the survey and evaluation of public programs. The products of the outside experts become the property of the contracting agency and are frequently not published.

OEO RESEARCH

No adverse reflection is intended on the competence of the Office of Economic Opportunity research staff and the high quality of its work. The research staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity, first headed by Dr. Joseph A. Kershaw and now by Dr. Robert A. Levine, has taken the lead among federal agencies in the application of systems analysis techniques to welfare efforts. Drawing on the vast supply of pertinent statistics, the Office of Research, Plans, Programs and Evaluation in OEO has classified and quantified the various sub-universes of the poverty population, analyzed the applicability of existing welfare programs to these groups, and prepared complementary and alternative plans for combatting poverty.

Thus far, the product of the OEO research staff remains largely in the files of the "Poverty House," the name by which the headquarters of OEO is known, though some of it has been transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget. All that we know about this significant work is based on sketchy newspaper reports, the result of some "leaks," inadvertent or perhaps contrived. And it is very doubtful that the product of OEO research and conclusions will ever become public property, unless the recommendations are adopted as official government policy, not a likely event. Neither Congress nor the public, therefore, may ever have an opportunity to assess knowledgeably the merits of the proposed multibillion dollar programs.

Planning-programing-budgeting system

Better public understanding of government programs should result from the emphasis placed upon the new Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS). Closely related to the systems analysis approach, PPBS requires program planners not only to estimate budgetary costs but also to analyze their effectiveness, to examine alternative approaches, and to compare expected benefits in relation to anticipated cost.

A significant element in this approach, pioneered in the federal establishment by the Defense Department, is to plan program budgets over a longer period than the customary one year interval. Congress has steadfastly insisted that appropriations for federal programs normally be limited to one year. Accordingly, executive agencies have budgeted their programs for the same period. In practice, federal administrators have even a shorter lead time to implement proposed activities since Congress rarely makes the necessary funds available before a new fiscal year starts. Shriver and his associates still do not know today the amount of money they can commit or spend during the current fiscal year which started on July first. This fact has led to considerable confusion in administering programs; and it has proved a serious constraint on efficient administration since appropriated funds must be committed, if not spent, within the year for which appropriated. A scramble is experienced at the end of each fiscal year, a rush to commit all appropriated funds lest some be lost to the program.

There is no guarantee that advance planning over several years by executive agencies will deter Congress from insisting that the nation's federal business be run on a year-to-year basis. But the hope is that advance planning by executive agencies will prompt Congress too to make efforts to run the government on a more businesslike basis. This assumes, of course, that executive agencies will learn to plan their programs on a more sophisticated basis than previously and that they will develop techniques which would convince Congress of the desirability to adopt the aspects of PPBS applicable to its own work.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

The basic objective of PPBS is to get the optimum return for the buck. Cost effectiveness measurement, a major component of rational program planning, seeks to determine the cheapest way to accomplish defined goals or to get the maximum advantage from a stated expenditure. As applied to the Economic Opportunity Act, the approach might be used to provide answers as to the most economic means to motivate and train disadvantaged youth, to equip them with job skills salable in the open market. Since comparable data are available on the costs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, and related programs, the determination of the cost effectiveness of the youth employment and training programs would, at first, appear a matter of simple calculation. One might too hastily conclude that the Job Corps is a more expensive program than the Neighborhood Youth Corps, for it costs about five times as much to maintain a youth in the Job Corps than to provide him with employment under the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The products of the two youth programs, however, are not necessarily interchangeable. To motivate and train certain youths it may be necessary to remove them from their environment, as the Job Corps does, and to provide them with continuing care and supervision. If that is the case, then the Job Corps, though much more expensive, may be the only way to help some disadvantaged youths.

Determination of cost effectiveness may also raise questions about the composition and direction of specific efforts. Thus far, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has concentrated upon providing employment and income to disadvantaged youths and the nature of the work is too often of dubious quality, reminiscent of old-fashioned work relief. The theory presumably is that as the youths mature they will get accustomed to the world of work and will shift for themselves. Available statistics indicate that as the youths mature their level of unemployment declines. But some critics have advocated the need for "enriching" the Neighborhood Youth Corps program by providing enrollees not only jobs but also basic education and more meaningful training. In view of the limited resources available to the administrators of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, enrichment would necessarily reduce the number of enrollees. A question that must be answered, therefore, is whether the effectiveness of the program for society would be raised by limitation of enrollees but with more intensive preparation for the world of work.

The above illustrations suggest that the quantifying of expected output can be elusive since it involves qualitative elements and that the pursuit of standards of quality seriously affects cost.

If a cost effectiveness analysis does come up with persuasive evidence that an alternative to an existing program is preferable, would the responsible officials be able to admit failure of their past efforts? Past experience has shown that this flexibility is indeed a rare occurrence. Despite the questionable value of some of the anti-poverty programs inaugurated in the last two years, none have been discontinued. Each program has attracted advocates within the federal establishment and a clientele outside of the government, and administrators find it most difficult to drop a program once initiated. And even if internal obstacles to changes within the executive establishment could be overcome, approval of changes in established programs or the substitution of alternatives still requires Congressional approval. Each program has its Congressional sponsors and supporters who may present insurmountable impediments to change.

The cost-benefit precedent

While great hopes are expected for cost effectiveness, it might be useful to recall the lessons of cost-benefit analysis, which has been practiced by the government in the field of public works for three decades. It might appear comparatively easy to add up the total costs of a public works project, but even if the reckoning is "clean," the decision whether a given project should be undertaken still involves value judgments and guesswork. In addition, there are old-fashioned political considerations which cannot be ignored. It is a relatively simple task to determine the costs of labor and materials to be expended on a project. But in calculating social costs it makes a considerable difference whether the resources utilized in the project would have been employed elsewhere in the absence of the project. Thus, it may be argued that the employment of idle labor should not be included as part of the cost of a project—at least not all of the labor cost, since idle workers may be collecting unemployment insurance or relief payments in the absence of work provided by the public works. Experts also disagree about the interest rate which should be applied to discount future benefits. The contingent and remote benefits from the project are even more difficult to calculate, and the estimates require arbitrary assumptions and projections. In the final analysis, it may be impossible to assign the dollar value benefits accrued to the various classes of consumers from a project and also to calculate losses to others, now and later. The current debate about constructing a dam in the Grand Canyon offers an excellent illustration. What cost is to be assigned to marring one of the outstanding tourist attractions in the United States as against the benefits resulting from adding a water resource?

In more recent years the government has also sponsored cost-benefit analyses in the field of manpower training programs. These studies have generally indicated an excess of benefits over costs. The conclusions may be valid, but they are based only upon certain explicit costs. In the field of training, as well as related activities, where training resources—counselors, testers, instructors—are scarce, a realistic cost-benefit analysis should include the impact of the newer programs upon the price and utilization of the scarce resources and their impact on education and other activities competing for the same manpower. A new training course may, for example, deprive the public employment service or the school system of part of the limited supply of counselors. A true cost-benefit analysis would have to consider the negative impact upon the latter institutions resulting from the expansion of demand for a limited supply of needed technicians. There is no easy way to measure this type of cost, especially if it is ignored! The studies which have concluded that the benefits of governmental training programs exceed costs may be useful to sell to Congress and the public the desirability of funding these programs. It can hardly be claimed, however, that the studies supply definitive answers to the questions they purport to research.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

We are therefore forced to the uncomfortable, but nevertheless realistic, conclusion that PPBS and related approaches are not going to provide a complete blueprint for rational public policy and, in most cases, the results of analysis will not be made available to the public for independent appraisal. Political considerations remain potent: they are likely not only to determine the outcome of controversial undertakings, but also to prevent public airing of the questions raised by the analysis.

There is, however, an urgent need in a free society for the public and Congress to be better informed than they now are about the operations of publicly funded programs. At the very minimum, the public is entitled to frank discussions and interpretations of program operations prepared by detached experts without vested interests. The needed interpretation and evaluation of public programs can be supplied by the academic community and related private institutions, provided government agencies reveal needed information. Evaluation is particularly important in the case of the Economic Opportunity Act and related anti-poverty programs. The momentum created in favor of these programs by the inauguration of the Great Society is diminishing, partly against the background of our expanding military involvement in Southeast Asia. Greater public awareness about the achievements of successful programs will provide the necessary support for continuing and expanding effective anti-poverty efforts and for dropping those which are of questionable value.

Congress acknowledged the inadequacy of public information concerning governmental operations by passing the "Freedom of Information" Act of 1966, which curbs the power of executive agencies to withhold information about their activities. The new legislation, according to President Johnson, will no longer allow government officials "to pull curtains of secrecy around decisions which can be revealed without injury to the public."

Thus, impediments to the study and evaluation of government programs by inde-

pendent researchers, if they have existed at all, in principle no longer apply. The neglect of meaningful academic research of government programs has not been due to the inaccessibility of information. The reasons for the neglect must be found elsewhere. A prime reason, in my opinion, is that institutional study has fallen into disrepute, at least in the field of economics. The emphasis in recent years on quantitative analysis has often led economists to build models without vital organs, to use Professor Jacob Viner's bon mot. Preoccupation with quantitative techniques, devoid of substantive issues, precludes controversy, attracts funds under the guise of objective scientific analysis, and is convenient for an age of consensus. Descriptive reporting, analysis and interpretation of institutional operations can lead to controversial conclusions and offer few brownie points to the aspiring academician seeking status in his profession.

Another serious impediment to the study of ongoing government programs is the trend toward greater government support of academic research. This support has been available for some years in the physical sciences and is becoming increasingly the source of funds for research in the social sciences. Government support of social science research provides no special incentive for critical evaluations of a sponsor's ongoing work, if publication of the results is also comtemplated. Universities with faculties engaged in critical evaluation of government programs may find that federal spigots eventually run dry. Academic communities dependent upon government largess for support of faculties often enjoy greater prestige and acquire greater material rewards by working on grants than by teaching students. Expanding government support of research has its insidious aspects.

If the academic community is to discharge its responsibilities to the public and attempt to evaluate the ongoing proliferating government programs, researchers must not be burdened by risk of retribution, subtle or direct. As long as the rewards are found elsewhere, an adequate number of researchers will not be interested in evaluating controversial government programs. Unless universities and foundations assume a more active role than they have in the past, in encouraging the needed research, the vital job will be left undone. The major responsibility rests with university faculties which possess the expertise to do the work.

In any event, the product of the research must be freely available and the researcher must be independent of thought controls. Whether university administrators will live up to the challenge of recognizing the value of such research remains to be seen. The need for the research is indisputable.

A question was asked by our colleague from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], can we afford the poverty program? I heard from other speakers on the majority side yesterday talking about the deplorable state of poverty in this country. No one is saying that poverty does not exist and that we ought not to do something about it, but those of us on the minority side have said that this is too expensive a program for the good it is doing. It has not been doing the kind of work for the poor that ought to be done. High paid professionals are doing well, however. If the releases which were emanating from OEO were actually true and it was actually reaching the poor with an effective program such as they claim it is, then we would now be saying we were wrong in our criticism of it last year and 2 years ago, and we would be supporting it wholeheartedly. However, that has not been the case. There is evidence that we have laid out in the minority views and there is substantial evidence that would have been too voluminous to make a part of the RECORD which indicates all over the country there are glaring mistakes and the program is not reaching the poor.

Mr. Chairman, we have pointed out a number of times the fact that the source of the malfunctioning is here in Washington of the national office of OEO.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I brought up the fact and pointed out the fact about the large number of consultants that were being employed by OEO. And, previously, we have revealed personnel figures and practices and the salaries in the Office of Economic Opportunity which indicate that OEO has produced more bureaucratic wealth than any comparable agency.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate last year the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will recall, a list of all these consultants was placed in the RECORD at that time.

Recently we examined again the OEO consultant list, and this examination has raised serious questions about the personnel practices of that agency.

Mr. Chairman, the Civil Service Commission advises that there are 112 vacancies at OEO, in grades GS–15 to GS–18. Coincidentally, as of July 1, 1966, there were approximately 200 consultants on the payroll, and the majority were in the $60 to $100 a day bracket. A number of these consultants have played prominent roles as full-time, top-level functionaries since the administration's antipovery program was launched in October 1964.

Mr. Chairman, many of these consultants have remained for the entire time. I listed two of them who have been with the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Edgar Cahn, the special assistant to the Director, and Lewis Eigen, an Associate Director of the Job Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the answer to the obvious question, "Why does OEO maintain full-time consultants rather than filling existing jobs and vacancies," I find may be one or more of the following reasons:

First, they are being paid at a higher level than permitted by civil service standards; or second, it could be that the individuals are being hired at a consultant rate which is higher than their qualifications or credentials justify; or third, Sargent Shriver cannot make up his mind as to what personnel to retain.

Mr. Chairman, when one realizes that OEO has more personnel in supergrades than the Office of Education, which is budgeted for twice OEO is, it is no small wonder that OEO tries to hide high-salaried people. The law and civil service regulations clearly provide that OEO consultants cannot be used, when jobs call for full-time, continuing employment. Perhaps OEO officials can produce a technicality by which to defend themselves, but it is a fact that they are evading the clear intent of the law, and the abuse is clear and flagrant.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned the fact that OEO has more personnel in supergrades than the Office of Education.

The Office of Education is budgeted for about $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1967, compared to the $1.75 billion for OEO. However, OEO is budgeted for 6,484 employees. The Office of Education is budgeted for 2,861 permanent employees, and OEO has 6,484 budgeted permanent employees. However, more importantly, referring to the supergrades and the high-level salaries, at the grade of GS–15, OEO has 249 budgeted as compared to the Office of Education, at 125.

At GS–16, OEO has 25, where the Office of Education has 33.

At GS–17, OEO has 17, and the Office of Education has 10.

And, at GS–18 there are 13 in OEO as compared to the number in the Office of Education, 3.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for furnishing this more detailed information.

Mr. Chairman, I have furnished to the Civil Service Commission a detailed list of OEO consultants and have asked for a full report on OEO consultant hiring practices. I shall further ask permission, when we are back in the House, to place my letter into the RECORD at this point:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: During the past two years, Members of Congress have been aware that the Office of Economic Opportunity uses a large number of consultants in its operation, especially at headquarters in Washington, D.C. I have recently been advised that OEO has 112 vacancies in authorized or budgeted slots in grades GS 15–18. These circumstances give rise to the presumption that OEO is filling authorized billets with consultants. This practice, I feel, has a demoralizing effect on career specialists and is in the whole contrary to the intent of Congress and the spirit of the Civil Service system.

I am aware that the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes the OEO to hire consultants for intermittent use. Further, I recognize the need of OEO for special kinds of advisors and counsel at times and in connection with special problems. However, where OEO utilizes the services of individuals on a full-time, continuing basis over an extended period, the agency is remiss, I feel, in not hiring these people at GS levels commensurate with their qualifications and ability.

Enclosed is a list of consultants retained by the OEO as of July 1, 1966. Where available, the date they were first retained by OEO is indicated.

It will be appreciated if you will cause a check to be made of the consultants' services with OEO in order to determine the number of days these individuals have served. It is interesting to note that the top 52 are listed by the OEO as "Full Time Consultants."

A full report regarding the status of consultants at OEO, including a ruling of the Commission if possible, will be most appreciated by the Congress.

With every best wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

(Enclosure.)

OEO consultants as of July 1, 1966

Name	Rate	Entered on duty
Allen, Thomas B	$50	
Baker, Robert N	60	Dec. 10, 1964
Barberis, Sister Francetta	75	
Bergman, Elihu	80	
Bergthold, Gary	45	
Bremond, Walter	40	
Cahn, Edgar	70	Oct. 26, 1964
Carson, Lester M	40	
Clark, Bayard S	60	
Cotton, Avery L	75	
Devlin, John R	50	Do.
Eigen, Lewis	85	Do.
Ferlo, Virbil J	45	Dec. 10, 1964
Friedman, Harvey G	35	
Gottlieb, David	85	Oct. 26, 1964
Guskin, Al	60	Do.
Hall, C. Mitchell	75	Jan. 18, 1965
Harvey, Lenore, M	75	
Johnson, James E	60	May 5, 1965
Johnson, Earl	80	
Johnston, Robert W	35	Mar. 19, 1965
Judson, Allen H	30	
Lippeatt, Selma	70	
Lubin, Shulamith	50	
Matsumoto, Franklin	100	
McConnell, William A	50	Jan. 4, 1965
McCormack, Richard E	75	
Michaelis, Diana T	50	
Michaels, Anne M	50	May 3, 1965
Moscovitch, Edward H	40	
Noble, Lindsley H	100	
Oppenheimer, Joan Ann	45	
Parsons, Arch	65	May 24, 1965
Peck, Marshall	65	
Reardon, John L	60	
Reilly, James B	60	
Rozendaal, Catherine D	60	
Sarason, Irwin	80	
Seward, William R	50	
Smith, James D	55	
Smith, Robert	60	
Smith, Waldo	55	
Spielman, Lester	70	
Steitz, Phillip	85	
Thomas, Ross	60	
Virden, John M	50	
Weeks, Paul R	65	
Westgate, Robert D	50	
Wheeler, William	45	
Womack, Joseph D	50	
Young, Robert	90	
Zagorin, Ruth K	40	Oct. 26, 1964
Arens, Shirley M	50	
Atkinson, Gordon	70	
Batt, William L	100	
Biddle, Eric	50	
Block, A. Harvey	90	
Blumfield, Coleman	50	
Borom, Roy	45	
Bouck, Aubrey J	75	
Brain, George B	100	
Brandl, John E	60	
Bronfenbrenner, Urie	100	
Brown, Howard J	100	
Brueckner, William H	75	
Bullock, Donald	45	
Carper, James W	80	
Casson, A. Mort	70	
Chandler, Cleveland A	60	
Clark, Leroy D	50	
Clark, Mamie P	100	
Clarke, Eunice A	100	Apr. 12, 1965
Cohen, Martin	100	Apr. 5, 1965
Coleman, Morton	60	
Cooke, Robert E	100	Mar. 28, 1965
Crump, E. Perry	100	
Davens, Edward	100	
Donovan, Ronald	50	Dec. 28, 1964
Donvito, Pasqual A	60	Feb. 9, 1965
Drachman, Robert H	60	
Edelman, John W	50	
Edwards, Paul	50	
Egan, Robert J	45	Mar. 9, 1965
Erickson, Marlowe	45	
Evans, Lester J	100	
Fisher, Bernard C	75	
Fleming, Edward S	100	
Fomon, Samuel J	100	
Foster, George J	50	
Frankel, Hyman H	95	
Friedberg, Judith, E	70	
Frost, Richard T	100	
Galiber, J. L	55	
Garber, Ralph	50	
Georges, Thomas W	100	Apr. 2, 1965
Ginsberg, Mitchell I	85	Apr. 25, 1965
Glatt, Milton S	80	
Goldberg, J. R	100	Mar. 12, 1965
Gordon, Edmund W	100	
Grennan, Sister Jacqueline	100	
Grimsley, Arthur E	70	
Grin, S. Spencer	80	
Guthrie, Harold W	70	
Hague, Howard R	75	
Halberstam, Michael J	100	
Happe, Donald L	45	
Harvey, Ruth L	60	
Hartman, Chester W	50	

OEO consultants as of July 1, 1966—Con.

Name	Rate	Entered on duty
Hathaway, Paul R	$40	Mar. 12, 1965
Hauck, Arthur A	60	
Herring, Frederick J	70	
Himmele, Irvin H	60	
Horner, Vivian M	45	
Hoshino, George	60	
Hymes, James L	90	
Irby, Alice J	60	
Jager, Oscar	70	Jan. 11, 1965
Johnson, Cernoria	75	
Katz, Charlotte S	45	
Kauffman, Joseph F	90	Jan. 4, 1965
Keyser, Stephaney J	45	Apr. 12, 1965
Kneedler, Mary K	100	
Koch, William H	75	
Kostopulos, Nichols P	70	
Kostick, Abraham	60	
Kroslov, Joseph	70	
Krohn, Kenneth B	60	
Lazar, Irving	85	
Liebowitz, Herbert	80	
Lind, Roger M	75	
Lorber, Max J	50	
Lourie, Norman V	75	
Lourie, Reginald	100	
Marchegiano, Rocco R	70	
Markle, Susan R	60	
Martin, John H	100	
McAndrew, Gordon L	75	Jan. 25, 1965
McCollum, John W	90	May 3, 1965
McConnell, Beatrice	50	Feb. 5, 1965
McConnell, Beverly	50	Mar. 22, 1965
McKay, Martha	50	Feb. 23, 1965
McKinley, Francis	50	Feb. 1, 1965
Minsky, Hyman P	80	
Mogey, John	80	
Mooney, Joseph D	50	
Murphy, John G	60	
Nadworny, Milton J	80	
Niebuhr, Herman	70	
Niemeyer, John H	90	
Oaks, Dallin H	80	
Oates, Wallace E	50	
O'Rielly, W. M	80	
O'Rourke, E. W	50	
Osborn, Donald K	80	
Porter, Douglas	65	Oct. 26, 1964
Prentice, Edward S	100	Apr. 26, 1965
Randolph, Robert	75	
Reader, G	100	Apr. 1, 1965
Rein, Martin	60	Feb. 15, 1965
Remsberg, Charles A	60	
Rendon, Gabino	45	Mar. 15, 1965
Richmond, Julius	100	
Ridder, M. W	55	
Ritz, Philip M	100	
Roth, F. L	50	
Runner, D. L	45	
Sasaki, Tom	60	
Scheirbeck, Helen M	40	Dec. 7, 1964
Schleim, Paul	100	
Schmidt, Fred H	75	
Schraeger, Philip	50	
Shelden, Miriam A	75	May 27, 1965
Sherwood, John T	40	
Smily, M. B	70	
Smith, Clodus	70	
Soldwedel, B. J	70	
Spencer, Esther	80	
Stellwagon, Walter R	80	
Stern, Alfred L	60	
Stevens, Austin	50	
Stone, L. Joseph	100	Apr. 26, 1965
Svenson, E. V	80	Feb. 23, 1965
Temple, S. E	45	
Thoburn, N. L	70	
Troudy, Chester	80	
Trussel, Ray E	100	
Vigilante, Joseph L	60	
Wagner, Nathaniel	80	
Waller, Fletcher	100	
Walsh, Ira	75	
Weaver, Ella H	70	Apr. 15, 1965
Wegman, Myron E	100	Mar. 8, 1965
Wilkins, William D	75	
Wing, Merrick S	50	
Wishik, Samuel	100	
Wolff, Harold	70	
Zeckhauser, Robert A	50	

I have also requested the General Accounting Office to investigate the matter, and I shall place the letter which I have written to them in the RECORD at this point when we are again back in the House.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1966.

Mr. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: The widespread use of consultants by the Office of Economic Opportunity has been of concern to some members of Congress. Questions have been raised regarding this practice, especially when OEO is operating with 112 vacancies in grade levels GS 15–18.

I am aware that the Economic Opportunity Act authorizes the OEO to hire consultants for intermittent use. Further, I recognize the need of OEO for special kinds of advisors and counsel at times and in connection with special problems. However, where OEO utilizes the services of individuals on a full-time, continuing basis over an extended period, the agency is remiss, I feel, in not hiring these people at GS levels commensurate with their qualifications and ability.

Enclosed is a list of consultants retained by the OEO as of July 1, 1966. Where available, the date they were first retained by OEO is indicated.

It will be appreciated if you will have a check made of the consultants listed in order to determine their titles, rates of pay, length of service, and number of days served. It is interesting to note that the top 52 are listed by the OEO as "Full Time Consultants."

With every best wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years have produced a series of mismanagement incidents in OEO. No Federal agency has had more management difficulties than OEO. No agency has had such hasty personnel turnover as OEO. No agency has abused its privileges in the use of highly paid consultants than has OEO.

The excuse that the program is new can no longer be used.

We can correct much that is wrong by adopting the Republican substitute entitled "The Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966." This would transfer most all of the programs run by OEO to existing agencies. All the educational matters to the Office of Education. All training to the Department of Labor. Small business would be handled by the Small Business Administration. The Farmers Home Administration would handle the loans to the poor farmers. The HEW would handle title V, the work program for those on relief. All that would be left of OEO would be the community action program of VISTA. I think the time is not far from us when the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Agriculture will be able to handle those parts and it will not be necessary for us to continue OEO as it is at present.

But if it is faulty management in OEO, the finger must be pointed to the Director. If these faults have not been straightened out, the Director must be called to act.

So I think the first order of business to meet the faltering war on poverty and to get on the road to victory would be to replace the Director, Sargent Shriver.

There have been attempts made to give some help to him—when the White House sent Mr. Boutin down there to be his assistant. When he could not do effective work he was removed over to the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Hardin is down there, after reportedly directing the special White House investigation for OEO himself, and is now placed in OEO to implement some of the recommendations that the investigation made. But we see the

signs again of growing disfavor in the eyes of the Director, Mr. Shriver. The only way this can be straightened out is when a man like Mr. Boutin, or if he fails, and a man like Mr. Hardin, would be able to have complete authority and straighten it out.

This is really the basic reason we are in difficulty in the management of the program from Washington. You go out in the field and talk to people out there, invariably they say the fault lies in Washington, in the administrative redtape such as we have never seen in other agencies of the Government.

Our school systems have been dealing with the Office of Education for some time and they have some new programs under which they operate. They criticize title I of the act because of the redtape and some of the difficulties, but none of them are insurmountable and there are moves which will eliminate that. But we see no moves that will eliminate the redtape and confusion that we have seen in the Office of Economic Opportunity. Let us instead get these programs functioning where they will do a better job under the existing agency.

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

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

Mr. BELL. Is it not true that part of the reason also is the fact that the poverty act to some extent is a new experiment in that it bypasses many existing agencies and superimposes on them a new jurisdiction. Is that true?

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Let me discuss the Job Corps, one of the most controversial parts of the whole program. Potentially the Job Corps is a good program because it will help those individuals who need a change of environment and need this type of surroundings in order that they can learn a marketable skill, learn work experience and achieve some basic education that will enable them to fit into the technological age.

But the failure we have seen in the Job Corps comes from the excessive costs, the profiteering, and permissive disciplinary policies.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Did I understand the gentleman in the well to just use the word "profiteering" as meaning deficiencies in the operation of the Job Corps?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from Michigan understood correctly.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Does the gentleman in the well wish to be specific about this? I assume when you talk about profiteering, you are talking about some private company or corporation contracting with the Government for the opertion of a Job Corps camp; is that right?

Mr. QUIE. I intend to be specific, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Would the gentleman care to be specific and name the people he believes are engaged in profiteering in their dealings with the Federal Government?

Mr. QUIE. Yes; I will be doing this and have done so already in public memos. I am just about to go into that.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I have read the press releases but now we are talking for the benefit of the Members of Congress and you made what seemed to me a rather strong charge. I wonder if the gentleman in the well would name specifically which corporations dealing with the Federal Government he believes to have engaged in profiteering?

It is your word, not mine, sir. It is your word and not mine.

Mr. QUIE. I plan to be specific. I am going to move into that now.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Do you intend to name the companies you are accusing of profiteering?

Mr. QUIE. I plan to.

The reasons that costs have so far exceeded estimates is a combination of high property rentals, excessive salaries, and underestimated site rehabilitation costs. There has been poor judgment, at best, on the leasing arrangements. The recent disclosure that we have made about Consolidated American Services, made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] in a memo yesterday, on a contract for the Job Corps site feasibility surveys, raises serious doubts about the happenstance selection of the sites which have later been found to be excessively expensive.

I will point to our Poverty Memo No. 36, which was the one I referred to made by the gentleman from New York.

I mentioned yesterday, as the gentleman from Michigan did, the Kanawha Hotel. Here we see what I believe is excessive profits. Mr. Angus Peyton, West Virginia commissioner of commerce, was the president of the corporation which owns the hotel and makes $94,800 a year straight profit, with the Federal Government reimbursing them for the taxes, and the utilities; $345,549.51 was spent renovating the rundown hotel worth, according to the estimates we received, about $250,000.

Mr. Boutin, of the OEO, disputed what I said in a public hearing, but was proved wrong, and I shall insert the memos which lay this program out:

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Mar. 21, 1966]

No. 5: CHARLESTON, W. VA., HOTEL CASHES IN ON ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

Lease a run-down hotel for $94,800 a year. Pay all taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs. Spend $225,000 renovating the building, which reliable real estate brokers value at $250,000.

Result: One Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, West Virginia.

The waste involved in another of the pet projects of the President's so-called War on Poverty was disclosed today by Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE (R-Minn.) in a speech on the Floor of the House of Representatives.

The Charleston Women's Job Corps Center is housed in the old Kanawha Hotel, owned by the Kanawha Hotel Company, whose president is Angus Peyton, a prominent West Virginia Democrat and State Commerce Commissioner.

"The run-down hotel, which was used for Democratic Presidential campaign headquarters in 1960, was assessed at $87,000 prior to occupancy of the Women's Job Corps in August, 1965," Congressman QUIE said. "It was subsequently raised to $115,000. Estimates of reliable real estate brokers in Charleston placed the value of the hotel at $250,000."

"In addition to receiving a guaranteed profit of 40 per cent on the annual $94,800 rental paid by the Federal Government, the $225,000 spent renovating the building would accrue to the Kanawha Hotel Company," Congressman QUIE said.

"Our investigations have revealed that in the Spring of 1965 a construction consultant, an employee of a firm retained by the Office of Economic Opportunity, on two separate occasions surveyed the Kanawha Hotel to determine its suitability for a Women's Job Corps Center," said Congressman QUIE. "Both times, despite pressure to approve the site, the consultant recommended against use of the Hotel, reporting among other things that the building would be too expensive to rehabilitate."

Congressman QUIE said there are "obvious political implications" in the arrangement and that it is "another example of extravagant diversion of anti-poverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians."

"Testimony at hearings currently being held by the Education and Labor Committee has revealed the estimated costs of maintaining one Job Corps enrollee for a year ranges from $8,500 to $13,000. Educators gasp at these figures and taxpayers question the justification for such an expensive program. We all recognize the necessity for the Job Corps program and agree with the concept . . . however, the program wasn't designed to be a windfall for the wealthy with influence," Congressman QUIE said.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Apr. 5, 1966]

No. 14: OEO FUDDLE-HEADED AGAIN

"Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you and through you were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were inaccurate. First of all, I would like to give you a chronology of the factual facts," said Deputy Director Bernard L. Boutin of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

He made the statement March 23 in a hearing before the House Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty as he attempted to justify OEO money poured into a run-down hotel in Charleston, West Virginia, that OEO is using as a Women's Job Corps Center.

Today, Congressman QUIE took the House Floor to answer the charge of inaccuracy. He was loaded with a battery of documents including the lease on the hotel.

The documents show that Congressman QUIE is right—Boutin is wrong.

"The Office of Economic Opportunity, through its Deputy Director, has again shown the fuddle-headed, make-it-up-as-you-go approach that has characterized the programs, administration and day-to-day operations of the so-called war on poverty," Congressman QUIE said.

The controversy rages around the rundown Kanawha Hotel in downtown Charleston. It is owned by the Kanawha Hotel Corporation, whose President is Angus Peyton, West Virginia Commerce Commissioner and unsuccessful 1964 Democratic candidate for the State Senate.

"As we consider the huge amount of money—totaling at least $477,839.76 in first-year costs alone—that OEO will have poured out to operate this center, I again say these concessions imply political favoritism," Congressman QUIE said.

The ranking minority member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee offered documentation that shows, he said, "a chronology of the actual facts":

Congressman QUIE's contention that the rental on the property is $94,800 a year is correct, as proved by the lease itself. Boutin had disputed that figure.

That OEO is paying all taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs is correct, as he had said, even down to paying transportation, storage and personal property taxes on the unused hotel furniture.

Originally, Congressman QUIE had said the cost of renovating the structure was $225,000. Boutin claimed $187,000.

"Though listed under various bookkeeping headings, the best figure I can determine after further investigation is closer to $350,000," Congressman QUIE said.

Congressman QUIE also quoted the West Virginia statute showing that his assessment figures on the hotel—challenged by Boutin—are correct.

"This is just another example of the way in which OEO operates its programs, even down to determining costs," Congressman QUIE said. "I might suggest that OEO pay more attention to getting its figures straight."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Apr. 15, 1966]

NO. 14A: CREDIBILITY GAP AT OEO—CHARLESTON REVISITED

"Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you . . . were inaccurate." Thus, in testimony on March 23rd Bernard L. Boutin of the Office of Economic Opportunity began a point by point denial of facts presented by ALBERT H. QUIE (R. Minn.) four days earlier with reference to the Charleston, West Virginia, Women's Job Corps Center. The same day Congressman SAM GIBBONS of Florida took the Floor defending OEO and declaring that Congressman QUIE, inadvertently, was wrong.

Further investigation in Charleston not only showed that Congressman QUIE was right but that he conservatively understated the established facts that add up to scandalous poverty profits to a leading Democrat office holder in West Virginia. Congressman QUIE said the Hotel Kanawha was owned by a corporation whose president was Angus Peyton, a prominent Democrat and the present Commerce Commissioner in West Virginia. This is undenied. Congressman QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel Lease provides for payment of $94,800 a year net profit, after the Federal government reimburses for taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs. Mr. Boutin said the rent was $90,000. The fact is that the rent is $94,800 and the Federal government pays, in addition, $4,800 a year for the storage of old hotel property.

Congressman QUIE said assessments in West Virginia were by law 50% of market value. Mr. Boutin said they were 40%. Chapter 18, Article 9(a), Section 4 of the West Virginia code provides that assessed valuation shall not be less than 50% nor more than 100% of appraised valuation.

Mr. QUIE said that the Federal government has spent at least $225,000 renovating the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Mr. Boutin said they have spent only $187,000. The fact is the Federal government has spent $345,000 to renovate the hotel into a Job Corps Center. This includes $290,026.60 spent on repairs and installation of equipment, $24,936.77 for electric, heating and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and $30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics liens.

Mr. QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel was worth about $250,000 at the time it was chosen for a Job Corps Center. Mr. Boutin claimed it was worth $438,000 in 1965 and $508,250 in 1966 (perhaps slyly including in its value $345,000 worth of renovations at taxpayers' expenses!) The fact is that reliable real estate brokers in Charleston indicated the Hotel Kanawha was worth about $250,000 prior to renovation. A somewhat older but comparable hotel in Charleston, the Milner-Ruffner, with more land and a more valuable location, sold on February 1st this year for $200,000.

Mr. Boutin defended the Kanawha Hotel expenditures with the claim that annual square foot rental cost is less than one dollar. This figure must have been computed by dividing the erroneous $90,000 per year rental by 100,000 square feet. This becomes an entirely meaningless computation when it is understood that it ignores $4,800 being paid annually for storage of the old hotel furniture, $7,500 paid annually for taxes (including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable), $5,740 paid annually for insurance and $4,800 paid annually for rent in addition to the $90,000 reported by OEO. Certainly a meaningful annual square foot cost figure should include all annual expenditures, not to mention $16,000 to settle leases of former tenants and some annually amortizing of the $345,549.51 renovations. Who does Mr. Boutin think he fools by citing such glib and misleading figures?

In Summary, the poverty program has spent $345,549.51 renovating a rundown hotel worth about $250,000. A corporation, whose then president is a leading West Virginia Democrat, receives $94,800 per year profit on property worth $250,000. That is a poverty profit of 38 percent a year. An OEO official described the Charleston Women's Job Corps arrangement as "the very best deal that could be gotten." The taxpayers might be justified in asking "the best deal for whom?'

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, April 20, 1966]

NO. 16: THE KANAWHA HOTEL—A LOGICAL CHOICE?

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE pointed out today more errors in the March 23 testimony of Bernard L. Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Boutin was testifying before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Congressman QUIE was attempting to learn more about a feasibility study that had been conducted to determine if the run-down Kanawha Hotel in downtown Charleston, West Virginia, was suitable for a Women's Job Corps Center.

The engineer who conducted the feasibility survey twice said that it was not suitable—and was fired for his trouble. The Kanawha Hotel was leased from the Kanawha Hotel Corp., whose president was Angus Peyton, West Virginia Commerce Commissioner and unsuccessful 1964 Democratic candidate for the State Senate.

Boutin was just one of three OEO officials that Congressman QUIE questioned about the feasibility study. He also asked Benetta B Washington, of OEO's Women's Centers Division, who had conducted the study. She said it was OEO's own engineers. Congressman QUIE asked Milton Fogelman, OEO contracting officer, who had conducted the feasibility study. Fogelman said it was Consolidated American Services. He was right. Boutin's version came out like this:

Mr. Boutin: "Survey for this was done by GSA for us. The facilities that were carefully looked at was the Ruffner Hotel, the Holley Hotel, the hotel in question, the Daniel Boone Hotel and the Holiday Inn Hotel."

The "hotel in question" was, of course, the run-down Kanawha.

Congressman QUIE had charged earlier that selection of the Kanawha Hotel, coupled with the $94,800 annual rental and the fantastic cost of rehabilitation which mounted the first-year cost of the site to at least $477,839.76, "implies political favoritism."

(Boutin also testified before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee that the first-year cost figures advanced by Congressman QUIE were inaccurate. Subsequent investigation showed that Congressman QUIE was right—Boutin wrong.)

As in the case of the cost figures, Boutin's testimony that several sites were "carefully looked at" appears to be inaccurate and misleading.

In order to determine what, if any, alternatives were considered for the location of the Charleston Women's Job Corps Center, Congressman QUIE had the minority investigator of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee make a check, with the following results:

On March 28, 1966, Mrs. Mary Lee Crowley, owner of the Holley Hotel on Quarrier Street in Charleston, said that at no time did she consider leasing the Holley Hotel to the Office of Economic Opportunity or its contractor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. She recalled that early in 1965 a representative of Packard Bell called on her and asked if she would be interested in leasing the hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center. Mrs. Crowley told this man that she was interested in selling the hotel, but not in leasing it. She remembered that his manner was abrupt and her conversation with him was less than five minutes. To her knowledge, no surveys or studies of the Holley Hotel were made by Packard Bell, OEO, or General Services Administration, which Boutin claimed made some studies for the OEO program.

Also on March 28, 1966, Mr. Joe Reiser, Assistant Manager of the Daniel Boone Hotel at Washington and Capitol Streets in Charleston, said that to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the Daniel Boone Hotel were made by Packard Bell, GSA or OEO in contemplation of a Women's Job Corps site. He said no approach or offer had been made to the Daniel Boone management by any representative of these organizations. On April 6, 1966, Mr. Reiser said he had been in contact with Mr. Roger S. Creel, General Manager of the Daniel Boone, who had been vacationing in Miami, Florida. Mr. Creel confirmed that at no time was any offer made to the Daniel Boone management regarding the Women's Job Corps Center and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the hotel had been made for that purpose.

On April 6, 1966, Mr. Lyman Stanton, President and General Manager of the Holiday Inn Hotel on Kanawha Boulevard in Charleston, told the same story. He said that no approach or offer had been made in regard to the Women's Job Corps Center site and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of that facility had been made.

On March 30, 1966, Mr. Vincent Chaney, Charleston attorney who had represented the Ruffner Hotel for years prior to the sale of the building on February 1, 1966, said that to his knowledge no action had been taken in any way by Packard Bell or OEO in consideration of the Ruffner Hotel as a Job Corps site. His statement was affirmed by Mr. R. G. Lilly, Sr., Charleston attorney and principal stockholder of the family-owned Ruffner Hotel prior to its sale.

Mr. Lilly said, however, that in 1965, when he learned that a Women's Job Corps Center had been planned for Charleston, he was interested but was never approached.

Had he been approached, Mr. Lilly said, he would have been very interested in leasing the Ruffner Hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center for much less than the $94,800 annual rental on the Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. Lilly described the Ruffner Hotel as a six-story building with basement and penthouse which includes about 170 bedrooms. He said the hotel has been leased to the Milner Co. of Detroit, Michigan, during the past three years under an arrangement where the hotel owners received 17 per cent of the

gross income. This resulted in the following approximate incomes to the hotel: 1965—$21,000; 1964—$18,000; and 1963—$14,000. Under the terms of the lease, the Ruffner Hotel paid taxes and insurance on the building and its furniture.

Under the Kanawha Hotel-Packard Bell lease, the Office of Economic Opportunity pays taxes and insurance on the hotel and its furniture, as well as furniture storage.

"It seems apparent from these figures that Mr. Lilly would have been glad, as he has said, to lease the Ruffner Hotel for much less than $94,800 a year," Congressmen QUIE said in a speech on the House Floor today. "Based on information furnished by responsible Charleston hotel representatives, it is apparent to me the Kanawha Hotel was the only site considered."

"This is in addition to the errors I pointed out previously in Mr. Boutin's testimony before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee," Congressman QUIE said. "As far as I am concerned, so many errors of such a basic and grave nature are enough to discredit Mr. Boutin's entire testimony. This is another example of the chaotic and make-it-up-as-you-go administration that seems to be so much a part of every-day operations at the Office of Economic Opportunity."

I also say that at St. Petersburg the rental of this property for 18 months was more than the appraised value. In addition, it was poorly located in a residential community for the elderly, a poor selection, and there was a necessity to close the camp after only 42 graduates with a cost of $39,205 per graduate:

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, May 13, 1966]

No. 25: ROCKING CHAIR VERSUS ROCK AND ROLL, OR COMMUNITY RELATION ATROCITIES IN ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

(To be delivered from the floor of the House of Representatives by Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Mr. Speaker, a first requirement in successful operation of a Job Corps center is good community relations. In St. Petersburg, Florida, Job Corps officials have acted out a textbook version of how not to promote good community relations. In April, 1965, they opened a Women's Job Corps Center in the Hotel Huntington in a quiet area surrounded by residential dwellings for retired people. The rental of the Hotel Huntington for 18 months totalled more than its appraised value. Community resistance and resentment were overwhelming. At the time an OEO spokesman, referring to Women's Job Corps Centers, said, "The St. Petersburg Center is the first. If any mistakes have been made, the responsibility is mine and I will learn from them."

After one year, OEO had graduated 42 enrollees from the St. Petersburg Center at a cost of $1,646,601, averaging $39,205 per graduate. The monthly cost of the St. Petersburg facilities is by far the highest of any Women's Job Corps Center in the country.

Training and classroom facilities were spread over four separate locations in St. Petersburg, and the Pinellas County School Board, the Center's sponsor, has been locked in continuous struggle and controversy with OEO, causing them now to terminate their contract.

Having blundered so disastrously in their selection of the Huntington site and in promoting good community relations in this first Job Corps operation, OEO has now demonstrated their "new look" in community relations and demonstrated how they have learned from past mistakes. On May 4, with great gusto, OEO announced the Center will be moved to the old luxury Soreno Hotel under a 14-month contract for $3.1 million. Amazed local officials lost no time in reacting. On May 10, the St. Petersburg City Council passed an ordinance precluding the use of the Soreno Hotel for a Job Corps Center. On May 11, the School Board refused to extend the current contract for use of school facilities. Protests rose from every corner, including community businessmen and planners who found the Job Corps location in direct contradiction of redevelopment and rehabilitation plans for that area of the city. The Governor has indicated he will try to veto the project.

It would appear that Job Corps officials have leapt from the frying pan into the fire, and they owe Congress and the people of St. Petersburg some explanations:

(1) Did any community officials agree to the Soreno Hotel location before it was announced?

(2) Could the dreamers at OEO come up with any location that would cause more community disruption in St. Petersburg?

(3) What possible basis did they have for selecting a community like St. Petersburg for a Job Corps site in the first place?

(4) What accounts for the apparent obsession at OEO to rejuvenate old hotels in unsuitable locations?

(5) Under present policies can they hold out any hope to the American taxpayers that they will ever get their cost per Job Corps graduate down to as low as $20,000, without counting dropouts as graduates?

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman QUIE, and I are particularly affronted by Job Corps bungling because of our long-time sponsorship of the Job Corps approach. Three years before the War on Poverty, we proposed experimental skill centers for young people who need to be liberated from their immediate environment in order to respond to educational training. The Education and Labor Committee this week has rejected summarily a whole series of Republican amendments to tighten up Job Corps procedures and to counter the mass production psychology that still seems to prevail at OEO.

Our 100-page Opportunity Crusade, as a complete substitute for the poverty war, would require proper planning, consultation with local officials and sensible economic management. It would direct Job Corps officials by specific provision of law to "stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees in community life."

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. In connection with the St. Petersburg Job Corps Center, I think it is appropriate to point out at this time that a Job Corps type of center was operated in St. Petersburg, Fla.—not in my district, but in the district of one of your colleagues. For about a year it had been a very successful program. It was not until the same contractor, which happened to be a member of the local school board, which is a Republican school board, moved the center voluntarily from where they had been operating it to the place where they were finally run out by public opinion that they got in trouble.

Frankly, I do not think they would have gotten into trouble had it not been for unjustifiable and unwarranted criticism, emulating some of it right here in this Congress, of the program. As I say, this is not in my district, but I visited the St. Petersburg Job Corps Center on a number of occasions. I talked with enrollees there; I talked with the people running the program. Frankly, it was the national publicity, much of it generated I think in political spite, which threw the St. Petersburg Job Corps Center into a tailspin.

I regret very deeply that this injustice was done to these young women. They were severely hurt personally. The program was severely hurt.

Mr. QUIE. I wish the gentleman would use some of his time for a spell, because we are going to be short on ours. I think you made your point.

Mr. GIBBONS. I think I have, too.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield for a question only to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentleman in the well has made reference now to the specific project carried out by Consolidated American Services, Inc. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with his references.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with the previous remarks of the gentleman about this. Also I called the attention of the House yesterday to Congressman SLACK's detailed reply.

Mr. QUIE. What was Congressman SLACK's detailed reply on?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. QUIE. I know about those on the Kanawha Hotel. Does he have one on ConAm also?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Yes, on April 25, beginning on page 892, there is a reply to the gentleman's previous charges. On page 845 of the hearings, we had before our committee Mr. Boutin. He made this statement in response to a question by the gentleman in the well:

Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you and through you were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were inaccurate.

Is the gentleman now relying on the figures that show in the official transcript of the hearings for the information that he is putting out today? Is the gentleman relying on the figures that he previously put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which a representative of that company testified before our committee were inaccurate?

Mr. QUIE. I made a further investigation, and I found out that Mr. Boutin was the one who was inaccurate.

In fact, my first figures were conservative. I had it checked thoroughly and found out what the situation was. I found out that OEO subsequently went to check on my figures and found them accurate. That is why they have not returned with any statement that said their figures were originally correct. My figure was $94,800 annual rent; Mr. Boutin said that was inaccurate, that it was really $90,000. He was the one who was inaccurate, not me. I checked the contract again which showed that it was $94,800. Anyone can read the contract and see that I was correct. I laid out the exact figures. I saw nothing in the rebuttal of the gentleman from West Virginia which disproved any of the facts which I gave. To date no one has disproved those facts.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason to take up the time of the gentleman in the well, because the gentleman from Michigan has not read the two subsequent speeches that came after the statement of Mr. Boutin in the hearings, in which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] reports on the full investigation and what the facts were, which proved to be worse than his original allegation. They have never been contradicted, since the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] followed up for us on April 20, and thereafter gave the full facts of the investigation.

Secondly, the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Michigan are talking about mixing up two entirely different situations. The Kanawha Hotel has nothing to do with Consolidated American Services, that is, ConAm. ConAm was an entirely different poverty million-dollar contract. I made a speech on this in August and I followed up on it yesterday. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. QUIE. With this exception, the ConAm surveyed the Kanawha Hotel.

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

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Part of the reference that was in the Kanawha Hotel dispute was that ConAm had made a survey at the Kanawha Hotel, but the facts did not have anything to do with ConAm. The facts were developed by investigators as to what the facts were in the rundown Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman who just spoke is obviously the one who has not read the RECORD, because he says the statements made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] are answered on the 25th of April, 5 days later, by Congressman SLACK.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman would read the comments of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] he does not in any way claim my facts are incorrect.

Until I find somebody from OEO who can prove that my facts are incorrect, they stand as they are. I know they are correct, because we did the kind of thorough investigation that should have been done by our committee. So I will yield no further on this point, unless someone can come forward with some facts. There is no use haranguing the situation.

A serious situation regarding the high cost of Job Corps facilities is found in the subcommittee report of October 27, 1965, signed by majority and minority investigators:

> Mr. McManus (the Community Relations Chief) also estimated on October 20th that Atterbury's total cost during its initial 18 months of operation would be approximately $5,000,000 more than the original grant of $10,828,000. He ascribed half of the projected increase to rehabilitation and construction costs which would amount to $3,000,000 instead of the estimated $500,000.

This, I might note, is a 500-percent increase in cost. I will point out here about the excessive salaries.

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

I understood that to be an invitation to come forward with some facts.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

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

Mr. QUIE. I will yield for some facts.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would simply like to call the gentleman's attention to the record of the hearings and to ask once again whether, in making the accusations he now makes, he relies upon the figures in our hearings, here branded as inaccurate, or whether he relies on something other than the figures elicited during the hearings.

Mr. QUIE. I repeat to the gentleman, if he misunderstood me before, that the statement of Mr. Boutin was incorrect and inaccurate. The gentleman can call him and find out for himself, or he can call the OEO and find out for himself. They will tell the gentleman Boutin's figures were inaccurate.

One would tend to believe a person in Boutin's position, so I subsequently investigated further and put into the RECORD accurate statements as to what the situation was, finding not only that Boutin was inaccurate but that I had used conservative figures previously.

Let me proceed.

The excessive salaries which have been paid to urban Job Corps employees have resulted in extraordinary expense and the proselyting of personnel from existing school systems and from other public services. We pointed out in the memorandums the various Job Corps centers and the salaries people are receiving now as compared to the salaries they received prior to being employed by the Job Corps centers.

We heard in testimony before the General Subcommittee on Education that there are similar facilities for $2,000 or $3,000 per annum, with 85-percent placement, even taking Job Corps rejectees in residential vocational schools.

I will insert at this point in the RECORD—and I will ask permission when we go into the House—a chart taken from the Education and Labor testimony, and excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Don Watson, the director of the Mahoning Valley School in Vienna, Ohio, in which he lays out the good job being done in this program.

The material referred to follows:

Breakdown of training costs (includes capital outlay and cost of equipment)

Project [1]	Trainees approved	Trainees actually enrolled	Trainees graduated	Approved educational training cost [2]	Average cost per pupil [3]	Approved training allowance, transportation, subsistence [2]	Average cost per pupil [3]	Approved total [2]	Average cost per pupil [3]
286-(1-19)	640	859	442	$899,912	$1.048	$1,188,603	$1,384	$2,129,318	$2,479
5111-(1-4)	95	90	53	58,091	645	135,392	1,504	193,483	2,150
5166	25	28	11	22,182	792	48,430	1,730	70,612	2,522
5186-(1-16)	805	833	433	953,292	1,144	1,379,512	1,656	2.332,804	2,800
6128-(1-4)	95	107	55	94,379	882	176,626	1,651	271.005	2,533
Total	1,660	1,917	994	2,027,856	1,058	2,928,563	1,528	4,997,222	2,607

[1] These are the code names for various vocational programs.
[2] Costs indicated are approved amounts and not necessarily amounts expended.
[3] Average costs are based on figures in col. 3 which reflect trainees actually enrolled.

MR. DON WATSON, DIRECTOR, MAHONING VALLEY SCHOOL, VENICE, OHIO

When we discuss our placement figure of 80 to 85 per cent, people say, "Well, yes, but the employment situation is very good right now, this is not a true evaluation". Maybe it is not, but I think it is necessary to point out the fact that these 400-some disadvantaged boys that we have were part, in many cases were part of that 4 per cent that were still unemployed. They were unemployed when they came to us, and they are getting jobs now.

In our guidance service we have, of course, orientation and testing. We feel it is very important to get them into the right spot, get the square pegs in the square holes. We have met with very little resistance of getting boys to go into the vocational area. They all want to do what they have the best chance of succeeding in. Our counseling service, the guidance department serves—it is on a consolidated basis to the training, housing, groups or individuals.

In other words, they make it a point to know as much about each individual case as they can in order that they might help us to better design a program that will meet their needs. The results of the residential vocational program—before I hit on that, the matter of service under the guidance program, our work-study program, Section 13, P.L. 88-210.

Now many of our students do not receive a training allowance. If they have not been out of school for a full year, they are not eligible for a training allowance. If they are 16, they aren't eligible. If they turn 22 when in the program, they are not eligible. The first year we noticed that we had quite a few boys dropping out because they said they could not afford to stay, they had financial obligations. We have used the work-study program the second year. We have had very few—I can't recall when we had a boy that

dropped out for financial reasons. We have them performing such tasks as custodial work, good service, grounds keeping, clerical—this sort of thing, at a dollar and a quarter an hour. It has been a tremendous help.

* * * * *

Some of the state people wonder how we buy parts for these automobiles, but I can assure you they are strictly by the students themselves. As far as the cost of the program, Dr. Shoemaker hit on this very briefly on page 24. In the testimony you will find a breakdown of every project that has been approved since the school started.

The number of trainees, the total average for every one, is right now $2,607. We think this is very economical. I have been questioned on this locally. That is pretty expensive. It is. We could do it in the public schools, at the high school level, for one-fifth or one-sixth of this. But it has not been done. It is necessary to do it now. It becomes more expensive to do it this way. Even at that price that you mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers will, I think—this is a good investment, because they will join us as taxpayers. It has been estimated within a period of three years they will pay back the investment and from then on it is profit; that they will be buying goods and paying taxes.

* * * * *

Mr. MEEDS. My compliments to you and to your program, in fact to the vocational education system of the State of Ohio. I think you have a tremendously fine vocational educational system.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I left out one very important item, and those are the recommendations. They are not exactly the same as Dr. Shoemaker and Dr. Ramsey's. We do have a good working relationship, however. It is my recommendation, on page 34 of the testimony, that funds be made available for the construction and operation of the residential vocational schools as stipulated in Section 14, P.L. 88-210. Number 2, that funds be authorized and appropriated under P.L. 88-210 for the construction, equipping, operating of vocational schools throughout the country. Ohio is using all monies available. We see the results of a lack of vocational education offerings in public schools.

And also I would recommend additional funds from the Vocational Education Act for the training of new vocational teachers and upgrading of present vocational instructors. This has been a very serious problem with us. We have fortunately been able to acquire a very competent staff, but we are losing them. We lost two this month to the Job Corps, because of the training they have had here. We can't afford to lose these people.

The work-study program made possible through Section 13(b) continued on a 100 per cent federal reimbursement basis, thus providing an effective tool in the struggle to prevent dropout——

Mr. PERKINS. The two you lost to the Job Corps, was that because of better salaries?

Mr. WATSON. These were very dedicated people, but I am convinced you can buy dedication. I think this is exactly what happened.

Mr. FORD. It is hard to make the payments on the family car and family home with dedication.

Mr. WATSON. Right. It was quite a bit higher salary.

Thank you, gentlemen.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Just in summary, if I may so state, Mr. Watson testified on July 12, 1966. We had a variety of other testimony from others as to the job being done in the new area residence vocational program. Mr. Watson pointed out that the Mahoning Valley School in Ohio is a State-run school with Federal vocational education support. They incorporate supportive services with a vocational training comparable to the Job Corps. They take Job Corps and in some instances Job Corps dropouts and rejects. They have an 80- to 85-percent placement figure upon graduation. The per enrollee cost per year is $2,607 as compared to the testimony we have on the Job Corps, which ranges from $9,000 to $12,000 per year cost per enrollee.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. QUIE. I will yield just for one question, and after this I should like to complete my statement before I yield further.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The question is to the gentleman from New York. I understood him to be quoting from testimony taken on July 12, 1966. Since this bill left our committee on June 1, I wonder if the gentleman would tell us where and before whom this testimony was given?

Mr. QUIE. I will say that the testimony was before the subcommittee of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. GOODELL. The general Subcommittee on Education, of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] on July 12.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to point out alarming instances of violence involving Job Corps enrollees in Job Corps centers and neighboring towns and cities. This emphasizes the need for more discipline, for more effective security, for more careful screening and selection of enrollees.

We recognize that the program is designed to assist the disadvantaged youth, and we can expect incidents to occur. A large number of them will have had scrapes with the law before they came in.

However, Congress did not intend the Job Corps centers to replace reformatories or to push out well-meaning and more ambitious youths because of fear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

I shall give some of the reasons for the discipline problems. These ought to be corrected.

There are no background checks for criminal records.

As a result of the speeding up of recruitment, in many cases they have had no health checks.

Lastly, there has been no individual authority given to the camp directors themselves. We pointed out the incidents at Mountain Home, Idaho. After this Director Stoddard, of the Bureau of Land Management, responsible for that particular camp, issued a memorandum giving his directors dismissal authority.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 2, 1966]

OUST UNSUITABLE BOYS, SIX JOB CORPS UNITS TOLD—BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTING ALSO TO BAR FURTHER PROBLEM RECRUITS

(By Orr Kelly)

The directors of the six Job Corps Conservation Centers operated by the Bureau of Land Management have been ordered to refuse to accept delivery of problem boys and to discharge "unsuitable" corpsmen.

Charles H. Stoddard, director of the bureau, said he had held up the effective date of the order during negotiations with the Office of Economic Opportunities but that it would go into effect in a week.

His order, issued in a teletype message Feb. 24, is the first open break between OEO and the head of one of the many government agencies that operate the Job Corps camps. Many others, however, are reported to be as disturbed as Stoddard.

Stoddard's order, which was obtained by The Star from sources outside the Department of the Interior, said:

DISCHARGES URGED

"It is apparent from continuing incidents at your centers that poor screening of candidates for enrollment in the program has and is having a deleterious effect on the program. Additionally, your lack of authority to immediately discharge unsuitable corpsmen has led to serious troubles in maintaining discipline.

"For above reasons I direct you to review records you now have on your corpsmen and to discharge immediately any who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property, extreme sexual deviation, or emotional disturbances.

"You will take this action without regard to procedures established by OEO when delay will cause overburdening of your staff, adverse community relations, escalation of discipline problems with other corpsmen, or serious morale problems at your center.

REJECTIONS ORDERED

"As you receive additional new enrollees and advance records indicate problems of the stature stated above, you will not accept delivery of corpsmen but will return them to their homes immediately.

"Should you be questioned from any source as to your authority to take the above actions, you will quote this communication from me."

Stoddard said the Bureau of Land Management, a part of the Interior Department, operates the six Job Corps Centers with money appropriated for that purpose. The centers have an enrollment of about 1,000 youths, with a weekly turnover of about 5 percent, he said.

The OEO retains control over education, and discipline, he said, and all cases involving major disciplinary action must be cleared with OEO in Washington. It is days and sometimes weeks, he said, before a decision comes back from Washington.

SPECIFIC CASES SOUGHT

Directors of the centers have been asked to send Stoddard reports of specific cases to back up his order giving them disciplinary authority.

"I hope to have a good, tight case in a week or so," he said.

Stoddard said he had heard nothing directly from OEO since his order went out, but "we've been talking to them for a year and getting nowhere."

One of Stoddard's major complaints is that the OEO does not operate screening centers and the result has been that youths with

criminal records and serious emotional disturbances have caused serious problems at the Job Corps centers.

In a memorandum to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall telling about his order, Stoddard said:

"Over many years the BLM has built favorable relations with communities in which our field operations are situated. . . . Assurance was given the public that youth who show a history of serious and repeated offenses against persons or property would not be enrolled in the program. This has not been the case.

"To illustrate this point, I cite the difficulties experienced at our center at Mountain Home, Idaho, which was the subject of considerable discussion recently in the House of Representatives.

"On Oct. 19, 1965, we were notified by the center director at Mountain Home that 18 enrollees of a group of 37 scheduled for input at his center had criminal records, several with serious and repeated offenses. In spite of appeals from the center director and from the Departmental Job Corps staff, OEO proceeded with the scheduled input. One of these enrollees performed the stabbing which led to the recent notoriety at that center."

OTHER INCIDENTS CITED

In a separate statement of the underlying reasons for his order, Stoddard cited a number of other incidents and said:

"This series of events need not have occurred. From the beginning the record will show that I have asked for disciplinary authority on the part of center director who is in the final analysis as responsible for his camp as the captain of his ship.

"Furthermore, I have exhausted every channel of communication to urge OEO to establish reception centers as a means of screening misfits, outfitting, providing medical examinations and adequate orientation prior to arrival at camp. . . .

"Many people in the national conservation movement who worked strongly for the passage of the Antipoverty Act did so only because the Youth Conservation Corps program was an integral part of it. They are deeply concerned over the failure to date, and wish to see corrective action taken immediately.

POORER QUALITY DUE

"But in December the federal conservation agency liaison people were told that the enrollee input would be of poorer quality than previously and that boys not capable of meeting Urban Center standards would go to Conservation Centers. If these moves were not calculated to ruin the program this could be their only result.

"If OEO will establish Reception Centers and delegate adequate disciplinary authority to Job Corps camp directors, these easily preventable situations will not occur. As soon as this is done, I will be glad to rescind my order of Feb. 24. Furthermore, I will request a leave of absence from the Secretary of Interior to direct this program into a successful operation."

The Bureau operates Job Corps Centers at Kingman, Ariz., Mountain Home, Idaho, Antelope Mesa, Nev., Fort Vannoy and Tillamook, Ore., and Castle Valley, Utah.

Other centers are operated by Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, National Park Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and the California Resources Agency.

Later he was overruled, but he said:

It is apparent from continuing incidents at those centers that poor screening of candidates for enrollment in the corps is having a deliterious effect and additionally its lack of authority to discharge has led to serious trouble in maintaining discipline.

So what we have done in our substitute, the Opportunity Crusade Act, is to set up guidelines on which OEO shall operate. We specify the kind of language which will eliminate the difficulty we have seen to date in the Job Corps centers because of the lack of discipline and screening.

The last point I want to make on the Job Corps, Mr. Chairman, is the very spotty procedure and poor job being done in the placement of youth after graduation. As has been stated now by the Director himself, the costs are something over $9,000 per enrollee. You would think with this kind of an investment they would keep track of the individuals who have graduated, but we could find no good information on the enrollees and what happened to them afterward. Many of them have not been able to get jobs or have been placed in jobs inferior to those that they had been trained for and even inferior to those that they had before entering the Job Corps. We received the graduation figures, and I would say they are discouraging. For instance, the lists given to us at Camp Custer indicate that 354 enrollees graduated prior to July 1, 1966. Of those 48 have been confirmed as placed. Of the remaining 306, they have been referred to the regional office for placement and nothing is known about their employment status. Now, can we be assured that this regional office made plans for employing those boys after costing the taxpayer an average of $9,120 per graduate at that camp? Are they in the same unemployed state now as they were before the Job Corps experience?

I refer you to a letter from Dr. O. J. Baker, the director of the Camp Gary Center, who stated that of 855 of the 1,273 graduates about whom they had no information since being sent home for regional placement—

Due to the delayed organization of the regional organizations, the feedback is not complete of the corpsmen referred to other States for employment.

Now, we need to do something to help these young men and women to find jobs to be placed in what they are qualified for.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my good friend in the well, the gentleman from my neighboring State of Minnesota, for the outstanding, sincere, and dedicated job he has done over the past many months in examining the intricacies and mismanagement of this whole poverty setup. The gentleman in the well, I think everybody realizes, is sincerely interested in finding a way to make this program more responsive to the needs of those people who must have help. Some of the amendments that have been offered in the committee, largely through the work of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and others on our side of the aisle, are very commendable—particularly the one to put poverty personnel under the Hatch Act to protect against partisan political activity being financed in the name of welfare. There is one further amendment that I think we should look over in the House and add to this bill if we are sincerely interested in fighting poverty. This is one that I often suggested to limit administrative expenses to not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated for the program. On most any kind of a program in the field of welfare they can hold their administrative expenses down to far less than that. Most of them run around 1 or 2 percent. By "administrative expense" I mean salaries and expense items of the people who are running the program and not teachers' salaries or payments to the poverty stricken.

I am referring only to the people who do the administrative tasks and their expenses. This amendment, along with the Hatch Act coverage would do more than anything else to remove this program from being subject to waste and politics. I hope to offer this amendment or that someone on the committee will offer this amendment. However, I did want to take this brief moment now to inform the House about this amendment and to commend my friend in the well for the outstanding job he has done for all Americans for these many, many months.

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota and I will say with the understanding that there will be no cutting off of debate, that the gentleman from North Dakota should have an opportunity to offer his amendment.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I simply want to add my commendation to that which has been made of the gentleman from Minnesota. The questions he has raised in his discussion here are serious questions and the criticisms which he has made are telling. What disturbs me about the nature of this debate—and we are now well into our second day of debate—is the conspiracy of silence which seems to have developed.

The proponents of this particular committee bill seem determined not to talk about the inadequacies of the program as it is presently being operated. They failed to do this in the committee. They failed to take a good look at how the program has developed and where its weaknesses were, and what could be done to correct those weaknesses. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the same criticism can be leveled now. Instead of accepting the valid criticism which the gentleman from Minnesota has made, they simply ignored it, apparently in an effort to obstruct the true facts in regard to this program, a program which everyone knows is not operating in an efficient manner.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. Chairman, these are the same old charges that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] have issued in some 35 or 40 so-called anti-poverty memorandums that really were sort of glorified press releases by which they have tried to hack this program to pieces.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the speech that has been made here on the floor today which has not been pointed out before, and which has not already been answered by responsible people, and that includes the remarks that were made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I want to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. I believe I fully answered you.

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me, since he used my name?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would withhold that request for a moment, I would like to help him out a little bit.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a little unfair to accuse our friends on the minority side of "bringing up all the old charges again." Indeed, they have not done that. It is true, many of the charges they have brought up are old familiar friends to all of us, polished by the frequency of their use, and become, like an old slipper, almost comfortable from age alone. But they have not brought them all up. One old charge has been strangely absent from the remarks of the minority Members in this debate. I have waited for it, but my patience has gone thus far unrewarded.

I refer to the old charge, leveled so often by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, that the program lacks coordination.

I have, Mr. Chairman, heard that accusation from minority Members time after time, in season and out, in the committee, in the corridors, in the cafeterias, and in the cloakrooms. But I have not heard it on the floor. I suppose the reason for this strange silence is the unfortunate fact that the Republican proposal would have the effect of doing away with whatever coordination has yet been achieved.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. In just a moment I shall yield to my able friend from New York, but I trust he will bear with me while I finish this statement.

Mr. Chairman, the "opportunity crusade" or whatever it is called, that the minority has promised to offer as a substitute for the war on poverty, takes each and every one of these important OEO programs and scatters them among existing agencies, leaving no coordination whatever.

Mr. Chairman, one of the ideas for setting up an Office of Economic Opportunity—one of the central concepts behind the entire war on poverty—was to achieve coordination of existing programs, including those involved in this act, and others, so that all of the resources of this Government may be better brought to bear upon the problems of the poor. I think this is fundamentally sound, and our difficulty has been that we have had too little coordination. So while absolving our Republican colleagues from mentioning all the old charges, I shall help complete the catalog by bringing up the one they had thus far been so silent about.

But at the same time that I air this old charge, I want to point out that the legislation before the House today goes a long way toward meeting it.

Let us examine some of the specific things this bill does to achieve greater coordination.

Mr. Chairman, I have had something to do with the Manpower Development and Training Act and manpower training programs generally, and I would like to point out that this is one area in which minority and majority agree there has not been enough coordination in the past.

Let us examine what we have done in the bill before us today to make such coordination more feasible.

First, this bill amends section 201 of the Manpower Development and Training Act, by directing the Secretary of Labor to "coordinate and provide for combinations of programs to be pursued concurrently or sequentially, under this act—the Manpower Development and Training Act—with programs under other Federal acts—such as the Economic Opportunity Act—where the purposes of this act would be accomplished thereby."

This language, Mr. Chairman, opens up the many Manpower Development Training Act programs, which have proven their utility, to coordination with programs under this war on poverty, and, in fact, makes it the unmistakable public policy of the United States that such coordination shall be undertaken. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is a clear and direct response to the repeated suggestions we have had on all sides for coordination and cooperation in this area.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman after I finish my statement.

We have amended section 203(c) of the Manpower Development and Training Act, relating to the payment of training allowances for the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees to enable young people who have completed a stint in the Neighborhood Youth Corps to go directly to training under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and to do without suffering a substantial reduction in income. As the law now reads, youths 17 years or older who have not had 2 years' attachment to the work force are eligible for the Manpower Development and Training Act training only in certain cases, and if eligible may receive training allowances of not more than $20 per week. The amendment allows youths who have completed the Neighborhood Youth Corps training to be referred to the Manpower Development and Training Act and to receive a training allowance equal to the average unemployment compensation weekly allowance. This amendment also allows the reference of such young people outside the 25-percent youth quota otherwise established by the Manpower Development and Training Act. These amendments will make it possible for the initial work of the Neighborhood Youth Corps to be continued and brought to fruition by the highly successful work of the Manpower Development and Training Act program.

In title V of the Poverty Act, as amended by this bill, the Director is authorized to transfer funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare so that he may fund projects designed essentially to enable persons now on welfare to become employable. In order to bring the work experience and work training activities of title V under the same expert direction that is now exercised over the Manpower Development and Training Act and other Federal training programs, the Secretary of Labor is delegated administrative responsibilities for such programs, while the provision of supporting services remains the responsibility of the Secretary of HEW. To quote from the committee report:

> Work and training without supportive services will be wasted upon the persons title V was designed to help. Services without the completion of the training-employment cycle will merely duplicate the ongoing welfare system. The coordination so essential to the success of title V is fostered both by structurally intertwining title V and MDTA section 251 and by giving the Secretary of HEW the ultimate control of the purse.

The bill before us contains other provisions to assure coordination and to assure the maximum use of the existing experience of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in areas where the war on poverty needs them, and where their participation can be most effectively used.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, while this bill is not solely concerned with achieving coordination among existing agencies, this is a major thrust of the legislation.

In the opinion of your committee, such coordination is necessary for more economical and, of greater importance, for more effective action in the Nation's struggle against the curse of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me quote, from the committee report, the following remarks, which I call to the special attention of the House:

> The committee and its war on poverty task force devoted considerable attention to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. We have concluded the program should be strengthened and its authorization considerably increased. Even with these improvements, close coordination with training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act as well as utilization of remedial education and other services available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be necessary if the Neighborhood Youth Corps is to reach a significant portion of the young

people of America who need the training, work experience and earnings it furnishes.

The key word in that paragraph, Mr. Chairman, is "coordination." The war on poverty, as indeed it must, cuts across traditional lines of departmental jurisdiction and across traditional lines of professional expertise. It is not a welfare program, though many of the techniques of the welfare worker are needed. It is not purely a job training program, though job training is central to it. It is not a program to provide employment, though it cannot be denied that the finding of jobs for the poor is essential to eliminating poverty.

The need for coordination has been recognized on all sides. Indeed, some of the most eloquent pleas for greater coordination in this area have been made in previous debates by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle—pleas which have been persuasive to me and to many of my Democratic colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has 1 hour and 34 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has 1 hour and 2 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I will wait for the gentleman from Florida to yield time on his side.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chariman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966.

In 1964, when President Johnson courageously called for a declaration of war on poverty, he was immediately received by Republican opposition cries of "election-year gimmick" and other arguments that such a poverty program resembled a "hodgepodge" of old programs that would do little to solve the causes of poverty.

Nonetheless, responsible Democratic Congressmen joined with their President in fighting poverty and appropriated almost $1 billion—$947.5 million—with which to carry on the fight.

In its second year against poverty, Congress allocated an expenditure of $1.5 billion.

Now, for its third year of operation, the antipoverty program is scheduled to receive $1.7 billion—less than a $200 million increase over the amount approved last year.

No one can reasonably deny that the current funds are insufficient to adequately fight the war against poverty. Those who have seen the statistics of deprivation know this is an inadequate appropriation. But, moreover, the victims of poverty know it.

In the past few days we have seen at least three worthy projects from northern New Jersey alone disapproved because of a lack of funds. Undoubtedly many other worthy projects would fall victim to the questionable economizing tactics of the poverty program opponents.

We can easily predict that the war on poverty is facing even harder days ahead. Already, the drain of money caused by other equally critical demands—such as the Vietnam war—are competing for priority with our domestic war on poverty. Currently, this Government is spending at least $12 billion on the Vietnam war. This is a war that in 1 month cost our Government a sum equal to what is now proposed for an entire year of waging the other war—the war on poverty.

There are those critics of the poverty program who say this is too much of a drain on our national economy. Let me remind them that if we in Congress approve the administration's budget requests for 1967, the total would be about $112.8 billion. Of this total, $1.7 billion is being asked to fight poverty. This, keep in mind, approaches a meager 1 percent of the total budget.

Even more telling is the fact that the amount being authorized by the current legislation is shamefully less than one-half of 1 percent of the gross national product. It is a tragic indictment against our society if we cannot or will not reinvest in people even 1 percent of an economy spending $732 billion a year.

I plead with my colleagues to join with those forward-looking Members of the House who intend to give more substance and meaning to accomplish the lofty objectives to which most Americans subscribe.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD very briefly?

Mr. JOELSON. I will yield to the gentleman very briefly?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like just to continue very briefly the colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. JOELSON. I do not think I would want to yield—the gentleman will have his own time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my point of order if the gentleman from New Jersey will yield for the clarification of the RECORD.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in entering into any bargaining with the gentleman from New Jersey. If you wish to pursue your point of order, you may do so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish to pursue the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a very brief inquiry to clarify the record?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman. I should just like, in relation to Mr. O'HARA's statement, to point out that the minority has argued for coordination, and specifically I, as others, offered an amendment to section 603(c) on page 29 of the committee print that requires maximum coordination of programs and activities authorized by this act. If Mr. O'HARA is not here, would not Mr. GIBBONS comment on that?

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman for his "clarification" and I yield no further.

I rise in order to discuss the charges made mostly by those on the Republican side of the aisle that this is an inflationary bill. We are dealing with a substantial amount of money, $1,700 million. But I would point out to the Republican side of the aisle that last week we passed a bill providing $4 billion for public works, and there were only 25 dissenting votes in the entire House of Representatives. I happened to be one of them.

I do not know why it is that we become concerned about inflation only when we are trying to do something for the poor, the disadvantaged, and the dispossessed. Last week I did not hear one word from the great economizers, even when we had unbudgeted items in the districts of the great economizers. The silence was deafening.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction of the record?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] constantly offered amendments on the very basis that they were unbudgeted, and no response was forthcoming from the gentleman's side of the aisle at all and, I regret to say, no response from this side. Nevertheless the effort was made.

Mr. JOELSON. That is the point I am trying to make.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Not at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JOELSON. I seem to have struck a very sensitive nerve.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Will the gentleman from New Jersey kindly inform the House whether there were any items in that bill, known as the pork barrel bill, that would benefit Members on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. JOELSON. Oh, definitely. Of course, I never engage in personalities, but some of the great economizers had unbudgeted items in their districts, and they were silent. They were submissive, and they were tranquilized.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I do not yield any further.

I would like to point out that what we are doing now is embarking on a new concept, a fight against poverty. And naturally there are going to be errors. There will be trials and improvisations. But the minority report, in the typical minority fashion, was negative. It highlighted every unfortunate thing that happened, without ever saying anything good about the program.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JOELSON. I do not yield any further to anybody.

When we spend $5 billion for space, we have our failures. Only last week, Surveyor bumped its nose on the moon. That cost us probably millions of dollars. The American public shrugged and said, "We have got to expect these things when we engage in forays into new frontiers."

I say we are engaged in a new frontier against poverty. We should recognize our mistakes, but we should not gut the bill with high-sounding names such as "Opportunity Crusade." The Republican substitute is not an opportunity crusade: it is just opportunity delayed, opportunity mislaid, and opportunity dismayed.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I do regret that after the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] took the floor and yielded so liberally to the other side, that we have not been able to answer allegations as they have been made. Mr. O'HARA indicated he would yield for an opportunity to answer his allegations about our supposedly dropping insistence on coordination and then did not, and now we have had no opportunity here.

But I would take this time to tell the gentleman from New Jersey that I also voted against the $4 billion "pork barrel" bill on very much the same grounds he did.

I also would tell him the first words we have heard in this debate about inflation came from him today. We have not talked about cutting the cost of this bill simply to cure inflation.

What Mr. QUIE and I have said, and the Republicans on this side—and the gentleman obviously has not read the minority views, because a large portion of the minority views are devoted to laying out the Republican "opportunity crusade" specifically—is that we would redirect this program so it can get the money to the poor and train more of these people for productive jobs.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey a half minute.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just want to say that the ranking Republican member of the Education and Labor Committee in his opening statement yesterday condemned this as an inflationary measure, and that was the burden of his attack.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself a half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for a minute.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey that he should get the words of the gentleman from Ohio, and check the RECORD, read them back, because it is plain he did not speak about inflation in his criticism of the program.

We keep getting these added comments from the other side where no point was made on our side. The gentleman from Florida says that our charges have been made before, as though he could put them off in this way, saying these are old charges which have been made before. He and OEO usually do not come up with any answers to them. I expect to get some answers now from my criticisms of the use of consultants today. I wrote a letter to the GAO and I wrote a letter to the Civil Service Commission and I expect an answer, which cannot be said of letters to OEO.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I had asked the gentleman from Florida to yield at the time he made this allegation about having answered all our charges. This is the way the OEO and the gentleman from Florida and generally those on the committee who were supporting this program as is have answered our charges. They have said they are drummed up old charges coming out of the newspapers. They have all been answered, they say.

Not a single one of these poverty memos has been contradicted in any of its major facts. I am putting the poverty memos in the RECORD again today. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Florida would come forward and answer these.

Yesterday I made a speech on the floor about Con Am. I put in for the first time the sworn statement of Mr. Dan Miller, who was chief engineer of Con Am, and his statements about Con Am and its operation. It is a brandnew charge. Mr. Miller made new charges. He talked about the organization of this engineering firm and the problems in it. Now the gentleman comes back and says that this has all been answered. The serious charges still have not been answered.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to explain my position.

Mr. Chairman, I did not say and the gentleman misquotes me if he says that I said it, that I have answered all the charges. I said they have been answered by responsible people.

I did not say that these charges came out of the newspapers. I said they were going into the newspapers, from the Republican Party.

I meant to say that I answered these charges until they cut me off the mailing list. I have not been getting the poverty handouts since then.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, all the charges have been answered by responsible persons.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. All the charges of the poverty memos have been put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, usually as speeches either by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] or by me. They are readily available to the gentleman from Florida. I do not believe the gentleman has been taken off our mailing list.

We believe he knows about them. We would be glad to be absolutely certain he is on the list, because I believe the taxpayers want to know about this and the gentleman from Florida wants to know about this.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the other half of that minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, page 23371, the words of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]:

> Here is your chance to really help to trim nearly $3 billion from the Federal budget * * *.
>
> I know of nothing that is any more threatening to this country today than inflation. Here is one place you can help. You can help your constituents, and you can help the President of the United States.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an answer to every single charge made by my good friends on the other side, documented.

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

Mr. POWELL. I do not have the floor.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I wish to say to the chairman of the committee, Mr. POWELL, if he has the answers on card file form, would he be so good as to put them in the RECORD so that everyone in the House can read them?

Mr. POWELL. I cannot ask unanimous consent now, because we are in the Committee of the Whole. When the Committee rises I will ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD every single documented answer, line by line, to every charge made by my good friend and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. QUIE. Very good.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It will be interesting reading, since I believe about half of the charges made have even been admitted to be true by the OEO. We will look at that closely. I am sure they do not contradict the major facts. I hope they will reveal more than the report of this committee on the investigation of the poverty program.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this program. I am hopeful that amendments will be introduced to increase the amount under the program.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in support of this most essential legislation to extend the antipoverty program.

Despite the general prosperity of our Nation, there are among us citizens caught in a cycle of poverty, those who have been denied educational and employment opportunities, and who have not experienced the environment of hope the majority of Americans enjoy. We have undertaken a war to eradicate this enemy of our democratic society, and I am sure there are few Americans who would deny the validity of our objective or the moral responsibility to our fellow citizens upon which it rests.

The city of Newark, in my congressional district, was one of the first communities to participate in the fight against poverty. And its experience is a most encouraging example of the invaluable aid the program can provide. Newark has shown what can be done with funds made available under the program, how disadvantaged individuals can be helped and social disruption or violence prevented with the help of the creative and positive projects the city has undertaken. In this connection, I would like to include with my remarks a fine editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger of September 23, 1966, which comments cogently on the "brave, earnest effort" by our pioneering antipoverty agency, the United Community Corp.

Now, however, the UCC's future programs are threatened, and all the progress made to date may be jeopardized.

The bill before us authorizes an inadequate level of funds for the next fiscal year. The UCC has estimated that it needs at least $9 million in the coming year merely to keep existing programs in operation at capacity. But under this bill the budgetary guidelines for the city of Newark include only $3.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, Newark is only one of many cities and communities which will suffer unless these funds are increased. The $1.75 billion approved by our House committee is simply not enough to properly carry forward the antipoverty program throughout the country. It is urgent that the authorization be increased to the amount of $2.5 billion, which I am glad to note is the amount approved by the Senate committee.

A second most essential need is for the allocation of more money to the community action program. Of greatest concern is the reduction in unearmarked community action program funds, for it is this area of the program which permits local communities, the poor and their representatives, to assign priorities and to develop the most effective programs for their individual situations. I understand that there are now more than 1,000 community action agencies in the Nation, an increase of about 300 percent as compared to last year. And this means there will be even less money available than last year, resulting in a curtailment or elimination of existing projects.

Another important change is needed if we are to achieve a truly workable program this next year. Under the bill before us, the present 90 percent Federal share for the community action program will be cut to 80 percent on June 30, 1967. This is a most disheartening provision, for many communities have found it difficult or impossible to contribute even a 10-percent share. I strongly urge a revision of this provision, to postpone the reduction from 90 percent for at least another year, to June 30, 1968.

With the amendments I have outlined briefly, I believe we would achieve a far more effective and realistic antipoverty program. "Penny wise and pound foolish" is an axiom that might well apply here, for if we fail to provide adequate funds for next year we may lose many of the gains made and much of the momentum achieved to date.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, the city of Newark has a most successful antipoverty program. We are ready to continue, and both the United Community Corp. and the representatives of the poor were appalled at the prospect that the proposed level of funds will not be increased. They determined to act.

From this determination developed Operation Concern, which was carried out most successfully yesterday, with great credit to all who participated.

In Operation Concern officials of the UCC, headed by Mayor Hugh Addonizio, led a delegation of more than a thousand concerned citizens of Newark to Washington to peaceably demonstrate the need for an increase in funds and other changes in the pending antipoverty bill.

Mayor Addonizio and Dean Willard C. Heckel, president of the UCC; Timothy Still and Willie Wright, both vice presidents of the UCC; and Donald Wendell, UCC acting executive director, met with Presidential Special Assistant Henry Wilson. Other delegation officials met with OEO Director Sargent Shriver and with representatives of the following agencies involved in the program: the Department of Labor; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and the Department of Commerce.

Later the entire delegation of more than a thousand gathered in the Cannon Building caucus room to be briefed on the results of these meetings. I would like also to include with my remarks a news story from the Newark News of September 26 describing Operation Concern.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was proud to welcome the delegation from Operation Concern. And when the day's activities were over, I was even more proud of the citizens of Newark who took part in it.

The people of Newark who paraded before the White House and who gathered a thousandfold in the caucus room made their point. But most important, they made it with order, restraint, and great dignity. Their peaceful but effective demonstration was an outstanding example of the benefits of our antipoverty program. And, even more, it was an example of why we must continue and expand this vital program.

The article referred to are as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star Ledger, Sept. 23, 1966]

A MISSION OF CONCERN

The United States is engaged in two conflicts, both intimately concerned with freedom and human dignity.

One, unfortunately, is a destructive force, the brutal element of warfare where violence replaces man's reason.

The other, fortunately, has the basic element of being constructive, a massive social effort of human renewal, the restoration of dignity in the midst of grinding poverty.

They are both, in a sense, wars in behalf of human decency, one involving basic human rights of freedom and self-determination, the other economic and social, instruments that have the potential of replacing despair with hope.

The war in Vietnam and the war against poverty are linked on the federal legislative level by a common bond, the resources of the American nation, the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world, to underwrite these massive efforts.

The conflict in Vietnam is a depressingly debilitating drain on the national economy, one that already threatens to impair the urgently-needed vitality of the war on poverty. There is the additional complication of inflationary perils, creating a restive economy and a legislative reluctance to deal firmly and forthrightly with pressing social problems.

The war on poverty is in a moment of crisis . . . ironically at a stage where it has begun to establish a determined capacity to deal with one of mankind's oldest and most frustrating problems . . . the sector of deprived citizens.

This is the critical stage, the crucial point where the anti-poverty program can broaden its horizons and push back the shadows of human deprivation. It can go upward and onward . . . or plummet to a disaster of negation because of the lack of legislative vision in providing sufficient funds to maintain and expand anti-poverty programs.

The plight of the anti-poverty program is reflected, in its frankest dimension, by the dire, bleak future confronting the United Community Corp., a Newark agency that was among the first in the country to engage in the battle against human denial, the pockets of poverty in the midst of plenty.

It was a brave, earnest effort by the pioneering UCC; the first strange, halting steps have been firmed by experience and the substantial results achieved in its short tenure. It was an experience honed by the fire of differences in approach and organization, the natural outgrowth of any group engaged in a new venture.

Now the UCC has the sinews of stability, the capacity to implement and expand programs that have had far-reaching effect in maintaining a tranquil atmosphere of racial unity, a phenomenon in a nation wracked by unrest and violence.

But now this is threatened by an intolerable fiscal short-sightedness, a drastic curtailment of urgent programs and the abandonment of new programs. A UCC official says the agency will need $9 million to operate existing programs this year; its guideline (budget) has been set at $3.5 million. This is totally inadequate, falling far short of minimal requirements.

The Newark project is a microcosm of the fiscal despair facing the national antipoverty program. What is happening in Newark ripples out with depressing effect in other large urban centers confronted with similar straitened circumstances in the antipoverty fight.

The UCC is forming a caravan of concerned persons who will travel to Washington Monday to urge congressional leaders to allocate a minimum of $2 billion for the national

anti-poverty program. The House has before it a $1.75 billion recommendation from its Education and Labor Committee. A Senate committee has proposed a $2.5 billion budget for the Office of Economic Opportunity, the federal anti-poverty agency.

A concerned Mayor Addonizio termed the proposed House appropriation for the anti-poverty program as woefully inadequate. He cautioned that the lower figure would "force cuts" in a number of Newark programs.

"And I could not permit a reduction in a program as vital as that run by the Pre-School Council," the mayor asserted.

It is against this backdrop of municipal concern that the UCC will carry its case to the nation's capital.

The UCC delegation is a group of thoughtful, perceptive persons deeply concerned with the social implications of a restrictive federal effort in this vital field. Last night the board of trustees voted 26 to 7 to mount a demonstration Monday afternoon in Washington. The form it will take is yet to be decided. The delegation will understand however that anything other than an orderly demonstration can only undo the best intentions of this worthwhile mission.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Sept. 26, 1966]

WHITE HOUSE MARCH FOR POVERTY FUNDS

(By Douglas Eldridge)

WASHINGTON.—Hundreds of persons from Newark marched outside the White House today to demand the expansion of the war on poverty.

The group paraded back and forth in front of the executive mansion after arriving in a caravan of 19 chartered buses from Newark on a one-day expedition to seek increased federal aid for the city.

The demonstration came after delegations headed by Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio and other civic leaders had told Sargent Shriver, director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, and Henry Wilson, an assistant to President Johnson, that Newark's future peace and progress depends on additional anti-poverty aid.

VERY PROUD

The mayor told Shriver that Newark is "very proud of our record . . . it is one of the few major cities in the nation that has not had any racial conflict." But, Addonizio said, failure to increase antipoverty activity "could lead to something none of us want to see take place."

Shriver told the 25-member group from Newark that he was "excited and pleased" at their appeal and suggested they put pressure on Congress to give more money to OEO. "We're spending our time night and day to get the message you've given to me over to them," Shriver declared.

The Newark delegation told Shriver and Wilson it would be disastrous to cut back any of the $7 million in programs already underway in Newark.

Most of the day's schedule had to be hastily reshuffled because the caravan from Newark arrived after 2 p.m., two hours later than expected. Large numbers of policemen, cameramen and spectators were on hand for the demonstrtaion.

The expedition was organized by the United Community Corp., the Newark anti-poverty agency, to seek increased federal spending to combat urban problems.

The mayor and the five UCC leaders told Wilson at a White House meeting that it would be dangerous to cut back programs already under way in Newark. They also said Newark should receive special consideration as one of the few major cities to escape racial violence.

GET ASSURANCE

Wilson assured the group its views would be conveyed to the President—he was preoccupied with West German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard and unable to see the Newark group—and would be given "respectful consideration" when the new federal budget is drawn up.

Wilson also said the President is "very firmly and deeply interested in seeing the (antipoverty) program enacted as he sent it to Congress."

The mayor said "it would be very hard for us to live" under a $1.75 billion antipoverty appropriation now pending in the House and Newark would be "far happier" with a $2.5 billion Senate bill. He also urged Wilson "to convey to the President our concern about the curtailment of programs we already have in being."

HAS PETITIONS

Willie Wright, a vice president of UCC, presented petitions with more than 12,000 signatures to Wilson. The petitions urged the President and Congress "to wage a real war on poverty."

Two early buses with an advance delegation of 102 from Newark did not arrive until 10 a.m., nearly two hours behind schedule. The early group fanned out to various federal agencies for conferences on programs affecting Newark.

At the White House meeting, C. Willard Heckel, dean of Rutgers Law School and president of UCC, said the federal government should pour resources into peaceful cities like Newark "rather than reward communities like Los Angeles after there has been a blowup."

Timothy Still, another UCC vice president, and chairman of today's expedition, told Wilson: "If we don't get help, the City of Newark is in trouble and the whole country is in trouble . . . you will let down all segments of the community if you do not do something about this problem."

Wilson told the group he expects "a long acrimonious debate" about the antipoverty bill in the House, and he made no predictions about its fate.

After a month of planning, UCC leaders hope a large, diverse and orderly turnout will make Washington aware of the city's needs and its determination to improve itself.

New Jersey poverty officials say the House measure would force a cutback in many programs, and would thwart involvement of the poor. The Senate measure, they contend, would provide the minimum of relief from big-city ills.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY].

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I have listened with interest to much of the criticism of this program. I am very happy to say I come from a district and from a metropolitan area in which our experience has not been checkered with failures of administration. On the contrary, there has been very strong citizen participation and response to this program. We are getting results.

I believe the existence of this program in metropolitan Atlanta has meant the difference between possible social chaos and the constructive situation which we see. I just had lunch with Mr. Jim Furniss, vice president of one of our major banks, who is chairman of the Community Council of Metropolitan Atlanta, which is a permanent conference of all the social work groups in our five-county area.

Without first stating anything about my view of this program, I asked this banker how he would vote if he were a Member of Congress. Without reservation, he said, "I would support it."

I said, "Will you tell me why?" He said, "Because I think that this program is an expression of the Christian ethic at work; that a man is not something to be thrown away." He said, "Many of the social programs I have seen working during my adult life have been addressed to the symptoms and have not gotten at the causes of dependency." He said that based on his experience in working closely with the Atlanta community he had seen this program work effectively in eliminating causes of dependency, and for that reason he believed in it.

We have had people from outside of our community come in and deliberately seek to foment strife. They have really been rejected. They were rejected because of the fact, as he put it, that there was reason for hope among the most depressed people in our community. The community service centers under the community action program were an important factor in stabilizing the strife torn communities.

Now, as a legislator, it seems to me I have to pass on the theory of the legislation. I am not in the executive department. We cannot expect perfection overnight. However, I applauded this legislation when it was passed before I came to the Congress and I am very proud of the role that the gentleman from Georgia, PHIL LANDRUM, the dean of our delegation, had in providing leadership for the passage of this program at that time. I supported the 1965 amendments and appropriations.

I have not seen it as a program that could be completed or even be made successful in a period of 24 months. I think if it can do 50 percent of what it intends to do in 24 years, it would still be a program worthy of our support.

So I have heard this chorus of complaint and confusion, but I can testify that throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia this program is making headway. I have examined the Headstart, the Upward Bound, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other programs and found them valuable. I will support amendments that I think would strengthen this program or eliminate abuses in it, but most of the abuses I hear of are in the administration and not in the law.

I asked this banker one other question. I said, "There is a proposal to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity and fragment this program. Would you support that?" He said, "I can think of no greater mistake. Because of the urgency we must have coordinated leadership. I feel this very strongly based on my observations." So, as the freshman Congressman from the State of Georgia, I commend this legislation and support it without apology. Every constituent I have talked to who has heard out the basic theory of the legislation said that this theory is right. I say that this is the job of Congress, to pass the law and then do our best to see that we get it properly administered.

There is one other thing about this program that I like, and that is the local participation. We have it. We get to

judge what is being done and what programs are to be activated or ended. This is a grassroots program, which I respect. This is an effort to make our religious pronouncements and political declarations meaningful.

The provision for economic opportunity is the way men and women can become productive and fully participating citizens of our country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, every intelligent and thinking person would concede that every practical effort should be made to eliminate poverty. I do not wish to belabor the evidence of waste and poor administration found in much of the existing antipoverty program, which I believe is inherent in the present legislation. The program should have been approached through pilot projects to eliminate these weaknesses; and it should have been coordinated with the fiscal and employment aspects of our war efforts.

False and unattainable hopes have been raised by the so-called antipoverty program. This, in fact, has contributed more than any other single factor to the riots and unrest among the underprivileged of our country. It is impossible to legislate self-respect. Since, even befor this legislation passed, few in our country lacked food, clothing, or housing, then poverty has not been so much a lack of money, as a lack of attained personal dignity. This must be earned by the individual or the group. Our efforts should therefore be to substitute for the dole or handout, instead of this the attainment of self-help through broadened opportunity, primarily for jobs. Only the business sector of our country can do this adequately.

Laws and appropriations can help through tax incentives, retraining programs, vocational education, and training programs.

The private or business sector must produce the vast number of jobs needed if we are to retain a free society with maximum opportunities for everyone to achieve his greatest potential. It is much easier to finance this free enterprise type of solution for our underprivileged because it is the business sector that pays taxes. And not the Government, which must get its revenue from the private sector of the economy. Of course, there may always be a few people who will not carry the load they can. And as to them it is difficult to determine what incentives can be offered; but it is worth our efforts and best thinking.

Mr. Chairman, I have two bills pending in the House which I believe would serve as a vehicle to help with the poverty problem in this country. They are based on the theory of self-help and that the private sector of our society should be encouraged to create jobs rather than the Government.

One bill, H.R. 6872, would provide assistance to individuals with low incomes by reducing the amount of income tax on individuals, helping to eliminate the need for handouts from the Federal Government. The other, H.R. 271, would provide deductions for persons engaged in trade or business who provide new jobs for the skilled and for all persons who provide new jobs for domestics and the unskilled. I believe these bills would create self reliance and help stimulate job opportunities and thus greatly serve to cure the poverty problem.

The high hopes of the so-called antipoverty program have been too well promoted and too well publicized and too slow in achieving the overnight success that has been promised by the promoters. This bombast over the program I am sure has led directly to some of this rioting and lawbreaking by individuals across the country. The free enterprise system can better do the job of lifting Americans from poverty, and I hope more emphasis will be given to the private sector in this poverty war to assure good management, fiscal integrity, and solid permanent results. Finally, it should be noted that the self-help, free enterprise type of solution has real hope of lifting individual dignity, which is not likely in the charity or dole approach.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard today the rather serious charge of "profiteering" leveled at private industries engaged in work with the poverty program, particularly in the operation of the Job Corps. I would like to read a quote to you:

> We like to think that stepping up to the challenge of our society is part of our business . . . what we see in Clinton is a chance to contribute to our society, a chance to help some people lead more useful and economically independent lives, and a chance to learn something important ourselves.

This statement was made not by an idealistic educator or social worker but by a hardheaded businessman, Gerald L. Phillippe, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co.

Mr. Phillippe's remarks are typical of the view taken by some of the largest and most distinguished firms in the Nation which have taken on the responsibility of operating Job Corps centers.

The business firms now involved in such operations read like a who's who of American business.

Why are they involved? I think Mr. Phillippe's remarks are indicative of the reason. They certainly are not doing it for profit, when the fixed fee is around 4 percent and they could make much more in other types of operations; they also run the risk of unfavorable publicity.

But the leaders of American business and industry have been willing to accept the low return and to run the risk of poor publicity. They feel they have an obligation to help find the means of training and educating the underprivileged school dropouts, to help make self-sustaining wage earners and taxpayers and good citizens of them. In short, the leaders of American business have committed themselves and their vast resources to a crucial role in the war on poverty.

In addition to General Electric, the following companies now are involved in Job Corps center operations: Litton Industries, Inc., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Graflex, Inc., a subsidiary of General Precision Equipment, Science Research Associates, an affiliate of IBM, U.S. Industries, Inc., Northern Natural Gas Co., Federal Electric Corp., an affiliate of ITT, Ford Motor Co.'s Philco Corp., Thiokol Chemical Corp., RCA Service Co., a division of RCA, Brunswick Corp., Avco Corp., Training Corp. of America, an affiliate of Westinghouse Air Brake Co., Burroughs Corp., Packard Bell Corp., and Xerox Corp.

Mr. Chairman, this is a remarkable and inspiring testament to American business and industry, and a major reason why the Job Corps is making such progress toward overcoming poverty. Mr. Chairman, I hail these outstanding firms, and call upon my colleagues to vindicate their magnificent effort.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 310]

Adair	Fogarty	Nedzi
Albert	Fulton, Tenn.	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Garmatz	O'Brien
Andrews, Glenn	Gilligan	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Gray	O'Konski
Aspinall	Greigg	Olsen, Mont.
Barrett	Griffiths	Philbin
Berry	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Bingham	Hansen, Idaho	Poage
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Pool
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Boland	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Bow	Hébert	Resnick
Callaway	Herlong	Rivers, S.C.
Carey	Holifield	Robison
Carter	Howard	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	Irwin	Roncalio
Clark	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
Clevenger	Keogh	Scott
Cooley	King, N.Y.	Sickles
Corman	Kirwan	Smith, Calif.
Craley	Kluczynski	Steed
Cramer	Landrum	Stephens
Daddario	McClory	Sweeney
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Derwinski	McVicker	Thompson, N.J.
Dickinson	Macdonald	Toll
Diggs	Mailliard	Van Deerlin
Donohue	Martin, Ala.	Vanik
Dorn	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Duncan, Oreg.	Meeds	White, Idaho
Dyal	Miller	Whitten
Evans, Colo.	Monagan	Willis
Everett	Morrison	Wilson, Bob
Farbstein	Morse	Wilson, Charles H.
Fisher	Moss	Wright
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	
	Murray	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 321 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM].

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because I want to talk

about the relative cost aspect of the social program about which we are talking today, the economic opportunity program, because I am quite interested in it, and I believe in its concept. I believe in its approach.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that over the course of the years we have, as a Nation, and in our communities, seen the growth of a vicious cycle—the cycle of welfare generation after welfare generation. I believe that we have to start now to begin to break that cycle. Many of the people that we are helping in the Job Corps, Headstart, and in the other programs that we have in operation under this overall program, in my opinion, are going to help to break that cycle.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that we shall be 100 percent successful. But I say we are making a start toward the solution of this problem, because I believe through our legislative process, must be concerned with providing educational and productive opportunities for all citizens. I believe we have to create the stimulus with which to provide taxpayers and not taxeaters. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a clear-cut choice. There are two ways in which to accomplish this purpose—the conventional welfare cycle, which tends to tax most heavily our local communities, and the imaginative approach of this economic opportunity program. I shall recite a few facts and figures, to show the contrast, to show to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union the difference between the two choices that we have.

Mr. Chairman, what are the actual costs today of the different institutions that are maintained and located in the State of Michigan?

Today, for example, in our penal institutions it costs us $1,500 a year for the maintenance of one inmate.

Yet we also find that many of the inmates in the penal institutions have families, whose care must be provided by ADC or who are on the welfare rolls.

And, Mr. Chairman, in our Michigan penal institutions approximately one-half of the inmates have families in this situation.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, another fact that we have to consider, besides the maintenance of the individual who is confined to an institution, is the basic cost of bricks and mortar to provide beds for these inmates initially.

Today in our State if you have to build a maximum security institution, the cost per bed—and listen to this—the construction cost per bed unit in my State for a maximum security institution is $15,000.

Mr. Chairman, we have just completed building in the State of Michigan what is known as a medium security institution which cost us $6 million for 600 beds, or an average cost of $10,000 per bed.

Mr. Chairman, in the population of our penal institutions we are receiving each year an average of between 3,500 and 4,000 new persons. Ten percent of these new inmates cannot read or write. They represent an average age of 24 years, and the average grade placement of these people is the fifth grade.

I would just like to give you one other figure to think about, that if we have to put in our penal institutions a person today in a maximum security bed, it costs us $15,000 for the bed, $1,500 for the individual and $1,866.24 for the ADC family—which is for only an average family of four, which totals $18,366.24. But if that person is a repeater and stays in that penal institution for the average of 10 additional years, we have to add at least another $40,000 for the care, maintenance, and support of that individual for the other 10 years which brings it to a total of over $58,000, for one inmate alone. To claim, as have some of my colleagues, that the cost of supporting one young man in the Job Corps is more than a Harvard education, is simply misleading. I say that our investment in a young person at this critical stage of development is an investment against the $58,000 we may have to pay later if this young person becomes a ward of society. Some of my colleagues seem to favor a "bypass now, pay later" approach to serious social questions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like also to turn to the mental health area, and talk about some of the costs in the field of mental health. In some of these areas about which we are talking there is a definite relationship between early preventive steps and later mental health, where we have such programs as Headstart designed to build strong citizens and to detect at an early age possible danger signs.

At present, we do not treat mental illness until it degenerates to the point that people become wards of mental institutions for the rest of their natural lives.

Today in our State the average cost per person confined to our mental health institutions is, for food, clothing and medicine, $8.50 a day. This equals $3,102.50 per year per individual. Yet the total cost of treating people who are mentally ill and mentally retarded in our State alone for this fiscal year is $120 million for some 31,000 persons. This figures out to a cost total which is a little less than $4,000 a year. The other thing you must remember is that most of these persons who are there—and I am talking about the hard core persons—are the ones who are going to stay there. This figure of $4,000 will be for every year of the rest of their lives—calculated even at today's costs.

What I am saying here to my colleagues is that we can take a look at these kinds of costs, what it costs us to leave a person in a penal institution, to build a bed for him, or to keep a person in a mental health institution, plus the welfare costs that emanate from those two causes, or we can take the broader and more essential approach of trying to provide educational training facilities to help uplift those individuals first so that they can help themselves.

We have had the attitude for years that we should and could get by in these areas as cheaply as possible. But the cheapest way is not always the best way to do it.

I say to you that the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Headstart program are the right start and right way to go. I say to you that the cost we pay today in order to be able to give a person a basic opportunity to become a taxpayer instead of a taxeater, is the right way to go. For that reason, I support the continuation of this program.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] such time as he may consume.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, at least 150 small farms in the Harrison section of Boone and surrounding counties in northwest Arkansas are going to have market and cannery facilities this year for their fruit and vegetable crops, entirely because of financing found available under this economic opportunity program.

A cooperative market center is going to be built in Harrison under a $26,000 loan that will be closed this week. It will serve as a central outlet, badly needed for a long time, for the produce of 100 farms brought in during the fruit and vegetable harvest weeks of the late summer and fall.

The farmers in this North Arkansas Farmers Marketing Association are hard-working people whose earnings, with facilities available to them up to now, have ranged from modest to meaker.

Individually they could not establish this kind of market; but grouping together, they can. It will be an asset to the farmers, to the consumers who patronize the market, and to the city of Harrison where it is operated.

There is every reason to believe this market will be as solvent, the loan financing it as sound, as the very successful St. Francis County vegetable growers co-op market, now operating for the second year in another part of our State.

Again in Boone County north of Harrison, an economic opportunity loan is insuring the presence of a canning plant to serve 50 small farms that otherwise would have no cannery for handling their tomato crops.

Smaller projects around our district offer more examples of the sound and practical wisdom of this program:

A loan of $3,450 has set up a small sawmill in Madison County where three families can process the lumber they are producing on several hundred wooded acres under an approved timber management plan.

In Van Buren County, three potato farmers, none of whom could alone afford to buy a potato digger machine, have formed a co-op that has taken out a $3,000 economic opportunity loan for a machine all three can share.

These are examples of how this program is being applied in the hill country of Arkansas to put equipment and facilities into the hands of rural people who want to work, who can work their way forward and earn a better standard of living for their families. They will accomplish this, if the opportunity to get the wherewithal, in terms of tools and supplies and marketing outlets, is provided.

No cash goes to these people from the Treasury; only the tools to work with,

the outlets for their homegrown and homemade products.

In all of Arkansas since January of last year, economic opportunity loans totaling $2 million have been made for such purposes to 1,322 rural families, both for farm and nonfarm lines of work, plus upwards of $300,000 to 48 rural cooperatives ranging in membership from 3 to more than 100 families.

In the rural areas where these loans are doing their work, I can assure the House that a dollar never went further to create economic opportunity for the family that wants to earn its way, and to ease the hardship of rural people trapped by circumstances at a substandard level of income.

These loans are competitive with no other financing enterprise. Everything they create in terms of added family earning power, increased employment and more business activity in the rural community is looked upon as a tremendous new-found asset for progress in the rural areas.

This program is a prime example of helping people to help themselves.

The returns from this very small part of the economic opportunity budget may well be the most immediately perceptible and measurable gains of the whole operation. It would be hard to find a program better justified on the basis of tangible returns to the people, the community, and the Nation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this bill represents the absolute minimum effort this country can expend if we are to continue the war on poverty at any meaningful level. The simple fact is that $1.75 billion is not enough to expand and strengthen our poverty programs as fully and effectively as they should be. There is ample evidence in the committee's hearings and in the field reports from many areas of the country, including my own, that the real requirement is for an effort two or three times this size.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, because opponents of this measure have indicated that they will try to cut even this minimum figure by 10 percent or more. They suggest that we cannot afford both guns and butter and that action against poverty should be delayed or deferred.

I cannot agree that the war on poverty is not a priority matter.

With fully one-fifth of our people sinking or struggling in the quicksand of poverty, a dangerous situation exists. Budget reductions at their expense would be false economies indeed. The war on poverty has already won some important battles. It has alerted the conscience of the country to the problems of poverty, and it has plotted strategies of how best to destroy its root causes.

Further, it has mobilized individual citizens, private organizations and public agencies in a nationwide effort to help the poor help themselves. In less than 2 years there have been over 300,000 volunteers in Headstart programs. Over 90,000 citizens, rich and poor, have served on community action boards; 350,000 teenagers have applied to the Job Corps; 10,000, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish and Negro women have worked through their own volunteer organizations, Women in Community Service, and over 50,000 have applied for service in the Domestic Peace Corps, or VISTA.

In terms of the impact on the poor, the poverty program has already made progress. And again I have seen evidence of this in my own district. More than 3 million poor people have received direct benefits in jobs, training, and other kinds of services. Nearly 75,000 part-time and full-time jobs have been created and filled exclusively by the poor.

And may I say as an aside, Mr. Chairman, only this last weekend in my district the community organized for the first time in its history what was known as a Job Fair, in which the employers in our district sought out those semiskilled and unskilled who need employment. It has been accomplished with great results.

Nearly 750,000 part-time and full-time jobs have already been created and filled exclusively by the poor. Over 1,360,000 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children have enrolled in Headstart classes, and again from my own experiences in observing what is going on in my own district, this, in itself, is an inspiring development.

More than 1 million teenagers have been provided with jobs through Neighborhood Youth Corps centers.

Most of you know in terms of my career in the House of Representatives I have had a longtime interest in the problems of the migrants, and if I contribute nothing else to this debate, I want to tell you something about what is happening concerning the migrant under the poverty program.

A little-noticed, but most important aspect of the war on poverty, is the assistance to migrant farm workers provided by title III–B of this act. This is the first time that the United States has had a national program directed specifically at migrants, and it is sorely needed. As Noel H. Klores, the Director of OEO's migrant workers program, has pointed out, the problem of migrant workers is virtually the same today as it was when John Steinbeck wrote his famous "Grapes of Wrath" in 1939. Migrant workers are the poorest of the poor, in spite of what we are doing in this day and in this period. They do not vote and no one represents them. Their children commonly do not go to school—they work alongside their parents in the fields. Child labor laws frequently are not enforced.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota briefly, for I do not have much time.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask two questions. Are there any of these poor people who now have jobs and are no longer in poverty? Second, what is your view of the report of the investigation stating that there was not adequate participation at the policy level?

Mr. COHELAN. In response to the gentleman's first question, the war on poverty programs have reached 8 million poor people. I cannot cite exact figures for all of these programs but from my own experience I know that the Job Corps program at Pleasanton, Calif., has an excellent record of placing its graduates in useful and productive jobs.

In response to the second point, I think it is worth noting, as I have already pointed out, that 90,000 citizens have served on local community action boards. Certainly, more can be done to involve the poor, but I think this fact is well known and that we are making progress in this direction.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman put in the RECORD under leave to extend the names of the people involved?

Mr. COHELAN. I am pleased to report to the gentleman that the Job Corps camp at Pleasonton has graduated approximately 800 young men. Of this number, Litton Industries, which is the sponsoring institution, reports that to its specific knowledge 635 have been placed in jobs, which, I might add, all pay more than the newly established minimum wage. The remaining 235 returned home and their placement is being handled locally.

I am also pleased to tell the gentleman that of the 635 graduates, 370 have been placed in jobs in industry; 23 have school jobs; and 242 are either in military service, working for the Federal Government, or in civilian employment for the armed services.

The lowest wage being paid any of these 635 graduates is $1.81 an hour and the highest figure, as far as I know, is $2.85 an hour. So it should be very clear that these young men have moved out of poverty and are contributing to our national growth and effort.

Now I want to finish my discussion of the migrant program in the minute or two that I have left.

In the 2 years since its enactment, the poverty program has provided over $26 million in grants to States where there are substantial numbers of migrants. In California, this money has been translated into temporary shelter units during peak harvest seasons. These units are literally putting roofs over the heads of thousands of families who previously lived in the open, on irrigation ditch banks, under bridges and in desert canyons. Other features of the program are day care and other educational services at isolated camps throughout the State. These programs are broadening the horizons of thousands of children whose development has been seriously handicapped.

The need for and the response to these OEO programs, in my State, have been both encouraging and pathetic. There are long waiting lists of migrant families who want shelter. When a camp was opened in Riverside County early this year, it filled up its accommodations for 80 families within 2 days, and 111 families were turned away during the first month for lack of additional space. And this situation is typical of what has been happening all over the State.

Mr. Chairman, the history of legislative attempts to ease the burdens of this country's migrant workers has been

characterized by inertia and indifference. Over 300 bills to assist migrant farmworkers have been introduced over the years. A mere 24 of these ever were reported to the House, and only 2 were ever passed before the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

With this program we are taking practical and long-needed steps to eliminate the poverty that has all too frequently characterized the migrant farmworkers' way of life. These efforts to aid our fellow citizens must not be allowed to falter. We have made a beginning, but the area of need is so great, and so long neglected, that we must do more.

Mr. Chairman, this bill places priority attention on programs of demonstrated value—Headstart, work experience, and Neighborhood Youth Corps. The judgment of the committee that these programs should be increased is borne out by their effectiveness in my own district.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a case in point. Five recent enrollees of a project sponsored by the Oakland Unified School District have graduated to full-time jobs. Thirty-two trainees of an Oakland Economic Development Council program transferred to the Job Corps for long-term training. Twenty-two more recently enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Act programs, 11 are going back to school and 1 has been accepted in a 4-year apprenticeship training program. Forty enrollees of an Alameda County Central Labor Council program have recently undertaken the construction of a new sheltered workshop for the Retarded Children's Association.

These, it is true, are only a relatively few cases, but they are indicative of the progress that is being made. The fact that more communities than ever before are planning to begin Neighborhood Youth Corps programs this year is another indication.

But in the process of supporting these programs, which generally enjoy broad community support, let us not neglect other more controversial programs which are part of our war on poverty.

The Job Corps, for example, is designed to give young people a chance to escape from the vicious cycle of poverty.

The camp at Pleasanton in Alameda County, Calif., has demonstrated that it is possible to take young men from crippling environments and put them in wholesome settings where they receive a blend of useful work, job training, and basic education. The result at Pleasanton has been graduates who are better able to earn a living and to play a useful role in society.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to emphasize that the war on poverty is far from won. Our enemy defies simple definition or rapid destruction. Poverty is characterized by physical and mental disease, delinquency and crime, high infant mortality, crowded slums and riots in city streets. Poverty is an environment, and we must attack it from its every aspect. Our problems are in education and in housing, they are in creating jobs and in training workers with appropriate skills, they are in health and they are in the attitudes of men. These problems are all-encompassing, and our attack must be equal in nature.

For the one-fifth of our people who live in poverty, the American dream has become a nightmare where it is a struggle merely to exist and an almost unattainable goal to maintain a standard of living commensurate with human dignity.

Our continuing objective should be a society where the young have an opportunity to learn, the able bodied an opportunity to work, and where all have an opportunity to live in decency and dignity. The war on poverty offers a means to achieve that goal. It must be pursued with determination and resourcefulness.

I urge that this bill be passed without weakening amendments, as a measure of our responsibility to this Nation and to that one-fifth of its people who are today unable to participate in its prosperity and productive growth.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN].

(On request of Mr. GIBBONS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FOUNTAIN was allowed to proceed out of order.)

RECOVERY OF GRANT OVERPAYMENTS PROHIBITED BY UNDESIRABLE PROVISION IN HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time to speak, because if this legislation passes, he may need some of the money which is about to be given away by the appropriations bill now being acted on in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I am greatly concerned by the language of section 205 in H.R. 14745, the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, as reported on September 22 by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Section 205, as amended by the committee, would violate established Public Health Service policy and is contrary to principles of good administrative management. Consequently, I want to inform my colleagues of the content of that section so the House will be prepared to take appropriate action in the event the other body fails to delete the new language from the bill.

Section 205 would prohibit the use of appropriated funds for the recovery of payments which exceed the actual indirect costs associated with research, training, and demonstration grants made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such overpayments by the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service have been substantial, and they have been the subject of considerable investigative effort by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. That investigation has begun to produce corrective action on the part of the Public Health Service.

In reports issued in 1961 and 1962—House Reports 321 and 1958—the Government Operations Committee identified and proposed steps for correcting administrative weaknesses found in NIH's management of research grants. In its June 1962 report, the committee specifically recommended that NIH pay no more than the actual indirect cost rate for any institution having a lower rate than the maximum established by the Congress. This report was made after subcommittee hearings which demonstrated that some grantees, contrary to the intent of Congress, were deriving a profit from the indirect cost reimbursement—15 percent of total direct project costs—then being paid by NIH.

As a result of the committee's report, the Public Health Service acted to recover overpayments made to an organization which had received sizable NIH research grants—after these grants were audited for the committee by the Comptroller General—and the 1963 Appropriation Act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which increased the maximum indirect cost rate from 15 to 20 percent, specified that the Department was to allow no more than a grantee's actual rate if less than the statutory ceiling. The conference report of July 21, 1962, stated:

> The committee of conference desires that the Department carefully review the expenses incurred under research grants with a view to allowing no more than the actual expenses for indirect costs in cases where such indirect costs amount to less than 20 percent of the direct costs.

This limitation was subsequently spelled out by the Public Health Service in a policy statement—PPO No. 39—issued August 20, 1962, and all grantees were informed that overpayments resulting from the use of provisional rates would be subject to recapture by the Government.

Accordingly, the language proposed in section 205 is directly contrary to the stated intent of the committee of conference and the Congress in enacting the 1963 Appropriation Act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Beginning in March 1963, I carried on an extensive correspondence with the Surgeon General concerning excessive indirect cost payments by NIH, and the Public Health Service's responsibility for their recovery. My letters referred specifically to situations where the agency had entered into research contracts with grantee institutions on the basis of the latter's indirect cost rates determined by audit; in such cases both the Government and the institutions involved were in a position to know when a lower rate than the statutory maximum was applicable to grants.

It is my understanding that a substantial portion of the overpayments in question have already been recovered. However, the subcommittee's 1965 hearings showed that NIH continued to overpay certain grantees as late as fiscal year 1965. The overpayments occurring since fiscal year 1964 have not yet been computed in many cases and claims for their recovery, consequently, have not yet been instituted.

In the case of one large grantee organization, the Public Health Service's recovery of more than $412,000 in overpayments has not yet been finalized and could be affected by this bill. Prohibition of this and other sizable recovery actions would discourage the efficient administration of grant programs and would have a most unsettling effect on

the morale of conscientious management personnel.

In view of these circumstances, the enactment of section 205 of H.R. 14745 would substantially negate the work of the Committee on Government Operations for greater economy and efficiency in the administration of health research programs, and it would nullify the intent of the Congress with respect to the reimbursement of grantees for the indirect costs they actually incur in the performance of grant-supported research. Moreover, since most of the organizations and institutions which received overpayments have already repaid the Government, the bill would have the effect of rewarding those relatively few grantees which have not yet returned funds to which they were not entitled. These favored grantees would, in effect, receive a gift at the taxpayers' expense.

Contrary to the reasons given for the inclusion of this provision, the amounts involved in the overpayments in question are substantial and there would be no burdensome workload involved in their recovery. In fact, most of the work has already been accomplished and the remaining work would be principally a byproduct of the normal postaudit activities performed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 205 in its present form would also prohibit the use of appropriated funds for the recovery of interest earned by grantees on unused grant funds in their possession. This is contrary to the Public Health Service's formal regulations, which state:

52.43 Interest. Any interest earned through any deposit or investment by the grantee of the funds paid pursuant to 53.14 (e) shall be paid to the United States as such interest is received by the grantee.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot have good and rational government if Federal departments and agencies are forced to violate their formal regulations and policies, and are deterred from seeking economical and efficient administration by general provisions of an appropriations act. While the improper and wasteful expenditure of public funds is never defensible, such expenditure is especially ill advised at a time when we should be making every effort to economize on Government spending. I sincerely hope this matter will be properly dealt with in the other body so that further House action will not be required.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by our side to talk on title V, the work experience and training program, because this relates very closely to the work which is done in the Ways and Means Committee essentially in the area of unemployment insurance but also in this vast area we have of social security, which includes not only social insurance but also insurance for the disabled, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, old-age assistance, and so forth, the real area where welfare and jobs actually meet.

I want to stress that in the committee report, as well as in the minority report, there is emphasis on the great need for coordination between the various Government agencies charged with carrying out the various welfare and training programs and the programs themselves. This is the area, I might say, that I have had in mind earlier this year in talking about basic fiscal policies, that we could afford both guns and butter, back in January, but we could not afford rancid butter, meaning programs that were not well designed or which were duplicating or actually interfering with programs already in existence. This so-called war on poverty is certainly a hodgepodge.

Incidentally, in my own Committee on Ways and Means we consider unemployment insurance but we also have international trade matters under consideration. Yet we passed out the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1962 wherein we created the trade adjustment features which were duplicating and, in fact, disrupting the very programs we had set up under unemployment insurance.

So the keynote is indeed coordination. It is not really money that is needed. We are flooding the carburetor in our drive on poverty. It is coordination we need, not more money. In fact, I am certain that coordination would result in a decreased expenditure at least on the part of the Government, as well as much better performance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in listening to some of the general debate on this subject, one would have thought that until the Federal Government got into this so-called poverty war no one in our society had ever been paying any attention to it. As a matter of fact, I am sure that everyone here back in their own community work before they came to Congress, and probably even now, followed closely the work being done by the great variety of Community Chest agencies that we have and also the great church work that goes on and the work of all the nonprofit organizations as well as profit, I might add. I think the reports in the newspapers in way of criticism of the manner in which Government is moving into this program is reminiscent of Jane Addams "Hull House," of the early 1900's. This is an account of the social workers of that date combating the ward politician. All of this demonstrates the need for coordination by any Government program with our great private sector. Putting it another way, we need "jobs, not welfare." If we are not careful with our welfare programs, we can seriously damage the business of creating jobs and trying to get people to fill them. As I have been trying to point out, similarly in foreign trade, particularly in less developed countries, what we need is trade, not aid. This is the same thing. If we have our aid programs set up in disregard for people developing their own sound economics, we can badly interfere with the sound economic development of the less developed countries and in the long run do more damage to them and their people.

I do not need to list the variety of departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the so-called war on poverty—they are multitudinous, but I would like to relate our problem of lack of coordination here in Congress itself. The very fact that here I am, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, pointing out to the Committee of the Whole the vast areas we have to study which deal right with this very field which very properly the Committee on Education and Labor is reporting to us on in conjunction with this bill illustrates the point. But the subject matter is also under the purview of the Banking and Currency Committee which is heavy in the field of housing programs, urban development and other collateral programs to do with financing. The Agriculture Committee and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee get into so many complementary fields. This points out the need for us here in Congress to try to coordinate this variety of committee jurisdictional aspects dealing with the one great problem of jobs and welfare. If we would do some of this coordination here in Congress it would help.

I might go further and point out the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress made the recommendation which personally I disagreed with but I went along with because of other things, to separate the House Committee on Education and Labor into two committees. My argument was that this area needed more coordination and not less, because labor and education do move so closely together.

So the recommendations in title V of this bill—and this is an area for real judgment—are to transfer a good bit of this operation of work experience and training into the Department of Labor and take it out of the Welfare Section of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with that and, therefore, my side—those on the Committee on Education and Labor—have talked to me about my views on it, and I have been happy to say that I agreed. I believe this is a mistake and, therefore, I shall offer an amendment to help keep this program basically in HEW. That is why I am taking the time, preliminarily, to point out the intent and the context of this amendment.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Now, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri is a very prominent member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Personally, I feel that title V as now administered, by the delegation of authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has worked well. I feel that we are going to work a great hardship on needy people in certain areas of the country, particularly the rural areas, by this change, where we undertake to split up the functions of title V and transfer a portion of the training to the Department of Labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the history of title V, we added a category to the old-age-assistance group, the disabled, the assistance to the blind, and so forth, back in 1962, the jobless group.

Mr. Chairman, when we enacted the work experience and training title in 1964 we merely amended section 1115 of

the Social Security Act, by providing that persons who were primarily on relief, and other needy persons, should have useful work and training experience.

It is my point that those individuals will not receive training under the Manpower Development and Training Act at the present time and, if this change should remain in the bill, we will force them right back on relief instead of giving them some useful training and experience. I feel we should leave title V alone because the welfare departments are making progress in improving the program.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we had the facilities under the Manpower Development and Training Act and, if we had the money and had the classrooms as well as the teachers, I would say well and good. But all of us know that in every congressional district of this Nation today there are numerous proposals pending that cannot be funded. That is true in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. It is the history—well, these proposals have been worked out by our vocational people and the Manpower Development and Training Act people, and the employment offices. The employment offices want to maintain good relationships with their employers.

They take the cream of the crop, but the group with which we are attempting to deal is the jobless, people with a lot of children, people with very little education, if any, and people who have been unemployed for many years or perhaps never have been employed.

Mr. Chairman, it is this hard core of unemployables that we are trying to keep off relief through the provisions of title V, instead of pushing them back on relief.

Am I correct, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], indeed is correct, and I am most pleased to get that fine statement.

Mr. Chairman, this sets forth important questions about which I worry. This is an area of judgment.

Mr. Chairman, let me state to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that in St. Louis the Manpower Development Corp., a private corporation, is in charge of these OEO programs. So we do gear them in with the Community Chest agencies, and other private and local governmental programs.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I noticed with great pleasure was the establishment of area offices in Metropolitan St. Louis itself. They were able to persuade the USES—the U.S. Employment Service—which used to be housed totally in a central area, to move a modicum of their activities out in these regional areas. In doing so the Government employment agency has found a means of opening up opportunities to a lot of the unemployed who had never been involved heretofore. Indeed the employment office had never seen these people before. It was unaware of their existence. This points up the criticism I have directed against the USES for years. It has been concerning itself more and more with helping employers get employees and less and less with helping the jobless get employers. There are plenty of private employment agencies available to assist employers to get employees—increasingly, I might say, employees who already have jobs. The job-project private sector can handle this aspect of the employment problem more efficiently than Government and contribute to the tax base as well. Where the job-project private sector cannot operate so well is finding jobs for the jobless, particularly when the problem is not lack of jobs but lack of skills of the jobless to fill the jobs going begging.

With the area offices available these people would come into the welfare offices and be assisted. They could be referred over to the services of the USES at the same time and same place and be helped.

That is the very point. The aid to dependent children families are working out of poverty, hopefully, and out of welfare with the help of trained social workers. They need this guidance but they also need what jobs might be available which they possibly could fill.

Let me say something in defense of our trained social workers because there has been so much criticism against them. These are, by and large, splendid people. This is a splendid profession. Let us just not write off the work they do.

Now we are administering to families in this way. We are trying to get them back into the job market. But a great deal more has to be done for them like a rehabilitation person—who is trying to get back into the labor market, someone who has had a stroke or had a leg off or whatever it might be. This requires a lot of understanding way beyond the kind of services offered by the USES or any kind of services we really would want to have the USES get into.

These are the arguments and the reasons that lead me to support the way the program is operated now.

Let me say, I think title V is going along in the right way. There are still a lot of things that need to be worked out, but I think it is essentially sound.

Mr. PERKINS. I think we should not lose sight of the fact that title V is a new program. I agree with the gentleman that there is need for coordination. In fact, I feel the welfare departments of the various States of this country have done an excellent job.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to add the following points.

Coordination is badly needed between the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training in the Department of Labor and the vocational educational programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Here I have recommended for some time that the consolidation should be more closely oriented into the Department of Labor. I have gone through vocational educational high schools and other training schools and find sometimes in the same classroom students working under apprenticeship training programs along with students working under vocational educational programs. Vocational education is, or certainly should be, tied closely to jobs in being or jobs soon to open up.

Coordination is badly needed with the Defense Department's vocational education program, by far the largest in our society, inefficient, wastful of manpower, costly, doing basically a poor job for the Military Establishment and badly disrupting civilian educational programs. Certainly some good comes out of it—the military moves in a fashion and there is some lapover into the civilian sector, but for one-tenth the dollars spent twice the value could be received both to the military and to the civilian sector. Even now with a pinch in the labor market the old War Manpower Commission has not been reactivated to relate skills needed for defense with skills needed in uniform. Who even thinks in terms of the need for coordinating military vocational training with other training programs? Yet the need is obvious and great.

The manpower training program is still under wraps. The Department of Labor's top brass is stifling it apparently under orders for the top brass of the national labor leaders. Two basic things have been necessary to make the Manpower Development and Training Act program fulfill its potential and these two things were mandates in the act of 1962.

First. To update and keep up to date the dictionary of occupational titles. It should be looseleaf volumes to keep abreast of the technological advancements in our society. To do a good job of training and retraining we need nomenclature, and common nomenclature, for the skills and jobs in demand. Yet it was not until January of this year, 1966, that the 1949 edition of the dictionary was made available to the public. It is not looseleaf and it was out of date by the time it was published.

Second. To compile and publish a statistical and definitive series of jobs available. How can MDTA or OEO or any training program possibly operate with intelligence without the jobs available and unfilled, being compiled? Nothing is more heartsickening than to have young persons spend 2 years training only to find at the end of that time that the skills they have learned are obsolete or for other reasons unwanted in the labor market. Secretary Wirtz testified this year that it was Congress fault because Congress would not give him the $2,500,000 he said was necessary to do the job. However, the representative of the AFL-CIO testifying before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee said—as the sole witness opposing compiling and promulgating these statistics—that it would be misused into making the public believe unemployment was not a serious problem. I must conclude that it is not Congress but the administration which does not want the jobs-available statistics compiled or published.

We need the Human Investment Tax Credit Act to equalize the effects of the 7-percent investment tax credit for machinery so employers will spend money training men instead of being induced to replace them with new machinery—all

other things being equal. Today employers spend over $15 billion a year in training and retraining, but more needs to be done.

Finally I would point out the dangers which come from failing to do the structural job of training, retraining, and properly setting up welfare. We can corrupt many good economic programs such as employment insurance and MDTA into half-baked welfare programs, but even worse we invite the macroeconomists to trot forth unrealistic programs such as negative income tax or guaranteed wage to do away with all the structure we have established.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply want to conclude my observations, and I will extend my own remarks, to say that even if it does go this way, if the amendment I propose keeps it the way it is, I think we must all agree there must still be a lot of coordination and cooperation with the Department of Labor and with other departments and agencies as well.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri some questions since the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and has some special insight into matters related to this issue.

Is it not true that in the MDTA today throughout the country that we do not have funds to take care of this extra category and to train these hard-core unemployed; am I correct in that statement?

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is.

Let me say something on that point.

The MDTA to some degree came out of the Committee on Ways and Means hearings on extending unemployment insurance when this question came to our minds: What good does it do simply to extend the period that an unemployed person receives benefits beyond the point of 26 weeks or whatever it is, if at the end of that period he remains unemployed? Our reasoning was that it looked like what we needed to do was to, as early in the game as we could, get into retraining, a training process. It was at that point we, in effect, referred it over to your Committee on Education and Labor which points out the tie-in.

I also do agree with the gentleman that there has not been enough money in there to do the full job.

Mr. PERKINS. The theory of the work experience and training programs was to take people off relief and give them some type of work-associated training, enough basic education and other types of training so that they could become employable. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. That is exactly right.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the gentleman has had the opportunity to look into the statistics of title V to know that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have a good placement record.

Mr. CURTIS. They do indeed.

Mr. PERKINS. I know in my area 100 people have gone from the work experience and training program to employment with the Ford Motor Co. The Ford Motor Co. representatives did not come to the employment offices, they came down to where these people were working out on the job, and recruited them.

At this point I would like to present for the RECORD statistics supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on training and placement under title V and MDTA programs.

TITLE V STATISTICS

The following statistics pertain to trainees involved in Title V Training: Total training spaces planned, 65,300; total training spaces filled, 57,549 (88.1 percent); percent of nonwhite enrolled, 37.2 percent.

Breakdown by sex: Males, 54.8 percent; females, 45.2 percent.

	Percent
Breakdown by age:	
Under 21 years	3.4
21 to 39 years	58.3
40 to 49 years	24.0
50 to 64 years	14.1
65 years and over	0.2
Highest school grade completed:	
None	3.6
1st to 4th	16.9
5th to 7th	21.6
8th grade	15.4
9th to 11th grade	28.1
12th grade	12.8
More than 12th grade	1.6
Employment history: [1]	
Employed 6 months or more	63.3
Unemployed	26.2
Unknown	10.5
Training Occupations of all Title V Graduates (Cumulative through March 1966):	
Semiprofessional, technical, managerial	7.3
Clerical and sales	7.3
Services	21.9
Agriculture	7.4
Skilled	6.9
Semiskilled	25.9
Other	27.7

[1] Data for this item are not reported other than "employed 6 months or more."

As of May 1966, of the 93,000 persons participating in Title V projects, an estimated 35,400 terminated. Of this number 52 percent either obtained employment, completed training assignment or went on to more advanced training. About 40.6 percent left the project for a good reason (for example; medical, marriage and increased resources). Only 7.4 percent were drop-outs due to poor attendance, misconduct, lack of progress or dissatisfaction with the training program.

The average cost per trainee, including allowances: $1,257 in fiscal year 1965.

The current employment status of all persons completing Title V training was, as of March 1966:

[In percent]

	Employed	Unemployed	Status unknown
All trainees reporting	44.6	44.7	10.6
White	(1)	(1)	(1)
Negro	(1)	(1)	(1)
Male	(1)	(1)	(1)
Female	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

Public assistance status of title V trainees enrolled in training projects as of April 1966:

[In percent]

	Total	White	Nonwhite
Receiving assistance	72.2	(1)	(1)
Not receiving assistance	27.8	(1)	(1)

[1] Not available.

Of all trainees enrolled in title V projects during fiscal year 1966, 61.1 percent were from urban, and 38.9 percent from rural counties. Further breakdowns by sex and race are not available.

MDTA STATISTICS

The following statistics pertain to trainees involved in Institutional Training, and do not include those involved with on-the-job training. Figures are for calendar year 1965.

Total trainess authorized, 152,014; total trainees enrolled, 102,989 (67.7 percent); percent of nonwhites enrolled, 33.7 percent (31,765).

Breakdown by sex: males, 60 percent; females, 40 percent.

	Percent
Breakdown by age:	
Under 19 years	18.4
19 to 21 years	23.6
22 to 34 years	33.4
35 to 44 years	14.7
45 years and over	10.0
Highest school grade completed:	
Less than 8th grade	7.1
8th grade	9.9
9th to 11th grade	33.9
12th grade	41.3
More than 12th grade	5.9
Previous years of gainful employment:	
Under 3 years	42.8
3 to 9 years	34.9
10 years or more	22.4
Training Occupations of all MDTA Graduates (cumulative through August 1965):	
Semiprofessional, technical, managerial	6.9
Clerical and sales	23.8
Services	16.9
Agriculture	4.4
Skilled	27.0
Semiskilled	20.3
Other	.8

The cumulative completion rate of all MDTA graduates—i.e. the percentage of those who completed their training courses—as of April 30, 1966, was 77.1 percent. The drop-out percentage is therefore 22.9 percent.

The average cost per trainee, including allowances, for the past two years was: $1,456, in 1964, $1,900 in 1965.

The current employment status of all persons completing MDTA Institutional courses was, as of May 1, 1966:

[In percent]

	Employed	Unemployed	Withdrawn from labor force
All trainees reporting	75.4	15.9	8.6
White	77.5	13.8	8.7
Negro	70.5	22.1	7.6
Male	80.4	14.9	4.7
Female	70.2	17.1	12.8

Public assistance status of MDTA trainees enrolled in institutional projects during calendar year 1965:

[In percent]

	Total	White	Nonwhite
Receiving assistance	11.2	8.7	16
Not receiving assistance	88.8	91.3	84

Of all trainees enrolled in the institutional projects during calendar year 1965, 80.6 percent were from urban, and 19.4 percent from rural counties. Further breakdowns by sex and race are as follows:

[In percent]

	Urban	Rural
Male	56.7	69.1
Female	43.3	30.9
White	62.6	83.6
Nonwhite	37.3	16.4

Is it not a fact that throughout the country today we have some 3,200 counties but only have about 1,400 employment offices?

Mr. CURTIS. That is also true. This comes under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee for financing.

Mr. PERKINS. In certain areas some of these people, the downtrodden and the hard-core poor, would have to go 75 miles to find an employment office. Is it not also a fact that the work-experience program, since it is administered by the welfare agency, is in closer contact with trainees and their families because of having social workers in every county in the Nation?

Mr. CURTIS. That is very accurate. These, to me, are compelling arguments as to why there was wisdom in putting title V into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. PERKINS. And if we establish a cutoff date here for most of the hard-core unemployed, we are not doing anything more than destroying their hope, working at cross purposes in trying to eliminate poverty in this country, and pushing many persons needing work and training right back on relief. Am I correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Let me put it this way. I think you could do it the other way and not destroy their hope, but I would argue, for the reasons the gentleman has set forth, the net result could be that, because I do not think it would work as well that way. In fact, I see reasons why it could not work that way. In essence, I am in agreement. I just want to avoid a categorical position.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 15111 which would continue efforts to eliminate in our Nation the causes of economic deprivation and disadvantage. The program initiated by the Economic Opportunities Act have only been in operation for less than 2 years. Yet, in that time great benefits and accomplishments have resulted from the entirely new concepts and programs which are accepted terms in our every day language. Project Headstart is giving over one-half million deprived preschool children in almost 2,500 communities throughout the land an opportunity for success in education by eliminating the handicaps that they might otherwise carry with them throughout their elementary and secondary school experiences.

Approximately 1,200 communities have in operation Neighborhood Youth Corps programs providing 330,000 youngsters with work opportunities and income to assure their ability to continue their normal educational pursuits or to find employment with the skills with which training in the program has provided them. In 1100 institutions of higher education throughout the Nation income opportunities have been afforded needy students in the now well-known program referred to as the college work-study program.

These programs, Headstart, work-study, Neighborhood Youth Corps, have been publicly acclaimed, widely accepted and are indeed the success stories of the so-called war on poverty. This is true because in these programs we are attacking poverty and deprivation before it has a chance to affect the lives of youngsters, before poverty matures into despair, frustration, unemployment, dependency or delinquency.

Other aspects of the Economic Opportunities Act deserve the wholehearted approval of the Congress and forceful and effective administration by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the other Federal agencies playing roles in these programs. I personally feel that Sargent Shriver has done an excellent job in administering the programs. The work experience and training program thus deals with a more troublesome aspect of the war on poverty in attempting to reach the hard core of our unemployed—the long-term unemployed head of a family, the widow with a large family, the middle-aged unemployed and unskilled throughout the Nation. Whether it be from processes of automation in the mines or the decline in job opportunities on the farm, many adult heads of families find their educations and their work experience inadequate for today's world of work. Too often members of this disadvantaged group lack the basic educational skills to make them eligible for occupational training.

My chief concern in seeing title V continued and expanded stems from the knowledge of the need of thousand of eastern Kentucky families in need of jobs. Their plight has been my chief concern since I have been a Member of Congress, but every legislative proposal designed to provide programs of educational, employment, and economic development assistance for the most part have been sidetracked and bypassed until the very recent sessions of the Congress.

As I have said, I have been anxiously concerned about the plight of these families who could look forward to little more than more hunger, more deprivation, and more hopeless years of unemployment. Regular grant-in-aid programs fashioned for the Nation as a whole seem to bypass and do little for this area. As a consequence, I have worked actively for national attention to the specific problems of the area through specific programs to cope with the educational and economic needs of this isolated region of our Nation. A region, I might add, which is vast in many natural resources not yet developed.

Many of the mothers and fathers in those families could not read or write and their children were growing up the same way because you cannot send ragged, half-sick, half-starved children off to school and even if you do, they are in no shape to learn.

For over 6,000 of the most desperate of those families, the winter of 1966 is very different from the winter of 1963 because of the work experience and training program. Unfortunately, that change has often been described by a phrase that distorts its real meaning: "happy pappies." Yet in a literal sense, the description is true. These men are happy.

They are happy because their children—some 23,000 of them—go off to school every morning with a breakfast under their belts and with shoes on their feet and warm coats on their backs. Most of these families still live far below the poverty line of $3,000 a year but now they at least have the bare essentials.

They are happy because they know that if anyone in the family is sick, he will get attention—and many of them can remember when loved ones suffered, perhaps even died, for lack of such attention.

But most of all, these fathers are happy because they can look to a future, not just for their children, but for themselves. In fact, for 400 of those families the future has already begun because the men have regular jobs and are beginning to get ahead, like one of many who started as stock clerk and is now assistant manager of the housewares section of a department store.

For another 400, the future is just around the corner because they are already working in firms and industries, training for specific jobs that are there waiting for them.

An additional 500 are right behind these fortunate 800. They are getting high school equivalency certificates—the passport to the opportunity to equip themselves for the highly skilled jobs our economy needs to fill.

The future is a little more distant for most of the rest of these families because their handicaps are greater. For one thing, a great many of them lack a grade school education, but they are gaining it fast through a three stage course that covers first through third grades in one basic course, fourth through sixth in another, and seventh and eighth grades in the third stage. Each man—and sometimes his wife too—begins at whatever stage he can handle.

And while they are getting "book learning" they are also getting job training by performing work that long needed doing. For example, they are clearing out creek beds so that the spring floods will no longer menace their homes and erode the soil. They are building bridges and access roads so that families are less isolated, they are fixing up schools and other public buildings. But you may say, these are manual jobs—how can such work prepare men for the more complex tasks which our modern mechanized society demands?

There are several answers to that question, but the key answer is that learning how to work is like getting an education—it has to be done in steps. Some of these men have grown up without ever having a chance to hold a regular job; others have been unemployed for years. Idleness takes its toll. For example, time is less important when a man is not busy; life has no routine or pattern; and standards grow lax. The first step in preparing these men for jobs—and it can be learned on almost any type of job—is

how to be a good workman; getting to the job promptly, sticking with in good or bad weather, accomplishing the task efficiently and in the least possible time. Good work habits and a basic education are the prime essentials; these must be mastered first, whatever one may do later.

But, for many of these men, there must be an inbetween stage of training in higher skills. The next step for them may be the manpower training and development program which concentrates on specific vocational skills. In Kentucky, these programs are running night and day but there still are not enough classrooms or enough teachers to take on all who are ready for this higher training. They have to wait their turn.

Now I want to tell you briefly about another element of these projects that may not be as obvious but is just as important as basic education and basic work training in bringing a permanent change in the lives of these people. This element is the attention that is being given to their families by the public welfare workers. These workers determine what families are eligible for the project and see that they get needed medical care and enough money for their necessities. But that is just the beginning. They also help with a whole gamut of family problems and plans so that it is not just the man who is working toward a brigher future, but the whole family supporting and reinforcing him. This is terribly important, because as you all know, a man's family can help him climb or hold him down. In fact, it was this part of the project that made all the difference to one young father I happen to know about. He and his wife and two babies lived with his parents and he was so under the domination of his father that he could not make even the simplest decision for himself. Today, he has his first paying job, as a truckdriver earning $340 a month; he has established his own home and while he is still on good terms with his parents, he runs his own show.

Multiply the difference the program has made to this young man by the hundreds of other men and their families who are independent or on their way to independence because of it and you can understand why the continuation of title V is of so great importance to many American citizens who do not have any opportunity to participate in our Nation's affluence.

In supporting the entire bill, I yet have some misgivings about committee amendments to title V for I had hoped that this promising program could be given the stability of operating for a sufficient length of time as presently authorized so that its future success could be enhanced by the experience gained by the agencies now administering the program.

Other features of the legislation deserve our wholehearted support. The Job Corps offers real hope to thousands of youngsters who are not only in great financial need but who have no other alternative training or hope of employment available to them. Criticisms of this program derive solely from the great difficulty of reaching this hard core of unemployed and out-of-school youngsters. In fact, opponents of the Economic Opportunities Act have directed their attacks on those very programs which the act authorizes to reach the most difficult problems encountered in economic deprivation.

None of us who have actively worked in fashioning this legislation have expected that the terrific problems with which we are dealing could be solved in the few months span of time in which these programs have been operative. We have anticipated that great difficulties would be encountered in reaching the most difficult cases, but these very difficulties point up the urgent need for these programs.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in my remarks the report that I have received from the Office of Economic Opportunity concerning the young men now training in the Kentucky Job Corps conservation centers.

The report follows:

Young men in training in Kentucky Job Corps Conservation Centers are helping to protect and improve national parks and forests.

Dr. Franklyn A. Johnson, Director of Job Corps, said the young men aged 16 through 21 spend approximately half their time in conservation work and half in education. He said they have logged an impressive record in the first 17 months of the program in forest fire control and prevention, timber and wildlife management, recreation and administrative facilities improvement, and erosion control.

This work is providing the young men with useful skills in the use of hand and power tools and in developing proper work habits and attitudes as Job Corps prepares them for employment. Their conservation work provides a substantial contribution to the nation.

There are 86 Conservation Centers in 36 states and Puerto Rico now in operation, with nearly 13,000 young men in training. Most of these centers are administered for Job Corps by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

There are four centers in Kentucky, with approximately 630 young men in training. The Kentucky centers are Cumberland Gap Center in Bell County, Great Onyx Center in Edmonson County, Frenchburg Center in Menifee County and Pine Knot Center in McCreary County.

A summary of the work done by Corpsmen in the Kentucky centers through June 1966:

They spent 1,105 man-hours fighting forest fires on 412 acres and built 2.4 miles of fire breaks; cleared 3 miles of roadside and 9 acres to prevent fires. They planted or seeded 30 acres in tree.

Corpsmen cleared 242.2 acres, landscaped 790.1 acres, planted 745 trees and shrubs and seeded or sodded 2.7 acres, prepared 70 square yards of parking areas and overlooks, developed 5.2 acres of picnic grounds, and laid 763 yards of walks of all kinds. They removed 12 acres of trees in beautification work.

They helped construct 2 foot and horse bridges, 66 barracks and bunkhouses, 17 equipment and supply storehouses, and more than 100 other types of structures. They restored 3 historical structures.

The young men constructed waste disposal systems with a capacity of 900,000 gallons and sanitary facilities in 11 locations. They placed 100 cubic yards of cribbing and filling.

They built .2 miles of fence and 1 mile of guard rails, helped install 1.6 miles of telephone lines, laid 6,817 yards of pipe or tile lines, and dug 2,865 yards of open ditches. They constructed 1 small reservoir and 82 trash collection stations, placed 1,165 yards of stone walls, erected 315 signs, markers and monuments, and marked 25 miles of boundary lines.

Corpsmen built 2 landing docks and piers and 43 helispots; they helped build 71.2 miles of truck trails and minor roads and 385.1 miles of foot trails.

They completed 1,000 square yards of bank sloping, seeded and sodded 24.6 acres to prevent erosion, and built 1,020 yards of diversion ditches.

Corpsmen cleaned 8 acres of stream channels and levees, excavated 580 cubic yards of rock, laid 1,900 yards of pipe, tile or conduit in ditches, and placed 845 square yards of rock and concrete rip-rapping.

The committee has broadened training and employment opportunities in new provisions dealing with public service employment and training. The needs for supportive personnel in the field of human services, welfare and health activities are urgent. These personnel shortages in fields of vital national concern afford an opportunity for the indigent unemployed. Consequently, the committee amendments designed to afford opportunities for training and employment in public service in the fields of health, welfare, and urban development offer an additional means of reaching the hard core unemployed. These are provisions relating to emergency family loans, legal services, adult basic education programs, special programs to combat poverty in rural areas and other important features of the legislation.

I urge passage of H.R. 15111.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for his dedicated work on a most worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago when I voted for this antipoverty program, I firmly believed that we had found a vehicle for improving the lot of the poor. I felt, as most of you did, that we had finally devised a firm, bold program that would help alleviate and eventually eliminate most of the poverty from our Nation. But I was wrong.

After following this program carefully and after witnessing all of the waste, abuses, mismanagement, corruption, mistakes and faulty mishandling of public funds, I have become completely disenchanted with this whole concept for rooting poverty out of the American soil. I might go further and admit that I am disgusted with these glamorous-sounding programs that have and will continue to produce confusion, hate, bitterness and misuse of our taxpayers' money.

I do not speak lightly of our mistakes. A program like the war on poverty is something you want to believe in until you have been shown—conclusively—what a shabby, disgraceful thing it is. This is what I feel has happened. The war on poverty has let America down. It has let our country's poor people down, after feeding them with revolutionary slogans, false promises, and misplaced hope. A betrayal of a false promise is worse than nothing at all. The poor have been betrayed while the poverty generals and commissars

have wallowed in luxury never before known to them. The war on poverty has only warred on the poverty of a host of social workers, social planners and social revolutionaries. The poor have been neglected and ignored while troublemakers and malcontents have been bankrolled and payrolled in incredible numbers.

If the poverty war had been built around a series of tough meaningful programs to be carried out by the appropriate Federal agencies, I believe that our multi-billion-dollar expenditures would be producing some results. Instead these tax dollars have been wasted on the hire of social revolutionaries whose actions are based on their own emnity towards middle-class morality. Federal dollars have inflamed expectations while ignoring down to earth needs. What has the war on poverty sown but trouble? What does it promise but more trouble?

I believe the poverty program is fundamentally unsound in its present form. It is not a sound program but a theatrical gesture, an effort at social revolution and a political power-grab rolled into one. It is WPA for social trouble makers, not a CCC for the needy. It is a sick program camouflaged with high sounding names like "VISTA" and the "Job Corps." It definitely is not a program to help the poor. On the contrary, it is just a payroll for troublemakers. It is not a war against poverty. It is a war against middle-class morality.

The war on poverty has a history of extravagant mismanagement. One of the few things to recommend it is initial good intentions. The road to the Great Society is paved with them just like the road to that other place.

The poverty program has been bungled. Make no mistake about it. All it has achieved are false expectations.

Not only has the program failed to eliminate poverty from our Nation, but it has not even made a good beginning. There are some critics of the poverty program who, admitting the program has failed, say this is because we have not spent enough money on it, and so they ask for more money.

I believe the poverty program has had more than enough money to prove itself. It is very apparent that this money has been incredibly misspent and misused. I believe that the record of the poverty war shows that further appropriations of Federal funds would mean throwing good money after bad.

The poor are not really benefiting from this money. This is because the program, as originally set up, was left wide open for maladministration. The most popular description of the Office of Economic Opportunity is "chaotic." OEO Director Sargent Shriver used this term in talking about administrations of the poverty program in New York City's Harlem district. I agree it is a shame, but the poverty program has ignored the real needs of those people who need help so much; the 20 percent of our population that may be classified as living below the poverty level.

There are almost as many instances of waste, mismanagement, abuse, and corruption in this program as there are dollars spent—and in both cases the numbers are too high.

Let me tell you about the tragic case of LeRoi Jones. He was given Federal funds to propagate his black supremacy ideas. He received not a grant of $40,000, as originally reported, but a $115,000 grant of Federal funds to conduct his Black Arts Repertory Theater in Harlem. This grant was made despite his having said:

> I don't see anything wrong with hating white people.

He has often urged the massacre of the white population by some local version of the Mau-Mau.

I asked Sargent Shriver about this. He was quick to assure me that it was all a mistake, and that Jones would not get any more money.

But yet this is where the flaw in the program becomes evident.

A short time later, the United Planning Organization, the Washington, D.C., antipoverty agency, invited LeRoi Jones to fly to Washington and be the paid narrator of a poverty program presentation called "Three Days of Soul." Jones came, pocketed his money, and spread his antiwhite hate message. The OEO tried to cover this mistake by saying it had no control over the UPO. This is stupid and ridiculous and they know it.

If this were not enough, that very same month, New York City police raided LeRoi Jones' Black Arts Theatre in Harlem, where they discovered a secret black nationalist arsenal full of rifles, shotguns, cross bows, and meat cleavers. These weapons, I assure you, were not stage props. I still wonder if any of these lethal weapons were bought with poverty funds?

Mr. Chairman, it would be possible for me to recount literally hundreds of instances of abuse and waste in this program, but because of time I will speak of only a handful.

In Jamestown, R.I., wealthy youngsters were employed to give sailing lessons to youngsters equally well off.

In Eagle Bend, Minn., a sum of $38,000 was awarded to build a swimming pool, located in the State of 10,000 lakes. Why? Because the nearest lake for swimming is only 20 miles away. That is a new kind of poverty in my book.

In January of this year, the New York City poverty agency took a number of people from cold unheated slums and tried to find them decent lodgings. Fair enough, but 11 families, consisting of 20 adults and 17 children were sent to a plush hotel and given $9 per day for food allowances. It is this last fact—that the people were given expensive suites at the elegant Hotel Astor and $9 per person per day food allowances—that bothered me. These people stayed at the Hotel Astor for over a month. Predictably, they started insulting maids and others who work for a living. It seems that the poverty war gives spongers swelled heads.

Great waste is apparent in Project Headstart. Take the case of the preschool center for 100 underprivileged children in Chicago. It required 28 personnel to handle these 100 youngsters at a payroll cost of $12,750 or $126 per month per child. This is a total of $1,512 per year per child—more than required for a year in some colleges. The proposed year-round operations of Project Headstart have averaged about 5 months.

Even Drew Pearson, in reporting on this most expensive babysitting program in our history, pointed out that some doctors rushed the little youngsters through the exams so fast that they were able to collect $100 an hour.

Here in Washington, the local poverty agency, the United Planning Organization, was offered a total of $79,000 for a birth control clinic.

The money was used for a class of married women living with their husbands. If anything, it should have been used for unmarried women or for those wives deserted by their husbands, so as to cut future pressure on the relief rolls.

The hiring of personnel to work on the poverty program is completely slipshod. No effort is made to employ those best qualified to carry out the proposed objectives in a constructive way. I cannot imagine what kind of personnel standards are used.

One man was employed by the United Planning Organization as a $6,000-per-year community program worker in a youth employment counseling center, working with juveniles. Later, he was promoted to an $8,000 job. He has a criminal record dating back to 1952 with 11 charges of larceny, false pretenses, and passing worthless checks. In October 1965, while still on the United Planning Organization payroll as a youth counselor, he was again charged with passing a worthless check.

Another man was employed by the United Planning Organization in January 1965, as a $3,900 community program worker and later was promoted to an $8,650 position counseling juveniles. He had deserted from the Army in 1944, and since then has acquired a police record which includes soliciting for grand larceny, false pretenses, forgery and being a fugitive from justice. I must repeat—he was hired as a youth counselor. I guess OEO figures he would be a good instructor in antisocial behavior.

Compounded to this is the sad fact that there are few signs of results in the poverty program. Per dollar accomplishment is incredibly low.

The Job Corps spent over $53 million in 1965. Its estimated budget for fiscal 1966 was $240 million, and for 1967 the projected figure is $355 million. But as of February 1966, there were a little over a thousand Job Corps graduates—and only a half of these were able to obtain a job in the private sector.

In St. Petersburg, Fla., the Job Corps trained 42 girls in the Hotel Huntington. The first year's bill for staff salaries, accommodations and incidentals came to $1,646,601—an average of $39,205 per "graduate."

The Job Corps spent $370,000 on 30,000 brass-buttoned jackets at a time when the Job Corps had only 17,000 members and the army had a uniform shortage.

The United Planning Organization is not alone in hiring social undesirables,

this is a nationwide poverty program trait.

In Casper, Wyo., a 35-year-old man was hired as a recreation instructor. Previously arrested for everything from rape and aggravated assault to forgery, he soon ran amuck. Why was he hired? On the recommendation of the NAACP.

Last August, a Job Corpsman on leave in Billings, Mont., was charged with shooting a policeman and wounding a woman in a bar. Job Corps officials not only posted a $2,500 bond and paid for his attorney, but they flew him back and forth from the camp in Kentucky to Montana at least twice. The corpsman still remains enrolled in the program. This is ridiculous.

These are not isolated cases of problems of discipline in the Job Corps. Three Texas corpsmen have also been charged with shooting two Air Force policemen. After being booked for assault with intent to kill and provided with counsel, they too were returned to their regular duty in the Job Corps.

In Kentucky, 150 enrollees wrecked the Breckinridge Job Corps camp in a riot set off because of a protection racket run inside the installation. Dozens of the youths dropped out of the program in terror.

In Camp Kilmer in New Jersey, officials in nearby towns complain bitterly about the rising crime rate which they blame on the corpsmen. The people say that the streets are unsafe and unfit for any young girls.

In San Antonio, Tex., two Camp Gary Job Corpsmen were charged with robbery, and attempted murder. The gun was found in the bus hired to take trainees back to camp after a Saturday night in town.

In Kalamazoo, Mich., a group of Job Corps trainees clashed with a rival group in a riot that spread over several city blocks and required 50 policemen to quell.

Warrants were issued in Kingsport, Tenn., for two Job Corps trainees charging them with bludgeoning two victims with a lead pipe.

At Charlestown, W. Va., Women's Center, there were reported drunken fights, thievery, and immoral conduct.

A secret House committee report on Camp Kilmer in New Jersey criticized the camp for lax discipline, racial discrimination, alcoholism and immoral conduct. One Rutgers University professor called the camp "an ill-conceived social monstrosity."

Mr. Chairman, it has become more and more clear that the population of America does not want the Job Corps around.

The Job Corps announced on June 7, that it was abandoning its women's training center in St. Petersburg, Fla., because of "local hostility." Girls at this center were reported soliciting, drunk, pregnant, and causing the ruination of the up-to-then respectable neighborhood.

On May 24, 1966, the City Council of New Bedford, Conn., passed two resolutions asking that the Rodman Job Corps center be taken out of New Bedford.

One of the resolutions "respectfully implored" President Johnson to close down the center. The other directs the mayor to meet Governor Volpe "with respect to relocation of the center out of New Bedford as soon as possible."

The cause of this is based on good reason. Two nights before the resolutions were passed, the police were called to the center to quell a riot in which some 40 youths had pelted them with rocks, iron pipes, and other missiles.

I would like to make it clear at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I do not regard these abuses in the poverty program as merely isolated abuses. On the contrary, I think it is the achievements of the poverty program that are isolated freaks.

Speaking of the Job Corps. Why spend $370,000 getting them special blazers? I know another type of outfit they could wear. It has brass buttons too. I firmly believe we ought to draft our Nation's punks and hoods instead of coddling and paying them in the Job Corps. Why should juvenile virtue be rewarded with military service in the Vietnamese nightmare, while a record of delinquency exempts punks from the Army and puts them in line for Job Corps coddlings? This is not the type of policy which is going to build a better America.

The poverty program has become little more than an antisocial protest movement. Instead of the money being used to help the poor, the money has been given to the social workers for them to help themselves.

The poverty program is too riddled with social revolution to be workable. Work, effort, and training are the road to success. This is something the poverty programmers refuse to acknowledge and admit. Instead it has become a Government-supported program for social revolutionaries, and a war on middle-class morality. For my part, I am well convinced that this program is too much of a loss to salvage.

What we must do is to sort out the good from the bad in the program. Then the sound programs ought to be transferred to responsible Federal Government agencies. The poverty warriors are overpaid dreamers who lack practical sense.

This is the poverty program in action. All they can do well is stir up trouble and waste money.

I would like to conclude my remarks by raising another point—one which relates to the appropriations process—but which I think should also be raised here. Congress has to devise some way of keeping the poverty war bureaucrats from building up a political slush fund with money they should be spending to help the poor. As of mid-summer, the poverty program had an unspent balance of $782 million. Columnists Robert Allan and Paul Scott wrote recently that this money is being hoarded so that it can be used as a slush fund in the fall elections.

This sickens me. We are fighting a war in Vietnam. Our soldiers are being killed because Johnson and McNamara cannot spare the money to give them green-dyed tee shirts and small pistols and other things they write home to ask their families to send to them. But the poverty war has enough money to rent tuxedoes for juvenile delinquents; and enough money to let the poverty beatniks and troublemakers accumulate an unspent balance of $782 million for stirring up trouble, paying off pressure groups or giving caviar to rioters. Maybe this money is going to be used to try and beat Members of Congress who think the hoods and punks should be in the jungle swamps of Vietnam instead of being coddled by the Job Corps and the rest of the Great Society.

I hope the poverty program meets the fate it richly deserves—dismantling. The good programs can be run by sensible Federal agencies. The Congress ought to say "no" in definite terms to care and feeding of punks, rioters and black nationalists. We ought to junk the poverty program, with its $782 million slush fund for immorality and troublemaking, and spend the money on a cost-of-living civil service and social security pension boost. Then we would be rewarding achievement instead of antisocial behavior. I urge a vote against the poverty farce.

Let us vote for commonsense—let us vote in favor of dismantling this phoney poverty war apparatus and transferring the sound programs to regular Federal Government agencies where promises can be matched by results.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment, following the colorful address we have just heard from our friend from New York. I know a political campaign is on in New York, but I had not realized it had gotten quite that out of hand.

I was especially interested in the gentleman's allegation that too much money is being spent in the war on poverty, because if my memory is correct—I am sure, if it is not, the gentleman, a very prominent Republican leader in New York, will straighten me out—the Republican mayor of New York, a former Member of this body, was in Washington not many weeks ago, asking for an additional half billion dollars for the war on poverty. Mayor Lindsay said he wanted $250 million more authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act, not less but more.

I believe I am correct in saying that Mayor Lindsay did not offer any significant or substantial, if indeed any, proposals at all for changing or amending the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I was also interested in the gentleman's allegations with respect to alleged waste and corruption in the program. I have here an article by a very distinguished and able Republican columnist, Roscoe Drummond, in which he talks about what he calls, the anti-antipoverty war. Mr. Drummond notes how the "far right" has been attacking the war on poverty and he describes some of their statements as these "extremists' tirades."

I certainly would not put my friend from New York in the category of the "far right," and I want to be very clear on that. I do, however, wish to quote

what Roscoe Drummond said in this article.

He said that in a survey of 40 cities the Christian Science Monitor, which is not known as a revolutionary journal, I may say to my friend from New York, that distinguished newspaper reached this finding:

The war on poverty may have established some kind of all time record. In the nearly two years of operation there hasn't been a whisper of scandal in the administration of the overwhelming majority of programs across the country.

Then Mr. Drummond goes on to conclude in his column:

The program as a whole in concept and substantial execution deserves the support of Congress and the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do hope that in any deliberations here we can pay somewhat more attention to the substance of the proposals being made by the Committee on Education and Labor for improving and strengthening the program and perhaps somewhat less to using the discussion of this bill for what can, I think, not unfairly be described simply as political speeches.

Mr. Chairman, I include Mr. Drummond's column at this point in the RECORD:

ANTI ANTI-POVERTY WAR—FAR RIGHT ATTACKS PROGRAM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Congress and the public ought to take note of the defeat-the-bill attacks on the anti-poverty program from the Far Right.

Congress will soon be voting on the 1967 appropriation and they should find these extremists' tirades persuasive evidence that the beginning which has been made to help the very poor help themselves is headed in the right direction and deserves support.

The kill-the-bill arguments of the Liberty Lobby and the propaganda spread by "Let Freedom Ring," as rung by the John Birch Society via the telephone, are so ill-founded, inaccurate and misleading that they ought to assure the public and Congress that there isn't much of a case to be made against the anti-poverty program.

By resorting to such tactics the extremists virtually admit that valid arguments against the anti-poverty program are scarce.

What are these misstated and distored arguments which their circulators hope will put the anti-poverty program out of business?

They argue that the anti-poverty program is a cause of the Negro rioting in Watts and elsewhere. The contention here is that the war on poverty, because of its political philosophy, has a large place in any explanation of rioting in Watts or Harlem or any other American city . . . not as a solution but as a factor.

The truth is that Watts and Harlem are the end results of decades of racial discrimination and unfairness and most Americans know that it is right and necessary to act with special speed to help those who have been most neglected. The anti-poverty program is part of that necessity.

The extremist argues that the anti-poverty program is "cynically" organizing "the poor for political and revolutionary purposes."

The answer to that is that a major criticism brought against the program by conservative Republicans in Congress, including minority leaders GERALD FORD and EVERETT DIRKSEN, is that the Office of Economic Opportunity has not done enough to increase the participation of the poor in the development of policy and program on the ground that such participation by the poor increases responsibility.

The Extremists argue that the war on poverty "is destroying individual initiative."

The thrust of all the antipoverty programs is self-help through special education, special job-skill training needed to break the cycle of extreme poverty. Such governmental assistance does not destroy individual initiative, it expands individual initiative.

Obviously in any pioneering effort of this kind there will be mistakes, large and small, and shortcomings. The anti-poverty program has had its share of such—but no more than might be humanly expected.

Probably less, indeed, in a survey of 40 cities the Christian Science Monitor reached this finding: "The war on poverty may have established some kind of all-time record. In the nearly two years of operation, there hasn't been a whisper of scandal in the administration of the overwhelming majority of programs across the country."

The program as a whole, in concept and substantial execution, deserves the support of Congress and the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I just want to answer the gentleman from Indiana. I would like to make one correction and remove any impressions that might be created in the minds of the Members of the House regarding the mayor of the city of New York. I want to make sure he understands that the mayor of the city of New York is a liberal fusion mayor and has a liberal fusion government, and that is not to be attributed to the Republican Party. Let me also advise the gentleman from Indiana that after 12 years of Democratic administration in New York City the present administration has found it bankrupt. That is probably the reason why there is so much need for additional funds.

I also want to tell the gentleman from Indiana that for 2 years I supported this program until I found all of this waste and misuse of funds which was something I could not tolerate any longer. I am not against a good program that will deal with these serious problems of poverty but I think the present program needs help, and I will support the amendments that will be offered by the minority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FINO. I think this program needs correction and modification and alterations. It needs a lot of changes and reforms so that we can reach down to the root of the evil. We must get down to the poor people and not stop at a certain level where it is not doing the good that it should do.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague from New York [Mr. FINO] whether he is aware of the fact that New York City's mayor, our former colleague, testified on the Senate side before the Ribicoff committee that he thought the Federal Government ought to spend $50 billion on our urban problems, poverty-creating conditions foremost—in the next 10 years at the rate of $5 billion a year. Does my colleague Mr. FINO now in effect repudiate the views of the mayor of New York City and his administration insofar as the poverty program is concerned? Has he been cashiered out of the Grand Old Party?

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield.

Mr. FINO. I am very happy to inform the gentleman from New York——

Mr. SCHEUER. My question is whether he repudiates the views of the Republican-liberal mayor—a Republican-liberal mayor, and whether Mr. Lindsay has been drummed out of his party?

Mr. FINO. I want the gentleman to know the mayor of the city of New York always said that his is a Fusion administration and not Republican, and I also want to tell the gentleman from New York that the mayor of the city of New York appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency at which time he asked for about $4 billion for demonstration cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINO. The mayor of the city of New York has come down before our committee and asked for $4 billion. It does not surprise me that he appeared before your committee and asked for so much money. It so happens when a Member of this House leaves and becomes the mayor of a city his attitude and feelings change completely.

Mr. SCHEUER. Do you repudiate his views as a leading liberal Republican in this country?

Mr. FINO. I disagree with the mayor of the city of New York on this score.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], a question with reference to the Governor of New York who was a liberal-backed candidate, but who I understand now is also urging a poverty program.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] repudiate him also?

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am not familiar with what the mayor and the Governor of the State of New York have asked for. We are not opposed to the poverty program per se. We are opposed to the manner in which it is handled, and mishandled.

Mr. JOELSON. In other words, the gentleman from New York is not opposed to the program "per se," but only "itself."

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I had anticipated some singular occurrences might develop during the course of debate on this particular bill, but never had I assumed that it would afford an opportunity for a requiem for a Republican.

Mr. Chairman, I, myself, have a very high regard for the mayor of New York, Mr. Lindsay, our former distinguished colleague, and I am distressed that in view of his voting record, and the sometimes progressive nature of his views, he is not a member of our party, especially since he has today been read out of the Republican Party by a prominent Republican from his own State of New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I shall yield to the gentleman from New York as soon as I finish my statement.

Mr. Chairman, as a Methodist, I believe it is never too late to be saved, and I hope therefore that the ex-Republican mayor of New York will, perhaps, come to look with a favorable eye upon our side of the political aisle.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to speak with reference to a Job Corps project located in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent.

Mr. Chairman, since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1954, this Nation has been attacking the formidable problems of poverty with unwavering dedication and bold programs. No one denies, of course, that we still face staggering problems.

People, generally speaking, have not recognized poverty in this country as being an ultraserious problem. This is because we live in the most affluent society in the history of mankind—we earn more, possess more, and consume more than any other people in the world.

And some say they are opposed to the war on poverty because they do not want to initiate a bunch of new fangled ideas and programs.

The fact is, that there is really nothing new. Poverty is one of mankind's oldest problems and we have, in fact, been fighting it for a long time. And we have made some progress.

If we recall the speeches of President Roosevelt in the 1930's, we can remember that he spoke in terms of one-third of the Nation being ill clad, ill fed, and ill housed. We now talk about the impoverished one-fifth of our Nation.

In the war on poverty, one phase which attempts to remedy manpower and unemployment problems is the Job Corps.

And, despite what some critics would lead you to believe, the Job Corps training centers have done a remarkable task of turning impoverished and disadvantaged young men and women into good citizens with gainful employment.

Near San Marcos, Tex., in my congressional district, the Job Corps operates one of the most successful—and certainly the largest—center in the Nation.

Gary has often been referred to as a model operation in the Job Corps program, and from firsthand observation I would say this description is modest.

Formerly an Air Force Base and Army helicopter training station, Gary—which was dedicated by President Johnson on April 10, 1965—offers some 39 vocational choices, plus four required basic education courses, including math, science, citizenship, and communication skills. The center is operated by the board of directors of the Texas Educational Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit foundation established by Gov. John Connally.

Governor Connally also called on business and industry leaders for help in setting up the courses.

Then another nonprofit organization, Opportunities, Inc., was formed by 50–100 Texas-based business and industrial firms, to provide advice and assistance in designing the curriculum.

Opportunities, Inc., also guarantee job placement for corpsmen who have completed their training. Gary corpsmen have been hired as draftsmen, heavy equipment mechanics, service station workers, supermarket workers, cooks, vacuum cleaner and lawn mower repairmen, and in numerous other vocational fields.

Center officials report that job placements are beginning to grow enormously, now that the first group of corpsmen have completed a year at the center.

Gary is unique in one respect since it is one of two urban centers administered by an educational foundation. Others are operated by industrial corporations, for profit.

The San Antonio Express recently praised the operation at Gary in an editorial, saying:

> With the latest status report on its trainees, the Gary Job Corps Center leaves the distinct impression of success in the youth rehabilitation experiment.
>
> The San Marcos Center has a current enrollment of some 3,000 and another 695 have been graduated since the program was launched. Of the graduates, 475 have entered industry, 59 have sought higher education and 161 have entered the military.
>
> These positive accomplishments of 695 young men far outweigh the negative effects produced by a small number of trainees who have been cited for violations of the law.
>
> The corpsmen now gainfully employed, returned to school or serving in the armed forces were young men with dubious futures only months ago. The results are gratifying and hold promise of greater gains with continuation of the program.
>
> Each trainee directed into a constructive path represents a reduction of the burden on society.

Job Corps placement figures since that editorial was written are even more impressive:

Total placement: 1,734—1,442 have been referred for job placement in business; 203 have entered the Armed Forces; 74 have returned to high school; 15 have enrolled in colleges.

Reports from employers on followup studies of job placement are highly favorable. Nearly half of the graduates enter the military service, which is in itself an accomplishment, since most of them could not have passed the basic educational requirements to enter prior to their training at Gary.

Still others have developed a renewed interest in school, and have returned home to enter classes at the high school, and even college level.

Industry has looked favorable at the total training program, and it is obvious that well-trained corpsmen are readily accepted into the business world.

I would like to give one example about this group of young men who completed their training:

A firm in Liberal, Kans., known as Tradewind Industries, has hired 32 young men from Gary. The sales manager of the company, Mr. Terry Moore, recently had this to say about the Gary graduates, who work there:

> We found the Job Corpsmen to be most cooperative—probably the most polite group of employees anyone ever hired. We feel that when you hire 32 people, you are going to get people from all walks of life, and, also we feel that these boys have had a minimum of trouble since they have been here. We have not had to bail a corpsman out of jail for being drunk, nor have we been notified by the police that they have caused a disturbance in town in any way.

Mr. Chairman, Liberal, Kans., is a small town, a farm community of 18,000 to 20,000 persons. You can be sure that if ex-corpsmen were not measuring up to what might be considered a proper responsibility level as citizens, it would not take a minute for the news to be all over the community and back to their employers.

Another aspect of the success of the Gary program has been the reports of field correspondents of several trade publications, including American Builder, Welding Engineer, and Printing Production. Their reports ring not only of high praise for the quality of training received but are laudatory with regard to the method of instruction.

Welding Engineer magazine, for example, pointed out recently that the ingenuity used in finding materials with which the men can work has kept instruction costs down to $500 per man per year, much lower than private trade schools.

Yet critics of the OEO program have said it is less costly to send a kid to Harvard than to a Job Corps center. Surprisingly, some people swallow this line of thinking.

Obviously, a school dropout who goes to a Job Corps center is no candidate for Harvard. And should a school dropout get into trouble and land in jail, he could cost society up to $25,000 a year. Yet, nobody has suggested in their wildest complaints that Job Corps boys cost that much.

Average cost per man-year unit for the Gary Center for the fiscal year of July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, has been estimated at $4,411.82 compared to an average for all eight of the Nation's urban training centers for men of $6,995.69.

Dollar-minded opponents have also been trying to build a smokescreen about the program by pointing to what they

describe as extravagant salaries of Job Corps staff personnel.

I suppose that it is quite natural that they should pick the Job Corps center in my district since it is the largest to launch their attacks.

I would like to point out, however, these opponents took the present salaries and compared them with earnings last year. In doing so, they conveniently ignored some rather crucial facts.

Many Gary Center staff members came from the public schools in Texas and the 1964–65 minimum salary schedules were used as the comparative figure.

Again, conveniently, they omitted the fact that the Texas State Legislature increased minimum salary schedules by nearly 19 percent for 1965–66.

Another convenient omission in comparing present and past salaries is the fact the Gary Center staff, in leaving public schools, forfeited their protection under the State civil service and benefits of the teacher retirement system. Furthermore, public school personnel work about 9 months of the year, while Gary Center staff work a 12-month year.

In short, the charges of excessive salaries at Job Corps centers, particularly Gary, are characteristically empty.

But possibly the most widely misconceived notion about Job Corps men is that they are all "hoodlums and misfits."

This is simply not true. Statistically, the average corpsman is 17½ years old; was unemployed and looking for work; finished the ninth grade; had been out of school for about 11 months; has a sixth grade reading level; comes from a family of six; was living in a crowded, substandard house; and his parents are either unemployed or hold unskilled jobs.

Recently a Gary corpsman, Dale Stewart, an 18-year-old Cumberland, Md., youth was credited with saving the life of a Carrizo Springs, Tex., man who had been electrocuted while working on a trailer.

Stewart administered artificial respiration until an ambulance arrived, accompanied the ambulance to the hospital and waited until the man was out of danger.

Such heroic actions, I am sure you will agree, do not fit the profile of a "hoodlum and misfit."

Nor do the actions of 25 corpsmen who volunteered blood to help a young girl; or the young men in the industrial landscaping course who voluntarily assisted the city of Austin in completing its municipal garden center; or the corpsmen who helped repair a Girl Scout camp.

The survivor of the electrical shock later praised Stewart and the Gary center, saying, "If Dale is an example of what Gary corpsmen are like, then San Marcos is fortunate to have young men like him training near their city."

This same feeling of good will is reflected in the attitude of the citizens of San Marcos and their elected representatives.

Mayor Ellis Serur, whose firsthand knowledge of Gary comes from almost daily contact, speaks for nearly all the community when he says that Gary is "one of the finest examples of youth rehabilitation" that has ever been undertaken.

Contrary to what many critics report about Job Corps center-urban relations, Serur reports that—

> Our (San Marcos) relationship with Gary and the corpsmen has been good. We have had few problems. The Center is a distinct asset to our community.

And to the good mayor's comments, I would like to add my own personal feelings.

I have been at Gary on a number of occasions. I have watched these young men in their classes; looked over their shoulders as they welded and as they worked on automobiles; and have talked with them in the cool of the evening.

As individuals, as persons, as human beings they are grateful, and sincere in their gratitude, for the "second chance" that their country has given them.

They are serious-minded young men, who realize the responsibility before them, and who intend, for the most part, to act wisely.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, the Gary corpsmen are showing that the investment of Job Corps is paying dividends—for neighboring communities and their residents and for the individual corpsmen.

These dividends will increasingly accrue to our Nation as a whole, as these young people take their places as constructive, productive, taxpaying citizens.

Another significant fact about the poverty program in the Southwest, and Texas in particular, is its ever-increasing public acceptance. All segments of society—the liberals, the conservatives, businessmen, mayors, county judges, school administrators, the welfare institutions, volunteers, and the poor themselves—are involved in the program.

The poverty program in Texas has been administered without a breath of scandal or misuse of funds. Along this line, the fact that no race riots have occurred in Texas this summer is certainly due in part of the outstanding progress of the war on poverty.

Recently, Gov. John Connally said at McAllen, Tex.:

> I can say in the full confidence of truth that in Texas we have made a genuine effort to see that poverty funds are doing, and will do, the job intended by the President and Congress.

And this year on the nationwide television program "Meet the Press," Governor Connally again praised the accomplishments of the poverty program when he said that "the war on poverty in Texas is a tremendous success in all phases." A great deal of this success, also, is the excellent and inspired administration of our regional office under the direction of the Honorable Bill Crook whose staff has worked closely with all the State programs.

This is a large part of the job the war on poverty was directed to undertake, and it is our clear responsibility to see to it that the fine progress being made at Gary and other Job Corps centers is permitted to continue and expand.

I believe we are directing our efforts in a positive and helpful manner in Texas. Surely we all want to help our young people. For 3 years I served as administrator on the Texas Employment Commission. I found after several surveys this inescapable fact: that unemployment was tied directly in ratio to the lack of education and lack of opportunities that a young man or older person had. Invariably, the smaller the education, the less the opportunity and the more the risk for unemployment and being a burden on society. It goes together so if we can give these young people a chance, they will respond.

I harken back to the day when I was with the NYA, nearly 30 years ago, when some people I knew, including the Governor, were a part of that program. We did good for the young people. Most of them responded and became worthwhile citizens. I believe we can do the same thing again. If the Job Corps and the poverty program are not the perfect answer—and we all admit they may not be—then I say, "Give me a better answer. Give me a better program." Until we can come up with a better answer, surely we ought to unite in a wholehearted manner to make this program work.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is clear that the antipoverty program has suffered from serious instances of maladministration, lack of full and current accounting controls and procedures, excessive overhead in certain programs, political interference, and failure to involve the poor in meaningful direction of their own future. Aside from certain administrative and fiscal failings, another shortcoming has been an inability to coordinate sufficiently and closely all the various training programs with, ultimately, full-time lasting job opportunities.

An amendment has been offered—and, I am happy to say, accepted by the committee—to mandate much closer coordination between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Labor with public employment offices to insure maximum coordination of all training programs and job opportunities.

Quite specifically, Mr. Chairman, there has not been sufficient talk today of the fact that in these United States there are still 32 million Americans living in abject poverty, more than 8 million Americans living in substandard housing, and serious areas of unemployment and underemployment.

Westchester County itself experiences a substantial amount of poverty amid affluence. More than 120,000 Westchester residents live in 30,600 substandard or deteriorating housing units. One out of every twelve Westchester families is estimated to be living in abject poverty and one out of five in serious poverty.

The antipoverty program, if it is to be fully effective, has to find better ways to tackle the problems of education, jobs, and housing.

It is essential that we do what must be done to break the cycle of hopelessness and despair that is the lot of so

many Americans in Harlem, Watts, Bedford-Stuyvesant, Woodlawn, Hough, and other areas.

We have serious ghetto conditions, in my judgment, in a number of cities—including several in Westchester County. One notable example is the city of New York, where Mayor John Lindsay is trying to do a creative, forthright, and imaginative job. He has brought in one of the ablest men in the country—Mitchell Sviridoff—to assist with this undertaking. The mayor has said that, in his judgment, due to past neglect and lack of opportunity and lack of action, some $50 billion may need to be expended in New York City alone in the years ahead.

Our primary concern must be these 32 million Americans and their needs—the need for much more effective identification of the problem of the individual who must be trained and the relation of that individual to a lasting job. In addition to coordination of the various training programs and employment opportunities, we need to follow through from the initial training to a serious, productive, and permanent job that will benefit the community and the individual. If there is no meaningful follow-through, hope is followed by an even greater despair.

I would say that in Westchester County the community action agencies, Headstart programs, the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, and the two VISTA volunteers have been effective.

The community action programs have been characterized by one Westchester leader as "the answer to our prayers." The executive director of another program told me that the CAP program, functioning in large part through neighborhood centers, "stresses dignity and the value of the self." Another leader said that, through "neighborhood involvement," CAP "helps whole families and has its most direct effect on families." In the 26th Congressional District, 5 community action agencies have received 27 grants since the inception of the antipoverty program, totaling $992,023 in Federal funds.

In the Headstart program, the director of one project in my district told me that those who have entered school following some training have "adjusted well to the classroom program." She also pointed out that the Headstart program has shown "how volunteers, professionals, and parents of different ethnic and racial backgrounds can work together." More than 1,000 children in my district have participated in 11 programs, utilizing $290,367 in Federal funds.

I believe it is interesting and pertinent to note that in the Neighborhood Youth Corps some 60,000 man-hours of work have been devoted to this program alone in the 26th Congressional District. Almost 500 young people are in training, and more than 100 have been placed in good firms in private industry with well paying jobs, some of them on the order of $95 a week. Several enrollees have gone on to college—a dream that they has never thought possible.

So there are areas, in my judgment, and in my own county, where this program is working. On a national level, several new programs have shown promise, including Upward Bound which is concerned with encouraging youngsters who have ability but who lack motivation to stay in school and go on to college. The legal services program is also fulfilling a pressing need—the poor require justice and legal advice like all of us, if not more so. Similarly, the neighborhood health clinics that have been established hold the promise of tending to needs at a community level that are presently being supplied at overcrowded hospitals.

But nothing having been underscored on the side of achievement should fail to point out that the House and the committee have not fully honored their responsibility to study the antipoverty program constructively and in depth. We did not have any full hearings in the field. No minority witnesses were called before the full committee in Washington. The report on the committee investigations was not released until September 19 of this year—well after these studies were completed.

I will not comment on this investigative report except to say that it failed to meet the demands of serious research to which this House and the American people are entitled.

The bill before us, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 15111, has some shortcomings, including a significant lack of flexibility in the apportionment of funds among the various programs. It is my hope that the House will look seriously at the bill in this regard and make this and other necessary amendments.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, to try to make significant and important and meaningful amendments to this bill, I will offer one tomorrow which will much more clearly deal with accounting controls and auditing practices and place these requirements clearly and specifically in the law. Certainly we need better administration and uniform and precise accounting controls.

Second, I will offer an amendment which I hope will in some measure encourage a greater relationship between the program and the private enterprise system, an amendment designed to insure that the talents and resources of the private sector are brought into play to the maximum feasible extent.

Lastly, I hope to offer an amendment, which I hope will be considered and adopted, which would make it more possible to identify the occupations and locations in which there are shortages of trained personnel so that we can coordinate the various training programs and relate them to existing and actual job needs. In this way, we will increasingly train individuals for actual, lasting jobs which will exist or which we can anticipate may exist.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the antipoverty program in the past and I hope to continue to do so in the future contingent upon the adoption of needed improvements and significant amendments.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 311]

Adair	Giaimo	Murray
Albert	Gilligan	Nedzi
Anderson, Ill.	Gray	O'Konski
Andrews, Glenn	Greigg	Olsen, Mont.
Ashmore	Griffiths	Passman
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Pepper
Berry	Hansen, Idaho	Philbin
Boggs	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Bow	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Pool
Callaway	Hébert	Powell
Carter	Holifield	Reifel
Celler	Holland	Resnick
Cooley	Howard	Rivers, S.C.
Corman	Jones, Mo.	Robison
Craley	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Daddario	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	King, Calif.	Roncalio
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	St Germain
Dickinson	Kluczynski	Scott
Diggs	Landrum	Sickles
Donohue	Long, La.	Sisk
Dorn	McClory	Stanton
Duncan, Oreg.	McVicker	Stephens
Dyal	Mailliard	Sweeney
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Van Deerlin
Farbstein	Meeds	Vanik
Fisher	Miller	Walker, Miss.
Flynt	Monagan	White, daho
Frelinghuysen	Morrison	Whitten
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	Willis
	Moss	Wright

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to a UPI story that appeared today which in part reads as follows:

> About 2,000 persons representing organizations for the poor in 13 States converged on Capitol Hill today to buttonhole lawmakers in behalf of their program for a bigger antipoverty program.

The wire service presents the following additional information, stating that they appeared on Capitol Hill and Chairman POWELL urged the delegation Monday night to bring the pressure on other Members of Congress to approve the bill.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. NELSEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it crystal clear that I do not approve of anybody putting any pressure on Congress. I also want to make it crystal clear that I do not support the type of activity that you have referred

to here. I think it is a mistake. I have said that time and time again. I believe Congressmen can be reasoned with, but I do not believe that Congress can be coerced. I think anybody that fools with the integrity of Congress by bringing mass marchers here just does not know the political realities of this country. If there is—and I do not think there is—any Federal money involved in this at all, I will pledge to you that I will do everything within my power to try to recover it.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for his sentiment and certainly agree with him. I will go on and point out another fact or two which are contained in the wire service's report. "A spokesman for a militant group known as the Poverty-Right Action coordinated the demonstration." It was my understanding that demonstrations are not permitted on the Hill, but the spokesman revealed that: "Representatives came from New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, Missouri, Nebraska, Michigan, Mississippi, and California, as well as Washington, D.C."

Now, the point I raise is that one of the criticisms of the poverty program in many parts of the country is that the money is going for salaries instead of helping those that this bill is intended to help. I am wondering if the people who are here are lobbying for their jobs or lobbying for the poor.

There are several questions I would like answers to. I would like, if it is possible, to get the list of those who are here. Certainly there must be a list of those who are attending this demonstration. Are they drawing per diem money? Are they collecting expense money? I think we need to have definite information by tomorrow in answer to these questions, and I think that the gentleman from Florida will try to supply that information. Rumors prevail on the Hill that many of the people here are drawing per diem from poverty program funds. This is a sad mistake if it is true.

I might add further that yesterday we learned that people employed in the poverty program were registering voters in Democratic precincts in Cincinnati, which I think is certainly out of line. If this is another instance of the misuse of poverty funds, then I think it should be corrected. Criticism such as this is constructive criticism. If the sentiment that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], expressed a moment ago is right, then he is in complete agreement with me on it, and I hope he supplies this information by tomorrow.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I will do my level best to find out the answers to the questions about the people here in Washington. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly that that is not a proper use of Federal funds. I reiterate again that I do not believe any Federal funds are involved in this. If there are any Federal funds involved in it, you have my word that I will do everything in the world to recover it if it is a misuse of Federal funds.

Mr. NELSEN. Thank you.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in less than 2 years the war on poverty has become one of the most exciting and successful aspects of the President's Great Society program. Building from the ground up, it has taken the Office of Economic Opportunity an amazingly short time to transform newly born ideas and blueprints into flesh and blood programs from coast to coast. The list of accomplishments is imposing. So far the war on poverty has served more than 8 million impoverished Americans, one out of four of the Nation's poor, with jobs, job training, educational programs, and an amazing variety of other services. It has contributed vitally to the emergence of 2.2 million Americans from poverty in 1965. Over half a million jobs have been filled exclusively by poor people. Operation Headstart had reached 1,300,000 disadvantaged preschool children as of the end of this summer. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided useful jobs and earning for more than half a million disadvantaged teenagers.

To date, the Office of Economic Opportunity has approved over 7,475 grants under the community action program to about 1,000 local antipoverty agencies in all 50 States. Job Corps centers have been established where nearly 28,750 of our most terribly disadvantaged teenagers are currently receiving remedial education, job training, counseling, and preparation for useful and productive lives. The OEO has approved 323 VISTA, or Domestic Peace Corps, projects in 49 States, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, in which 2,300 VISTA volunteers from 18 to 80 are serving, with 1,077 more in training. So far, approximately 9,000 poor residents of target neighborhoods have participated on the governing boards of community action agencies across the country.

Perhaps most indicative of popular response, the war on poverty has brought forth an absolutely unprecedented outpouring of volunteer effort, including 350,000 Headstart volunteers, approximately 36,000 members of community action boards, 10,000 members of Women in Community Service, and countless doctors, dentists, lawyers, businessmen, religious leaders, and local government officials who have freely and enthusiastically devoted their efforts and skills to the success of the program.

Flexibility has been a keynote of the Office of Economic Opportunity's thinking, as the exciting new programs and innovations clearly indicate. This summer, 20,418 promising but economically disadvantaged high school students participated in Project Upward Bound on the campuses of 224 colleges and universities, beginning a full year of intensive tutoring and special counseling that will enable them to break the cycle of poverty by qualifying for college. Thirty-seven foster grandparents projects, which serve the economic needs of low-income elderly persons, together with the emotional and psychological needs of the most unfortunate little children in public and private institutions, have won wide acclaim. Over 160 legal services projects are, for the first time, bringing the majesty of the law into battle on the side of the poor; 68 antipoverty projects for migrant agricultural workers are providing the first avenues of opportunity from the migratory labor streams to the mainstream of American life. And 100 American Indian tribes are vigorously conducting their own wars on poverty as a result of the special attention OEO has given to their problems.

In addition, illiterate adults in 45 States are participating in adult basic education programs; work-experience projects have brought jobs and income to over 134,000 family heads previously on relief; over 32,000 antipoverty loans have gone to combat poverty in rural areas; and small business development centers in 50 urban and rural communities have approved approximately $22,840,774 in economic incentive loans to struggling small businesses in poverty neighborhoods.

All this and more has been accomplished in less than 2 years under a program that accounts for about 1 cent in each tax dollar, and which is directed by an OEO staff approximating in numbers that which is required by the Air Force to keep a single squadron of B–52's in the air. Our Republican friends have spoken of "chaotic administration" in the war on poverty, but I feel that these facts constitute, instead, a tremendous tribute to Sargent Shriver and his staff. I endorse the war on poverty, and lend my full support to the pending bill.

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH].

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, with gratification at its many good features but with profound regret at its limitations that will prevent us from making a full-scale assault on poverty and its related ills. The tremendous progress that has been made in the less than 700 days of its existence is clear proof of the need for expansion of the antipoverty program. It is intolerable that the splendid beginning that has been made in giving the deprived and disadvantaged their first chance to achieve a better life may be thwarted by our failure to allocate sufficient resources of our affluent society to the war on poverty. The doors to the American way of life and economic abundance that have been slowly opening to the poor must not be closed again. The commitment that the Nation made in the Economic Opportunity Act to eliminate, within our borders, the ancient plague of poverty must be fulfilled now. To those who object that we cannot afford to launch a major attack against poverty, I say: Can we afford not to?

Yesterday more than 1,000 citizens from the Newark, N.J., area, citizens from all walks of life and all economic brackets, journeyed to Washington to demonstrate their concern about the restrictions contained in the pending legislation. These citizens embodied the spirit of the war on poverty—the spirit of mutual help and neighborliness which made pioneer America great and which has given new hope and vitality to our hard-pressed urban area. This was a *stirring* example of democracy at work. The poor and the unlearned marched with their able mayor, the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio; with the distinguished president of United Community Corp., Dean C. Willard Heckel, of Rutgers University Law School; and with other leaders and workers of the community, in the great cause of human dignity and justice. These citizens know full well that the poor have a major role to play in their own escape from poverty. But they cannot do it alone. The CAP programs, Operation Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, legal services, job training, basic adult education, the Job Corps—all have proved their value in coping with poverty and its ills.

Among the volume of letters, both commendatory and critical, I have received from constituents, was one from a participant who summed up in a few words the whole point of the poverty program:

> Men and women and teenagers in our area have been looking at life in a different light since they have been trained for new jobs through the antipoverty funds.

More than 20 years ago President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in proclaiming an economic bill of rights, declared—

> We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence.

The war on poverty helps to implement that realization. I urge that we do so comprehensively and adequately so that the one-fifth of our population who live lives of poverty and despair can "look at life in a different light."

The ultimate aim of the war against poverty, it has been well said is "to provide the young with the opportunity to learn, the able bodied with the opportunity to work, the poor with the opportunity to live in decency and dignity." To achieve that aim will not be easy. The battle will not be won this year, or next year, or the next year.

The important fact is—we have begun—and we must not falter or retreat.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned at the import of the remarks which were just made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that any Member of this House would deny the right of any citizen of the United States to petition the Congress, or to come to Washington to express his viewpoint or his opinion upon any matter pending before the Congress of the United States. The first amendment to the Constitution was adopted to protect the right of the people to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. I do not recall any outcry from the other side of the aisle when the real estate lobby descended upon Congress to oppose title IV, the open housing section, of the civil rights bill of 1966.

Mr. Chairman, it is my own opinion that the citizens of the country who are most concerned and who are most directly affected by the antipoverty program, not only have the right, but have the obligation to express their points of view and to tell the Members of Congress how the program has been implemented and what their needs and concerns are.

Mr. Chairman, one of the objectives of the antipoverty program, I thought, was to bring about the maximum feasible participation of the poor in the programs conducted under it.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the objectives of the community action program. When people are involved in trying to help themselves to develop their own programs, I believe it is important that the Members of Congress know from them how effective the programs are, and what needs to be done for the future. This is essential if we are going to begin to move toward carrying out the words of President Johnson, which he addressed to the Congress of the United States in his state of the Union message on January 8, 1964—and I would like to quote the President. He said he was "declaring unconditional war on poverty." He warned:

> It will not be a short or easy struggle—no single weapon or strategy will suffice—

And he pledged that:

> We shall not rest until that war is won. The richest nation on earth can afford to win it. We cannot afford to lose it.

Mr. Chairman, when we enacted the first Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, we knew that we were charting a difficult and hazardous voyage toward a distant shore which no civilization had ever reached before.

But with full knowledge of the magnitude of the hazards and the costs which lay ahead, we accepted the challenge of poverty not simply because it was there, or because it was politically expedient, but because the abolition of poverty is right. It was right to begin an attack on poverty which could abolish it eventually, if we used the full resources of our Nation.

And, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why the richest nation in the world, the most technologically advanced nation which history has ever known, cannot abolish the anomoly of poverty in the midst of plenty.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the war on poverty is all about, and that is what this bill is all about which we have been debating today and yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, 30 years ago a great President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, spoke about "one-third of a nation ill housed and ill clad, ill nourished."

Now, 30 years later we know that there is still one-fifth of the Nation living in the subbasement of our society, one-fifth of the Nation is still ill housed, ill clad, and ill nourished and unable to participate fully in our national life. One-fifth of the Nation is now not asking for handouts, not asking simply for shelter and clothing and food, but asking for the opportunity—for the opportunity—to help solve their own problems, to help begin to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps and shape their own destiny.

Mr. Chairman, the community action part of this program is designed to give people in the ghetto communities of our cities and in the poverty-stricken rural areas of our country the opportunity to shape their own programs. This is how it is different from other social welfare programs in the past.

To his everlasting credit, President Johnson saw that, although our Nation is richer now than ever before, there was still one-fifth of our Nation living in poverty.

The first challenge confronting President Johnson was to enable the entire Nation to see how poor 35 million of its inhabitants really are. In the revealing phrase of Michael Harrington, the poor of this country were truly "the other America." They were invisible to the naked eye, that is, unless the eyes and ears of America could be brought into the urban ghettos and impoverished rural areas which scar and pock America's bright new face.

So the first task was to make America face fully facts which seemed so distant when presidential candidate John F. Kennedy told a nationwide television audience that 17 million Americans go to bed hungry every night.

And in this first task, the war on poverty—led by the impoverished people themselves, and by their President—has been a success. Poverty has become a fact, a household word.

The second challenge of the war on poverty was to formulate a program to do something about poverty, to plan battle tactics. It was clear from the start that poverty consisted of more than bad housing, bad clothing, and bad food. Poverty is a psychological as well as a physical phenomenon. In addition to houses and clothes and food, the poor need self-confidence.

In plain terms, the poor needed to develop the belief and the knowledge that they can control their own environment and shape their own destiny.

To accomplish this purpose, we defined a community action program as one "which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served." We charged the Office of Economic Opportunity with the responsibility of involving the poor. At the same time, the Office of Economic Opportunity was to provide education for youngsters, provide jobs for those who might be persuaded to remain in school, encourage people to learn new skills, and confront the myriad problems which are summed up in the word "poverty."

Rapidly, a truism became obvious. The only way to persuade people that they can have a hand in determining their own fate is to ask them to help decide what that fate will be. The only

way to overcome their sense of powerlessness is to give them power.

This, Mr. Chairman, was the key to the battle plan for ending poverty. Help people to help themselves. Handouts—housing, food, and clothes—are not enough.

Thus the community action program was born. It was a bold new idea and to use it as a weapon against poverty could be very dangerous. For it required the creation of new institutions which would threaten the existing power structure. But the community action program represented the kind of challenge which must be met to create a successful program.

Mr. Chairman, the third challenge of the war on poverty was to wage it: to finance it adequately, to see it through the difficulties, and to win it.

Today we are meeting, in effect, to review our battle plans once again. There are those who argue that the effort has already cost too much—too much money, too much power of local officials, too much patience by the American public. They would cut spending, abandon the controversial programs, and redistribute the remaining functions to other agencies.

I totally disagree with those arguments. When we passed the Economic Opportunity Act 2 years ago, we knew that to be successful the program would have to be daring and controversial. The question which we should ask today is not whether the program is treading lightly, but whether it is having any success.

Naturally, it is very difficult to evaluate a new program of this sort after only 2 years, with any real precision. It is particularly difficult to evaluate the effect of community action. How does one weigh dignity? What price does one put on indignation?

However, a moving testament to the effect of community action is the hundreds of people who have come to Washington from all over the country today to join the poor people's march. The point is that these people care. To them the war on poverty is no longer the administration's war—it is theirs. Their families and their communities are the ones at stake. They have now decided that they want to carry on the struggle. From us they ask the money to do so. Rather than taking exception to their presence here, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] did, let us see it as a measure of the success of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to review some of the accomplishments of the war on poverty which perhaps can be more easily measured.

In the 2 years since the Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States to open to everyone "the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity," economic opportunity programs have reached almost 7.8 million people. More than 1,361,000 children have been enrolled in the Headstart child development program. More than 600,000 jobs for teenagers have been provided through the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Over 5.1 million people have been served by the almost 700 community action agencies.

Yet I would be the first to agree that this record is inadequate. We have reached 7.8 million people, but 30 to 40 million people live in poverty. The programs have barely begun to take effect. The administrators have just begun to develop the understanding and expertise to administer them effectively. To date, the war on poverty has been little more than a skirmish. It is time now to expand it rather than to explore ways to limit it.

Mr. Chairman, in the war on poverty I am a hawk. When the 1964 legislation was proposed, I enlisted for the duration. I believe that the Congress has made a moral commitment and must carry it out. If we do not, it is not only the poor who suffer, it is the Nation as a whole.

It is with this feeling that I would like to comment on particular provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966.

The Job Corps under title I provides residential centers for young men and women, 16 through 21, in a coordinated program of basic education, skill training, and constructive work experience. It is designed for youth lacking the schooling and skills for decent jobs. A typical enrollee entering the Job Corps has only a 4.7 grade reading level, although he has finished 7 years of school. He is 7 pounds underweight, and the chances are four out of five that he has never seen a doctor or dentist. Forty-five percent of the enrollees are from a broken home. Sixty-five percent are from families where the head of the household is unemployed. Fifty percent are from families on relief. Nine out of ten enrollees are unemployed at the time of enrollment; the 1 in 10 who is employed earns an average wage of only 80 cents an hour.

For 9 months, Job Corpsmen are given 60 hours a week of training and instruction, including work training, basic education, guidance and counseling, physical fitness, and citizenship. The success of this training is noteworthy. The typical Job Corps graduate has raised his reading level by two and a half grades. He has gained 10 pounds and is no longer underweight. He has received medical and dental care and is now in good health. His earning capacity is now solid; Job Corps graduates have moved into jobs with an average entry of $1.68 per hour.

Furthermore, as the committee has noted:

> Any attempt to objectively evaluate the Job Corps must take into account that its target population is youngsters who are not only poor, but also have no other alternative training available to them.

So the fact of the matter is that the Job Corps is not only successful, but it is unique.

It not only represents a constructive opportunity for the poor; it represents their only opportunity.

Despite these glowing facts, the committee has chosen to limit the program. It has cut the administration request by a full $28 million and set a ceiling of 45,000 enrollee positions or training slots for all conservation camps and urban centers. It offers as a justification "the present high cost per enrollee," but I would prefer to consider the high cost of welfare payments year after year, the cost of unemployment compensation year after year, and most of all, the cost in human dignity which follows the realization that one is not only unemployed but also unemployable.

Unfortunate as the committee's action on the Job Corps is, the treatment of the community action program is even more serious, for the community action program is the very heart of the war on poverty. Embodied in nearly 1,000 urban and rural antipoverty agencies across the Nation, it has become the catalyst of community renewal and the conduit from poverty to opportunity upon which the entire national effort depends.

A guiding spirit of the community action program is faith in the idea of a "community," where people can work together to identify common interests in a goal as large and noble as the eradication of poverty, and can link their efforts in achieving this goal. Community action programs represent one of the most important ways in which the poor can formulate and articulate their views. Congress should not restrict this program, which at last has given people a chance to help determine their own future.

However, the committee has downgraded the community action program. Section 210 of H.R. 15111 amends title II of the 1964 act by striking out that provision which directs the Office of Economic Opportunity to give preference to programs and projects which are components of a community action program.

The community action program is further downgraded by the authorization provisions contained in H.R. 15111. To implement the provisions of title II, $832 million is authorized by section 2. From that total at least $509 million is authorized for programs other than community action. Many of these are quite worthy—as I will point out later—but the fact remains that they will all have to be paid for from community action funds. Only $323 million remains unearmarked, that is, remains to be allocated by the local communities—which is about $125 million less than the amount authorized for community action in fiscal year 1966, and about $150 million less than the administration asked for for fiscal year 1967.

I am particularly distressed by the effect which this restricted CAP budget will have on New York City. The poverty program in New York has been misadministered by local officials, but nevertheless it is now beginning to make some headway. If all of the programs now operating in the city were to be renewed and funded for the next year, they would cost $36 million—even if no new programs were started. Yet under the authorization in this bill only $23 million could be made available. Thus current programs in the city—which are far from large enough to accomplish the purposes of the act would have to be cut by one-third.

The committee is to be commended, however, for the other changes which it has made in defining the role of community action programs. The new definition of "community," making it clear that it is not necessarily coextensive with a political subdivision, is consistent with the concept which I have fought for in trying to amend the Economic Development Act to allow an area like Harlem or Watts to be treated independently of the political unit of which it is a part. It also would seem consistent with the purposes of "community" action to require, as 202(c) now would, that the representatives of a community action board reside in the community itself.

More important, the proposed new section 205(f) would require that at least 20 percent of the funds available for carrying out community action programs would have to be used for operating independently funded programs in communities in which an overall community action agency is concurrently in operation.

This amendment is similar to a proposal which I made in a letter to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver, on April 30, 1965. I pointed out:

> The success of the President's antipoverty program depends upon stimulating local initiative. This must not be stifled by permitting the city to have a stranglehold on the program. There is a fear that, unless the city controls the program, the status quo will be threatened creating a problem for the city. Because of this political fear and the enticing visions of a new patronage pool, the city administration is attempting to thwart the intent of Congress.

Noting the failures of New York City to get its proposed programs off the ground, I said:

> There should be a substantial amount of direct Federal funding to local community action programs. . . . This will provide for diversity as well as a balance between the city and private, nonprofit agencies.

Hopefully the OEO will now be able to cope with such situations directly.

Mr. Chairman, a second important result of independent funding is suggested by the committee in the report:

> The amendment will insure—

The report says—

> that there is unequivocal opportunity for nonumbrella groups of a grassroots nature to undertake independently funded projects.

As the committee has made clear, the grassroots nature of the independently funded projects is not to be considered a substitute for the maximum feasible participation of the poor in the community action boards. Rather, it is an additional method of involving the poor in the projects which will help to shape their environment.

There are other commendable aspects to H.R. 15111 as well. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the committee have been imaginative in devising new and exciting programs, while expanding a few—too few—of the older, already successful programs.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps authorization has been increased to $496 million, which is almost twice as much as was obligated during the past fiscal year. The new amount is expected to result in 180,000 job opportunities for youths in school during the next academic year, 180,000 summer jobs to bridge the academic gap between spring and fall and help insure the return to school of disadvantaged youngsters, and 85,000 full-time job opportunities for school dropouts. The out-of-school program has been improved by including not only work experience but other assistance, such as basic literacy training and occupational skill training, as well by broadening the program to include on-the-job training in private employment.

Mr. Chairman, Sargent Shriver has called Project Headstart "OEO's greatest single measurable success." It has had great impact on the children it serves, as is evidenced by the fact that children's intelligence quotients have been raised by as much 8 to 10 points in just a 6-week period. This record is recognized by the committee's action in authorizing $352 million—almost twice last year's obligation—for this year's Headstart program. The additional money is to be used to improve health, nutritional social, educational, and mental health services for the preschool children.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I must express my great concern about the administration of the Headstart program by New York City, a problem which underlines my view expressed earlier that there must be more direct funding by OEO of independent programs.

New York City's Headstart program has been tripped and often immobilized by an impossible tangle of redtape.

Last December, OEO approved $6.5 million for Headstart programs which were to benefit some 12,000 New York City youngsters in programs operated by 46 agencies, including New York City's Board of Education. The programs were to operate during the 6 months period from January through June.

By the middle of April only 21 independent agencies were operating Headstart programs, 7 agencies were partially operating, and 17 agencies with programs involving 3,500 children were not operating at all—the children trapped in the middle of bureaucratic wrangle.

Mr. Chairman, many of the independent Headstart agencies in New York City have been pleading with OEO to be able to negotiate directly with the Federal agency, to be funded directly, to avoid the morass of local redtape which has impeded rather than facilitated their efforts. One of the important purposes of the antipoverty program is the development of community action and self-reliance; yet many of the persons operating these local programs feel that almost all their efforts are absorbed in fighting through the many layers of local bureaucracy only to be confronted in the end by another layer of Federal bureaucracy.

I believe that there are many instances where it is in the interest of the poverty program to have OEO deal directly with local independent agencies. And I feel particularly strongly that the Federal Government should step into a direct administrative position when a local poverty umbrella agency has demonstrated its inability to effectively administer a program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to note that new approaches will be introduced to strengthen old programs. Section 211 of the pending bill would expand the adult basic education program to include not only reading and writing English, but also other basic skills, such as arithmetic and speech. Section 805 would authorize VISTA to spend up to 15 percent of its funds for special volunteer programs which would include the employment of low-income persons.

One especially important program that will be enlarged by H.R. 15111 is the legal services program. In a few short months it has emerged as one of the most effective arms of the antipoverty effort. Administered as a branch of the community action program, it sets up local legal assistance projects in urban and rural areas. Local projects generally establish community law offices in the target poverty neighborhoods, thus providing immediate legal aid and representation to the poor in the countless crises of their lives, in which the law is, or can be, the crucial determining factor. The extent to which the poor are in need of legal services cannot be exaggerated—and OEO has moved dramatically to meet this need, to close the gap between poverty and justice.

The poor are at a power disadvantage, politically and economically, in American society, and one of the traditional roles of the law is the elimination of the arbitrariness of power. Equal justice under law is an ideal which can only be obtained when strength and influence are countervailed by effective legal protection of individual rights. Unprotected rights are no rights at all.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example of how the legal services program helps the poor. In urban areas, slum dwellers often demand that landlords bring their property up to the minimum standards required by municipal housing codes before they pay their rent. The landlord's response to such demands frequently is the service of an eviction notice: "If you don't like it, get out." Such response has made it possible for landlords to flaunt housing codes, for poor people would rather live in rundown apartments than in none at all. With a legal services lawyer to defend the tenant, the practice of evicting tenants who demand habitable apartments can be significantly reduced.

In addition to providing legal aid, OEO has funded one program at Columbia University which is a research project, designed to develop a body of expertise—presently nonexistent—on the subject of the legal problems of poor people. In cooperation with this program, the Neighborhood Legal Center of Mobilization for Youth, recently funded by OEO, has already begun litigation challenging unannounced visits to welfare recipients' homes by investigators of the New York City Welfare Department. The Columbia project will make the issues, opinions, and arguments available to legal services projects throughout the country.

Law schools are being encouraged to use OEO funds to develop courses dealing with the legal problems of the poor. Both the University of Detroit and the University of Mississippi have already begun such programs, and both of these programs are functioning in connection with OEO-funded law offices in which law students are able to learn at first hand the kind of legal problems which the poor actually have, and the manner in which lawyers can be of use in solving them. Thus, OEO is changing not only the world of the poor but also the world of the lawyer. One result of this program has been a tremendous enthusiasm for the program on the part of law students, many of whom will devote their time and energy to legal services to the poor after law school.

OEO and the project agencies around the country have been flooded with applications for jobs in legal services programs. If legal services does nothing but interest a large number of intelligent law school students and recent graduates in the need and opportunities for providing legal help for the poor, I would feel it is worth while.

At least three new programs also deserve special mention. The first, contained in section 205, would authorize $88 million in fiscal year 1967 to provide training and public service employment for the hard-core unemployed. Work experience will be combined with educational and training assistance, such as basic literacy and occupational training, and it is estimated that at least 25,000 people will receive jobs, training, and supportive services during the next year. This is a creative new idea, which attacks hard-core unemployment while supplying needed services. Experts estimate that some 5 million people could be usefully employed in the fields of health, education, urban improvement, and welfare. The supply of trained personnel to fill these positions is inadequate and is becoming increasingly more so. What better people to train for these jobs could be found than the chronically unemployed?

Mr. Chairman, the uncontrolled growth of narcotics addiction has become a fact of life for many of those in the target areas of the war on poverty. Section 207 is aimed at helping to meet this problem. It authorizes $12.5 million for a new experimental program for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of over 5,000 addicts. The approach is noninstitutional. It would offer the motivation of a job, combined with educational and training assistance, in a total effort toward providing the addict with a hopeful, not despairing, future. This program is particularly important for New York State, where nearly one-half of the known narcotic addicts in the Nation reside.

Section 207 also provides another important new program by authorizing $8 million to establish a program of small loans to persons from low-income families who are confronted with financial emergencies. Approximately 40,000 loans, each bearing 2 percent annual interest, would be made and wherever it is feasible, the loan will be made through local credit unions created in poverty areas through community action groups. Such a program holds out great hope for averting family tragedies induced by a lack of urgently needed funds, although I must express my disappointment that the loan limit should be only $300 per individual.

Mr. Chairman, while the war on poverty has initiated many new programs, the necessary financial commitment has not been made. Last year, for instance, we authorized $1.785 billion for the fiscal year 1966 portion of the war on poverty. But when the appropriations bill came up, it appropriated $1.5 billion. I deplored this action and introduced H.R. 15851, which would have appropriated the additional $285 million needed for full funding of the war on poverty in fiscal year 1966. The bill we now consider authorizes $1.75 billion—$35 million less than last year. On the other hand, the Senate bill authorizes $2.5 billion. When this bill goes to conference, I hope the Senate figure will prevail.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a solemn promise to the poor. We have the opportunity and the duty to fulfill that promise with total commitment. Let us proceed to do so.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

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

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in this debate on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966 I wish to give the following examples which point out to me that needless duplication of existing, private, State, and Federal programs is occurring under the auspices of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Just yesterday I received a communication from the Seattle Building & Construction Trades Council which called my attention to the fact that the Opportunities Industrialization Center in Seattle is competing with an apprenticeship program which is already operating successfully and which is sponsored jointly by State and Federal funds.

Instead of funding over $1,135,000 to the Seattle project, why was the existing program not enlarged upon if the need is there?

Another glaring example was called to my attention early this summer when the magazine Welding Engineer carried an editorial pointing out that the Office of Economic Opportunity had set up a welding training program in an eastern city and that the initial program would cost about $16,000 a year to train four welders. This is figured on the $3,800 cost for a 12-week course in arc welding. As if the cost were not a sad enough commentary, there is also another one—the students are receiving training only with stick electrodes. There is nothing in the course to instruct the student in the use of the Mig gun which is used extensively in the trade.

I do not know why a welding school has to be set up in a city that has two of the best privately operated welding schools in the country, schools where experienced teachers would provide welding students with adequate training and virtually insure them a job at a cost of one-fourth to one-eighth the money the Office of Economic Opportunity is going to spend per student.

Mr. Chairman, these are just two of innumerable examples of waste in Government spending through duplication of OEO programs with existing and adequate private, State or Federal programs. I would urge each of my colleagues to give careful consideration to the provisions of the legislation which we are currently considering so that we might alter or eliminate those portions which would lead to further needless duplication of programs.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, last year, when we were discussing this same poverty war here in the House of Representatives, several of our colleagues here in the House spoke of the hopes that we had had for the program. When the original bill to establish the OEO came before us, the Congress had hopes for a vigorous, effective program to combat one of our most serious national problems. Our hopes were shared by the impoverished.

Last year, when we discussed the continuation of the program, we looked back at those hopes and at the failure of the poverty war to meet them. We noted with disappointment that the strong, vigorous, imaginative program we had been promised was in practice a half-hearted ineffectual sham, weighted down with political patronage, untrained and unqualified personnel, and with a complete lack of purpose and direction.

I wish that I could stand here a year later and report that the situation had improved. I wish I could point to the improvements and the attempts to clean up the problems. I wish I could point to poverty-stricken people whose faith in the Government had been renewed and, most important of all, whose faith in themselves had been renewed by the work of the OEO.

Instead, I find only more disappointment, more political antics, more mismanagement, more people asking "when will the poor be helped?" We have pumped billions of dollars into a program that has never gotten off the ground. And here we stand once again, about to pour in more money, about to pledge the taxpayers to another year of supporting one of the most expensive boondoggle in our history.

Perhaps the most heartbreaking part of this is the realization on the part of the poor that this program which promised them so much can give them so little. Many of the people we are dealing with here are already suspicious of their Government. They feel that it does not represent them, and they blame their society for the poverty they live in. One of the most laudable goals of this program was to restore their faith and give them hope and confidence.

This summer, two teaching Sisters from a convent in Florida came to

Washington and worked with the poverty program here. With their lives already dedicated to helping others, they came full of energy to see and help in what they expected to be a shining example of what the program could do for the poor. They left hurt, bewildered, and disappointed. They told me of young men and women who were just beginning to think that someone cared, beginning to really want to learn and work and make something of themselves. They told me of the promises made these young people and never kept. Paychecks were held up for weeks. Careless handling of the books and confusion in offices resulted in incorrect payments, errors which then took weeks to correct. They told me of equipment promised and never delivered, of appointments broken, of endless waiting, of the struggle to get needed supplies, of the royal runaround whenever they tried to appeal to the poverty authorities.

They were indignant, they were upset, and they were terribly disappointed. They saw young people buoyed up by hopes and promises, let down. They saw old suspicions creep back. They heary cynicism return, and apathy and distrust.

Their story is not an unusual one. We have heard it in variation from all over the country. Bungling in the OEO has come to be expected, and such reports cause little surprise any more.

In Memphis, Tenn., youths with a weekly salary of $31.25 were forced to kick back $25 each from their salaries for the hiring of an unauthorized supervisor. In Bellevue, Nebr., a Neighborhood Youth Corps project was canceled after it was discovered that 90 percent of the youths enrolled were not from low income families. Officials in Chicago admit that 27½ percent of their 23,804 children in the Headstart program were from families exceeding the poverty level. They did not even know the incomes for 20 percent more. This means that another 5,000 disadvantaged children could have been helped.

Payroll ghosts are haunting the Boston community development program; 200 of the 600 teenagers employed last summer claim that their W2 forms showed more income than they actually received. An additional 200, for whom W2 forms had been issued and in whose names checks were written cannot be located—either because they were signed up without addresses or because they never existed.

In North Tonawanda, N.Y., after waiting since August of 1965 for the application forms to arrive, the city paid for its own director, teachers, and facilities to get the Headstart program underway. The forms arrived in November, and the officials were told that there was no hope of getting them cleared before March of 1966.

In Wisconsin, a Job Corps enrollee was assigned to a camp 90 miles from his home. His travels to get there covered 400 miles and 2 days, 3 plane changes, a bus ride, and a car ride. All this was at Government expense, and after the Job Corps had been advised that the cheapest way would have been by taxi for $35.

In Chicago, city hall controls the appointment of 42 of the 75 community action directors. This enables the mayor to keep control of the $21 million in poverty grants to keep his political machine running.

In Philadelphia, of the first 16 group leaders hired to work with youngsters in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, 13 had arrest records including larceny, assault and battery, and morals counts involving minors.

In Charleston, W. Va., the poverty programs spent $345,549 to renovate a hotel worth $250,000. A corporation whose president was then a leading Democrat officeholder receives $94,800 a year profit on the property.

In Pasadena, Tex., they did not understand the Youth Corps to be a strictly "poor-folks" program. The chairman of the selection committee was quoted saying:

> We felt there could be kinds of poverty other than material poverty, that perhaps some needed jobs for spiritual or other reasons.

It was reported that some youths were hired who just wanted to support a car. If they went down the list far enough, he admitted, it is possible a boy with a father and mother who made $20,000 a year could have been hired. Maybe that is poverty in Texas, but I doubt that this is what Congress had in mind.

Over one third of the employees, 38 percent making over $6,000 at five men's urban Job Corps centers received over a 20-percent increase to join the war on poverty. Percentage increases run as high as 526 percent, and increases over 100 percent are not at all uncommon.

On the subject of salaries, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, [WILLIAM AYERS], pointed out some very pertinent figures earlier this year. According to the President's 1967 budget 6,484 permanent Federal employees are budgeted to run Mr. Shriver's war at a cost nearing $53½ million in salaries alone. Twenty-five of these are paid more than General Westmoreland. Five receive more than the U.S. Commissioner of Education who runs programs twice the size of the entire poverty war.

The tragic part is that this bill we are talking about today only repeats the same old promises, only makes the same old claims, only tries to buoy the hopes of the poor, without providing a single concrete step for fulfilling them.

We have had 2 years now to profit by our mistakes, to learn by our experiences and to try to improve the concepts and the operation of the war on poverty. Instead, we have just poured in more money.

It has become even clearer than it was last year that the majority does not want the investigation of the war on poverty that is necessary if we are to make the program work. We have attempted on many occasions and even introduced legislation to institute such hearings and investigations, but we have been blocked at every turn. The hearings were so stacked with favorable witnesses that Sargent Shriver turned out to be the most critical. Republican suggestions for witnesses were summarily rejected.

Mr. Chairman, the American people deserve a better return on the investment of $2.3 billion of their taxes. And they deserve to know where the next installment will go and what they will get from it. No one expects the program to end poverty overnight, or entirely. But we do have a right to expect that after 2 years and $2 billion, some progress might have been made. Or at least that some progress is in sight.

Unfortunately, it looks as if all that is in sight is more waste, more unkept promises, more highly paid political hacks, and more newspaper articles about the failures and foibles of the most expensive fraud of the decade.

This is not what we wanted. This is, unfortunately, what many of us predicted. It did not take a crystal ball to see that a poorly conceived and badly planned program run by unqualified leaders on political patronage was doomed to fail. And it takes no occult powers to see that until these basic flaws are righted, the poverty war cannot fulfill the hopes of either the poor or the taxpayer.

It is not because we are not interested in the poverty stricken that we oppose this bill. It is rather because we do care and because we would like to be able to answer the cries of "when will the poor be helped," that we continue to insist upon a more responsible program.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, every now and then we all get a wonderful letter from what we like to call our grassroots back home. If you will indulge me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter I received from a lady. I think this is truly grassroots, Oswegatchie, N.Y. I will not try to identify where that is in the foothills of the Adirondacks.

But in this letter she wrote to her Congressman, she said this:

> The "Vista" program in Oswegatchie was (is) sure a big joke! You should have seen the two characters who came here last fall to show us how to live. Ha! Two beatniks, no less, with scraggly beards and long hair to say nothing of tight pants. One left when we had our first frost—the second has stayed on and altho we can't see that he has done anything for Oswegatchie in 7 months, we have managed thru the school and clergy to make him look quite human, so now he has taken his government car and his credit card and gone to Potsdam to live.

The community she refers to has two colleges.

Her letter continues:

> He is now shorn and shaved so we have reversed the formula and have done something for VISTA. And when he returns to Berkeley College in California next fall they may send us a whole flock of these characters to "humanize."

Finally, Mr. Chairman, she concluded in her letter as follows:

> You may wonder what sort of a nut I am. I am one of many who try to serve their community and fellow men—who work in churches, on school boards and fraternal organizations; who hold a job—care for their

homes and families and who worry about wars in far-off lands that kill our fine young men for reasons we do not always understand, who desire to build up a certain amount of security for our old age, if we achieve it, and who still have faith in God and country and even our Congressmen.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I am going to assume for the purposes of my remarks here that your letter is correct and I am sorry that this was not brought to my attention sooner because I am opposed to that kind of person myself, the kind of beatnik who was described there. They do not represent my philosophy and I hope that they do not represent the philosophy of this program.

If you have any evidence of this, if you will turn it over to me, I will do my level best to get them out of the program. They are an embarrassment to me personally, and I think they are an embarrassment to our Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the VISTA program can be a fine program. I regret to hear these kind of remarks about the volunteers.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, as we near the end of the general debate, I would like to emphasize first of all that we Republicans have tried to take a constructive view of the poverty program. From the very beginning—and I will not reiterate what has been said here earlier today—we have offered specific alternatives. Since the program has gotten underway, and it is now 2 years old, a great many problems have developed.

It is a matter of deep concern to me as a Member of Congress, as it must be to you, that these problems seem to proliferate and compound themselves.

Unfortunately and sadly, it would appear to me that this Congress is not prepared even today to take the direct action necessary to begin to do the job that we all agree should be done.

There have been good programs. Some of them were proposed by a few of us before there was a war on poverty and they have done some good. But it is unforgiveable that after 2 years we are unwilling as Members of Congress, yes, as Americans, to take an honest look at this program and make the changes that should be made.

I am sad to say that this year the hearings on the poverty program were a farce, literally. Those who were heard made contributions, but they were almost exclusively those who were representing the administration.

We asked that there be 67 different witnesses called. Some of the Republicans had been out on the road with the investigative staff; some of the Democrats had. We talked with people in the field who were striving to make this law work. We were aware of the number of problems. We felt there were people who were working to eliminate poverty who had greater wisdom, perhaps, in the practical application of this program than we did.

None of the 67 witnesses were called. Not a single constructive critic was called. In fact, the most critical witness was the first, Mr. Shriver, who spent the first five pages of his testimony outlining an admission of things that were wrong with the program.

When the chairman of our committee was asked by the press why none of the 67 witnesses were called, he said, "Because I am chairman."

This concerns us because today we come to the final moments of general debate. Tomorrow we will be marking up this legislation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will at the outset offer a constructive substitute that has been, I must say, much misrepresented. It is called the Opportunity Crusade. It would drastically redirect this program.

A few minutes ago I listened to the very eloquent words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]. He expressed very well the objectives that many of us have. He expressed very well what many of us wish this program were.

Unfortunately, too often the program does not stack up. We have heard discussion earlier of the poverty program reducing the welfare rate. We would all like to do that. We would all like to get more people off welfare. The evidence is that in a period of mounting prosperity and decreasing unemployment, welfare expenses have been going up. I need only quote the report of the Appropriations Committee this spring in the second supplemental appropriation bill:

> When Congress acted on the regular annual bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966, it reduced the request for grants to States for public assistance by $242,200,000 on the basis that we have been appropriating hundreds of millions of additional dollars every year for the past few years for programs that are aimed at combating dependency, and the outlook for reduction in the rate of employment was better than it had been for a long time.

This was the summer of 1965. Continuing:

> Of course, unemployment rates have been going to even lower rates than was anticipated when Congress acted on the original appropriation for 1966, yet in the face of this fact, the request for a supplemental appropriation is not only to restore the reduction made by Congress last year, but for an additional amount of approximately $140 million.

We can argue about the merits of individual programs, but none of us can argue about the fact that there are warning signs, that the amber light is up on this program, if not a more serious warning, and if we believe in the objective of eliminating poverty—and I think we all do—we had better make some changes. So when those of us who criticize, offer constructive suggestions in the next few days and present our views, I hope they will have the serious and sincere attention of the membership, and that we can make some significant changes in this program.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] earlier talked about the Job Corps. I will not reiterate the many revelations there have been. I might say that I have never been one who criticized the fact that there were some problems in Job Corps camps getting unruly youngsters adjusted, provided officials were realistically trying to apply discipline. I have never been one who criticized, where people, young people, who had had problems and brushes with the law, were being given a reasonable and realistic chance to make good, and yet some of them might get in trouble. This is inevitable.

But we get a little tired of the reply constantly that we have to expect these things, and we do not do anything differently to perhaps improve the program.

We have now had, according to present statistics, 11,254 young people graduate from the Job Corps camps. OEO has claimed 4,971 of them as confirmed placements in jobs, in the Armed Services, or in school. That's less than half.

I would say that if we have saved less than half, if we have really saved them, the investment would be worthwhile. But unfortunately, the best objective analysis that we have been able to get by respected economists and academicians is that these figures are not reliable.

When we look at the procedures followed with respect to Job Corps enrollees, we cannot help but have questions. The boy or girl graduates from the Job Corps and then what happens to him or her?

Unless he locates in the immediate area of that Job Corps center, the center is finished with him. He is referred to a regional office. The regional offices have just been developing and getting personnel. They have had all sorts of problems churning all around them. They obviously were not giving individual care to the enrollees to try to help these youngsters get back into the flow of our economic system.

A large number of them, in fact most of them, have been graduated and just dropped back into society. Most of these figures we find are reports that they had a first connection on a job. They are very unreliable reports. In some instances, we found that actually they had taken jobs at a lower level than they had before they went into the Job Corps.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, from the figures I can find, there are over 11,000 graduates and only about 5,000 placements. This brings another point to mind. In the Job Corps center, the Job Corps program has people who apply from all over the country, and they come to the Job Corps center, so therefore the community identification is lost, the feeling of the people in that area that it is their job center for their young people.

So we have a community relationship breakdown.

There are two things that go wrong. There is the impossibility of following through on placement and, second, the community relationship breaks down, the rapport between the people in the Job Corps center and the people who should depend on it to give them help.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. I must say many of those sitting here know that 4

or 5 years ago, I was asking for a resident skill center on an experimental basis in the District of Columbia. I believe in this concept. But I have been very much concerned at the misuse of this concept.

Perhaps we only have to write one statistic into the RECORD when we consider what has been going on in these Job Corps camps, and that is the statistic that was referred to earlier in our debate. In the vocational area residential schools, the average cost per enrollee has been $2,600, testified to in our hearings in the Education Subcommittee, with an 80- to 85-percent job connection confirmed at the end of the road. They took, in some instances, Job Corps dropouts and rejects.

What is the cost in the Job Corps? It is estimated somewhere between $9,000 and $12,000 or $13,000. If nothing else, we can say that for the cost of $9,000 or $10,000, we should be able to take care of three or four more youngsters than we have.

Many of us bridle because we are not convinced that for that cost we have actually done anything very significant for these people.

I will not belabor this point. Page 12 of the report finally released by our chairman, at the bottom of the page, in the last two paragraphs, talks about the conservation camps. It could readily read right out of our debate of 1964, spoken by Republicans:

First, the skills being taught at these centers are not marketable in an urban area environment, from which most of the enrollees came and to which they will return.

Second, most of the centers are so remote to the need for doing meaningful conservation work that the corpsmen spend most of their time keeping the centers intact.

Third, most of the enrollees enlisted in the Job Corps to learn marketable skills and find themselves in remote places doing nothing but digging ditches, which discourages many beyond the point of restoration.

That is from the chairman's report.

With all of these factors, let me emphasize, I believe very deeply in the concept of involvement of the poor. Perhaps the saddest part of this program is the community action program. We have made some good starts, but basically across this country we have had chaos for 2 years in the formation of our community action boards. It is time Congress delineated in the law what kind of representation we expect on these boards. It is time we set a minimum requirement of involvement of the poor, in representation on the board. It is time we set, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] advocated last summer, a minimum requirement for involvement of the poor on these boards, as well as the involvement of all other elements of our society and community. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] advocated that in specific terms when the original poverty proposal came to our committee in 1964.

It is time we faced up to the fact, and it is a fact, testified to in the record, in Los Angeles, Cleveland, Memphis, San Antonio, St. Louis, Atlanta, Albany, Mobile, not to mention Oakland and Chicago, we do not have true representation of the poor, selected by the poor themselves, on these boards.

But we seem not ready to do anything about this, to set out the standards for fiscal responsibility, to eliminate the community civil war that has been going on in too many of our communities, to insist that OEO set clear administrative guidelines and stop vacillating back and forth, treating one community one way and another community another way and retracting the financial commitments that have been made.

It is time we started involving the States, when we can, in this whole program.

In good faith the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I have prepared the opportunity crusade. It would cut $300 million out of the total cost of the war on poverty. It would do so by several devices.

First, it would transfer the Headstart program under one leadership, the Office of Education. It would see to it that all of these programs were coordinated.

Someone said earlier, "We have given up coordination."

My gosh sakes, what we want is coordination. We want manpower training programs to coordinate with the Job Corps and not to send children to the Job Corps who can be trained under vocational education or manpower programs. We want them to start cutting costs. We want the OEO to concentrate on community action.

We would double the money in community action. Unlike the committee bill, we do not earmark these funds. We want to insist on representative boards, and then let them use the money the way they see fit for their people, with representation of the poor.

We would realine this program to give the SBA responsibility for the small business loans, keeping the community action boards involved in these decisions but putting the responsibility in Washington on a single agency.

Believe me when I say we are convinced, after all the administrative chaos that has gone on in this program, the OEO has all it can handle, if not more than it can handle, in just the community action program. That is what we would leave it with.

We hope the Members will give the opportunity crusade and our amendments serious consideration, because they are offered seriously and sincerely.

COMMUNITY ACTION—A WHISPER OF SCANDAL?

Mr. Chairman, the community action program has the greatest potential of the entire poverty program as an innovative force to channel and focus all Federal, State, local and private efforts for the development of human resources. As designed, the community action program would allow, for the first time, the people to be served by the program the opportunity to communicate their real needs to people with the ability to assist them. Through a two-way communication, each community could work out a program specifically tailored to meet the specific demands of its peoples. How has the performance of community action matched the potential? The structure would hardly be recognizable by the blueprint. Community action has become the most confused, mismanaged, and ineffective effort of the entire poverty program.

The original design of the program has been obscured by—

First, virtual community civil war over the structure of community action policy boards caused by the vacillating and indefinite policy by OEO central on representation;

Second, fiscal irresponsibility and chicanery;

Third, the failure of OEO to set adequate administrative guidelines;

Fourth, the vacillation of OEO on guidelines that are set;

Fifth, the retraction of OEO from financial commitments to CAP's; and

Sixth, failure to involve States.

Formulas for selection of the CAP boards varied. Some cities have been allowed to hedge on the establishment of a representative board while others have had their funds withheld until they have complied with an OEO prescription. In the prepared testimony for the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. Shriver acknowledged that there was insufficient representation of the poor in Los Angeles, Cleveland, Memphis, San Antonio, St. Louis, Atlanta, Albany, and Mobile. Two additional cities not mentioned by him, but acknowledged to have very controlled selection of membership, are Oakland and Chicago.

Full committee investigators found true representation and participation lacking in Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Newark, New Haven, and Oakland.

Last year, Mr. Shriver was ballyhooing elections as the true method of getting involvement of the poor on community action boards. After several well-publicized attempts at holding community-wide elections of the poor, the disappointing turnouts—1 percent, 5 percent, 4 percent—caused Mr. Shriver to completely reverse his position on elections. We do not support elections as the sole method, nor necessarily the best method of achieving involvement of the poor. On the other hand, we do feel that the failure should be judged on face value or that it should be construed as a reason for abandoning the "involvement concept."

The most basic involvement of the poor in the poverty program is their receipt of its benefits. How well have they fared in this type of involvement? It is undoubtedly true that after the expenditure of $2.3 billion, many people have been recipients of true aid from the poverty program—particularly such people as Headstart enrollees and recipients of small business and rural loans. Many more thousands of people, as Mr. Shriver is so fond of quoting, have been exposed to the program in the past 2 years—Job Corps enrollees, for instance, who have walked in and out of Job Corps camp gates, and Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees who were "put to work cleaning lots" to prevent them from rioting. How many of the program enrollees who have been touched by the program have benefited from the program is another story.

This is the real scandal of the program—that $2.3 billion has been expended and a recent Christian Science Monitor article can claim:

The really poor have been almost completely overlooked. The program isn't yet really reaching out to the masses of the poor where they are in their slums and meeting their needs.

CONFUSING AND CONTRADICTORY DIRECTIVES FROM OEO

Much of the local confusion and strife resulting from the limitation and administration of poverty programs is due to the directives issued by OEO. On some matters such as representation and organization of community action boards OEO has refused to take a stand other than not taking a stand. No community is able to tell what is acceptable in OEO's eye until OEO has given final approval to the local plan. Apparently, on the matter of community action boards, OEO makes a case-by-case decision. Because OEO has frequently retreated from ideological positions and lacks written guidelines on the subject, it has little influence in enforcing its ideas. Take for example the struggle that has beset Milwaukee for the past year with the resultant waste of time and effort.

In November 1965, Milwaukee was to have notified OEO that it had accomplished real representation of the poor on its CAP board, or risk the loss of its allotted CAP grant. The representation problem was not cleared up by the deadline but funds were released by the Washington office in December and people went to work on programs.

Then, after releasing the funds, OEO indicated they still were not satisfied. However, Milwaukee was allowed to act under an "interim" plan until July 1, 1966, by which date the poor were to have been given a greater voice in the program. July 1 came and went with no improvement having been made. A lenient OEO has now given Milwaukee an extension until November 1 to work out a plan. With OEO's past history of retreat, I wonder whether the Milwaukee CAP board will feel compelled to expand itself even by November 1.

Unfortunately, even in cases where they do set guidelines, they frequently retreat. I have in mind, particularly, the infamous CAP guideline memo No. 23 which deals with personnel policies and procedures. One of the parts of the directive states that:

No person who serves as a voting member of the governing body, the neighborhood council, or other major policy advisory body of a grantee may be employed by the grantee or any of its delegate agencies.

Because of this clause, and another regarding the families of board members, a number of CAP agencies had to drop personnel, and thus protested vigorously. Philadelphia was one of the cities affected. They had to suspend an estimated 500 people on June 29, 1966. But a week later OEO allowed the 500 to be restored to their jobs, "pending a study."

When the community action program is discussed, people usually talk in terms of the large cities—Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, Detroit—little is said about rural programs or programs in nonurban areas. The reason is that very little has been started in nonurban areas. Still less than 10 percent of the community action funds have gone to rural areas and much of that money has been in Headstart. What is the reason? Certainly not a lack of need. Forty-three percent of the U.S. poor live in rural areas. The reason is that it is difficult to get programs initiated in the rural areas because of their special problems. OEO, however, has been very negligent in using imagination and encouragement to help these areas. When programs are developed they can be very good—such as the L.B.J. & C. CAP in Tennessee and the W.A.M.Y. CAP in North Carolina, which has a very imaginative craft cooperative in operation.

Certain State technical assistance offices have been very active in trying to promote rural community action programs and aiding them with technical assistance. Now that they have overcome many handicaps and succeeded in developing CAP structures, slowly developing the hard-to-win rural confidence, they find their work is going to be undone by a severe unavailability of funds.

The fund shortage is going to be no less acute in urban areas. The loss in confidence of the poor is a severe disability to the progress of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should have in the RECORD at this time the Republican poverty memos we have issued regarding the problems with the war-on-poverty program and Republican investigation of the poverty program. I include the memos at this point:

[Republican poverty memo, Tuesday, Mar. 15, 1966]

No. 1

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Hearings are now underway on the poverty program. Congressman QUIE and I are pressing for consideration of our proposal to substitute an Opportunity Crusade for the misfiring War on Poverty.

Last week, Mr. Shriver testified rather superficially on a variety of issues. Among other things, in his prepared testimony, he made the incredible statement that, "Since last summer fewer than 50 ineligibles have been discovered in the Neighborhood Youth Corps." The very next day, Secretary Wirtz contradicted Mr. Shriver by admitting that at least five to six thousand enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have been found ineligible and dropped since last summer. 1700 were dropped in Chicago alone since January 1st. Now they are saying that these are welfare cases, barely exceeding the strict poverty standards. Well, a quick spot check of widely dispersed records in Chicago gives quite a different picture. Although arbitrary handling of the hearings prevented me from questioning Mr. Shriver on these, here are some samples. I have removed the names of the enrollees to spare them embarrassment; however, they are available to officials who may be interested:

Male enrollee—17, family of four, father head of household, income $11,000 a year.

Male enrollee—19, family of five, father head of household, income $10,200 a year.

Female enrollee—19, family of two (housewife with no children), husband head of household, income $5,000-plus a year.

Female enrollee—18, family of three (an only child), father and mother both work, earn jointly $150 per week.

Female enrollee—20, family of three (an only child), father head of household, income $7,500 a year.

Male enrollee—17, family of six, father head of household, income $7,000-plus a year.

Male enrollee—19, family of five, grandfather head of household, income $7,000-plus a year.

Male enrollee—18, family of six, father and mother both work, earn jointly $500 a month.

Male enrollee—20, family of five, father head of household, income $5,400 a year.

This is the program supposed to help poor youngsters who are school dropouts or likely drop-outs for reasons of poverty. Obviously, a full investigation would reveal many times more than Mr. Shriver's 50 ineligibles in Chicago alone. And no wonder! Last November the public relations representative for the Chicago poverty program stated, "We don't know what the families of kids make. No straight flat figure on what an applicant family should make has been set. We have no statistics on incomes of the families of the kids in the Corps. We assume that, when we receive a name from the Illinois State Employment Service, the candidate named is qualified."

At that time, the Executive Director of the Chicago program was quoted as follows: "It is absolutely correct that, until today, no means test was given in recruiting."

Almost one quarter of the total enrollees in Neighborhood Youth Corps in Chicago had to be dropped because they exceeded the income requirement. At the same time, the poverty director in Chicago admits that there are at least 35,000, and others estimate up to 60,000, young people between the ages of 16 and 22 in Chicago who fully meet the poverty standards for Neighborhood Youth Corps but weren't given a chance.

These are not isolated cases; they prevail all over the country. In addition to the 1,700 dropped in Chicago, Mr. Jack Howard, Director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, admitted that about 2,000 in New York City and at least 1,000 in Los Angeles were ineligible. That is close to 5,000 ineligibles from three cities alone.

In the next few days, I will discuss other serious violations in the poverty program in Chicago. In the meanwhile, let me emphasize that the Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade would correct these deficiencies and put 50,000 youngsters into productive jobs in private enterprise through a new Industry Youth Corps.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, Mar. 16, 1966]

No. 2

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE)

We who believe in the concept of helping the poor find their way out of the debris of despair are dismayed by the lavish spending and waste that have blocked the effectiveness of the present War on Poverty. It is especially disheartening to see the great potential that lies within the anti-poverty concept spend itself in needless bureaucratic confusion.

The time for this senseless spending to cease is long past. The Administration's War on Poverty is no longer in its infancy and the time for target practice is over. The program should be zeroed-in and hitting its mark. But, unfortunately, this does not appear to be the case.

Proponents of the Administration's War on Poverty would have us believe that the waste and abuses have stopped. They have not stopped, Mr. Speaker, and they should not have occurred in the first place. But we must be realistic. We must face facts. And the facts are that these incidents did occur—and at great expense to the weary taxpayer—and we must now do something to correct these wrongs before a great idea dies for want of proper guidelines and implementation.

I respectfully relate the case of the Job Corps enrollee who was enlisted at his home in Wisconsin and assigned to a Job Corps Center only 90 miles away from his hometown.

Under these circumstances there appeared to be no problem, save the minor one of transporting the enrollee the 90 miles to his assigned Job Corps Center. But not so. The wheels of bureaucracy began to grind and here is what came out at the end:

Before reaching his destination, the enrollee's travels spanned two days and more than 400 miles. He had to be put up for the night and fed two meals, changed planes three times, took a bus ride and ultimately a car ride; all paid for with Federal funds.

The trip from Rhinelander, Wisconsin, to Clam Lake Job Corps Center could have been much quicker and cheaper ($35) by taxicab, as the Job Corps was advised by its recruiting agency, the Wisconsin State Employment Service. The final touch of irony was that a free ride could have been secured for the enrollee with a Forest Service Radio Operator who travels daily from Rhinelander to Park Falls, Wisconsin, which is very near Clam Lake.

The Director of the Clam Lake Job Corps Center admitted that the route was a bit "circuitous." Here's the "circuitous" two-day itinerary of the enrollee for February 4–5, 1966:

February 4: 11:20 a.m., departed Rhinelander, Wisc. via North Central Airlines; 12:53 p.m., arrived Duluth, Minn.; 1:10 p.m., departed Duluth, Minn.; 1:55 p.m. arrived Minneapolis, Minn.

The enrollee spent the night in Minneapolis, where housed at a YMCA and given meal tickets by the Job Corps.

February 5: 1:00 p.m., departed Minneapolis, Minn., via Zephyr Bus Lines; 5:25 p.m., arrived in Cable, Wisc., where he was met by a car from Clam Lake Job Corps Center.

The young Job Corps enrollee traveled a total distance of 245 miles by air; 160 miles by bus; and a short distance by car to reach his final destination, which, before he got caught up in the Job Corps planned travel program, was only 90 miles away from his home. I feel that examples such as this case cannot help but raise serious fears that the Job Corps is long on planning and short on action and results.

I am not a critic of this Administration's War on Poverty by choice but rather by conscience. I have long supported the concept of training young men in an environment away from home if such is needed. As far back as 1961, my colleague, CHARLES GOODELL of New York, and I offered legislation built on this concept of the Job Corps.

Let me call to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade is structured solely for the purpose of offering more effective implementation of sound anti-poverty ideas. I strongly feel that this bill would correct the bureaucratic confusion and poor planning that is presently clogging the machinery of the War on Poverty.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommitee, Thursday, March 17, 1966]

No. 3

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Payroll "ghosts" are haunting Boston's scandal-torn poverty program. The FBI now has some leads on the extent of mismanagement and fraud uncovered there several months ago.

Two hundred of the six hundred teen-agers employed in the Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. (ABCD) Neighborhood Youth Corps last summer claim they received Federal income tax W-2 forms showing more income than they had actually received.

In other instances, the local poverty board, ABCD, has been unable to track down youths who were either signed up without addresses or who are non-existent "ghosts."

U.S. Attorney W. Arthur Garrity said the FBI determined in February that it had "Federal criminal jurisdiction" over the case. One ABCD official said he was afraid "the FBI will blow Boston's poverty program right out of the window."

This is not the first scandal for Boston's poverty program. Falsified and padded payrolls, forged identity cards and checks, political favoritism, sloppy administration, controversy and bitterness—all have been a part of Boston's poverty politics.

Federal funds were held up for two months, but on January 17, 1966, $1,503,670 was released to ABCD by the Labor Department and a spokesman said the department was "satisfied with the administrative changes and improvements in ABCD."

They finally had to fire the Deputy Director, Arnold L. Schuchter, and the Director, Joseph Slavet, resigned under pressure. I understand Mr. Schuchter is now employed as a consultant for the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade would throw out the present War on Poverty and replace it with a sensible, scandal-free program that would get the money and the help they need to the poor themselves.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, Mar. 18, 1966]

No. 4: CONGRESSMEN QUIE AND GOODELL PREDICT MORE RIOTS UNLESS

There is a developing crisis in the urban poverty areas of our country and the high promise and low performance of the War on Poverty are key contributors. Unless things are changed quickly, there will be more riots in Watts, Oakland, Chicago, Cleveland, Gary (Indiana), New York City and other areas. It is not too late to launch a true Opportunity Crusade as a complete substitute for the sputtering War on Poverty.

When our investigators returned from Los Angeles in January, we warned that the planned election or repesentatives of the board from seven large sprawling districts covering all of Los Angeles County, rich and poor, would be a farce. We warned there would be further riots in Watts as things were going. Four highly-placed poverty officials in Los Angeles themselves admitted that there has been very little meaningful progress in the anti-poverty programs there. If anything, the situation is even worse in Oakland, Chicago and Gary, Indiana. The poor complain, "The money is being spent but where is it going?" Representatives of areas where poverty is concentrated must be given the real policy role they were promised, before it is too late. Too often, the big city politician has taken over. As one resident of a poor area put it, "The Mayor says get all the programs you can, but don't let anybody organize. The Mayor believes in utilization of the poor, not participation. If the poor speak up, they lower the boom."

Another gave his reaction to the War on Poverty: "I do not see that anything meaningful and of substance is going on today in this program."

There are good concepts and exciting potentials stifled and strangled in the poverty program. Unless we change the War on Poverty, and change it fast, the frustration of the poor is going to boil over in one city after another. We've got to start striking at root causes, not treating the symptoms. Riots and violence are wrong and self-defeating. They can be avoided if the poor are given a voice. Residents in concentrated areas of poverty must be encouraged to organize in neighborhood meetings and choose at least one third the members of policy-making boards. When this happens, there will be participation of the poor.

OEO didn't spend any money on poverty elections in Huntsville, Alabama, for example, where 14 per cent of the eligible voters turned out. In Cleveland, over 11 per cent of the eligible voters in the two poorest districts voted. You don't get participation by the poor, when the poor don't believe in the program. A man whose organization is spending $1 million of OEO's funds in Watts summed it up this way: "They are disgusted with the phony anti-poverty program the Mayor is running in Los Angeles."

We believe the Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade will give the poor the chance they need to bring dignity and hope to themselves.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Monday, March 21, 1966]

No. 5: CHARLESTON, W. VA., HOTEL CASHES IN ON ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM

Lease a run-down hotel for $94,800 a year. Pay all taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs. Spend $225,000 renovating the building, which reliable real estate brokers value at $250,000.

Result: One Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, West Virginia.

The waste involved in another of the pet projects of the President's so-called War on Poverty was disclosed today by Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE (R-Minn.) in a speech on the Floor of the House of Representatives.

The Charleston Women's Job Corps Center is housed in the old Kanawha Hotel, owned by the Kanawha Hotel Company, whose president is Angus Peyton, a prominent West Virginia Democrat and State Commerce Commissioner.

"The run-down hotel, which was used for Democratic Presidential campaign headquarters in 1960, was assessed at $87,000 prior the occupancy of the Women's Job Corps in August, 1965," Congressman QUIE said. "It was subsequently raised to $115,000. Estimates of reliable real estate brokers in Charleston placed the value of the hotel at $250,000."

"In addition to receiving a guaranteed profit of 40 per cent on the annual $94,800 rental paid by the Federal Government, the $225,000 spent renovating the building would accrue to the Kanawha Hotel Company," Congressman QUIE said.

"Our investigations have revealed that in the Spring of 1965 a construction consultant, an employee of a firm retained by the Office of Economic Opportunity, on two separate occasions surveyed the Kanawha Hotel to determine its suitability for a Women's Job Corps Center," said Congressman QUIE. "Both times, despite pressure to approve the site, the consultant recommended against use of the Hotel, reporting among other things that the building would be too expensive to rehabilitate."

Congressman QUIE said there are "obvious political implications" in the arrangement and that it is "another example of extravagant diversion of anti-poverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians."

"Testimony at hearings currently being held by the Education and Labor Committee has revealed the estimated costs of maintaining one Job Corps enrollee for a year ranges from $8,500 to $13,000. Educators gasp at these figures and taxpayers question the justification for such an expensive program. We all recognize the necessity for the Job Corps program and agree with the concept . . . however, the program wasn't designed to be a windfall for the wealthy with influence," Congressman QUIE said.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, March 22, 1966]

No. 6: CHICAGO HEADSTART FOR THE NOT-SO-POOR

Operation Head Start, fashioned along the lines of a proposal offered by Representatives ALBERT H. QUIE (R-Minn.) and CHARLES E. GOODELL (R-N.Y.) back in 1961, is supposed to help pre-schoolers from poor families.

Out in Chicago, however, our investigation shows that the poverty program is doing a little bit more by giving a "head start" to the not-so-poor, Republican Representative GOODELL lamented.

Officials there admit that 27½ per cent of the 23,804 children in the program are from families whose standards exceed the "poverty" level. Our investigation also shows they don't even know the family incomes for another 20 per cent of the children.

This means another 5,000 children from truly disadvantaged homes could have been helped if the poverty warriors had stuck to their own guidelines. The Quie-Goodell proposal for an Opportunity Crusade would require adherence to strict poverty standards, meanwhile tripling the funds available.

How can Chicago justify the fact that more than ¼ of their children in Head Start were above poverty standards? How can the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington justify the clear violation of their guidelines? When I visited Chicago recently, I was told that Washington ordered Chicago poverty officials to expand in ten days Head Start from 4,000 to 24,000. I was also informed that very little solicitation was done in several hard-core poverty areas because teachers were afraid to enter those sections of the city.

Seven urban progress centers are in operation by the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity. One center showed 41.1 per cent of enrollees over the income requirement, one showed 31.8 per cent in excess, one 28.3 in excess; and outside of the urban centers, 36.8 per cent reported income over requirements.

Thousands of impoverished youngsters were overlooked by Head Start recruiters in their frantic efforts to build impressive statistics. And these youngsters, children of hard-core poverty victims, are precisely the ones for whom this program was developed.

We cannot continue careless neglect of such a good concept as Head Start. We certainly cannot justify to the thousands of children unable to participate in Chicago's Head Start Program the spending of Federal poverty money for those who are not poor.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade offers a way out of the wasteland of bureaucratic confusion and callousness that has marked OEO's administration of the Head Start Program.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, March 23, 1966]

No. 7: OEO TEACHES CALIFORNIA A STRANGE LESSON IN SUBTRACTION

(By Congressman ALPHONZO BELL)

Today I want to recount for my colleagues the bewildering experience of the California State Office of Education's attempt to have OEO fund our State's very successful Adult Basic Education Program. Some of this information was introduced into the record of the poverty hearings by my colleague, Mr. Goodell. I bring it up again because it has escaped the attention of many of those who must be made to realize that all of the poverty programs are in peril if such irresponsible administration continues.

OEO's stop-and-go approach has caused considerable confusion for states operating Adult Basic Education programs. States have had difficulty in securing the money which OEO pledged them. Numerous revisions of allocations have caused administrative problems, disappointment, and expenditures of state funds that will not now be reimbursable.

One of the states hardest hit by the OEO confusion has been California. In June, 1965, OEO sent a memo to the California State Department of Education, as it did to all states, notifying them of the anticipated state allocation for 1966. According to that memo, California was to receive $1,809,725. Successive notifications indicated the following changes:

June 21, 1965	$1,809,725
Nov. 9, 1965	1,622,080
January 1966	819,530

The final amount is less than half the original estimate. OEO claimed that they ran short of funds and thus had to make the cuts.

If there were no funds available, where then did OEO come up with the $802,550 they restored to California on February 25, 1966, after I, and other Congressmen, lodged vociferous protests to OEO over their treatment of our state?

OEO claimed they are not responsible for the revised 1966 allocation. They charge the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Education with the responsibility. This bureaucratic buck-passing has to stop somewhere.

I commend to the consideration of my colleagues reforms proposed by the Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade that would fix singular responsibility for this program with the Office of Education.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, March 24, 1966]

No. 8: I DON'T SEE ANYTHING WRONG WITH HATING

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Less than a week after Poverty Director Sargent Shriver told Rep. ADAM C. POWELL'S Poverty Subcommittee that funding Harlem's Black Arts Theatre was a mistake, Washington's anti-poverty agency welcomed with open arms the theatre's controversial leader, playwright LeRoi Jones.

Jones, whose Federally-sponsored workshop in Harlem produced dramas that Shriver called "vile racist plays in the language of the gutter unfit for youngsters in the audience," was brought to Washington by the United Planning Organization and a neighborhood arts committee to narrate a three-day music festival for youngsters at Cardozo High School March 18–20.

The festival, named the "Three Days of Soul," is the second in a planned series of cultural programs being offered by the Cardoza Area Arts Committee in cooperation with three centers of the United Planning Organization, Washington's anti-poverty agency.

Jones came under sharp criticism last summer for producing "hate white" plays with the aid of Federal money. The Black Arts Theatre received $40,000 in funds from OEO. Jones, responding to criticism that the program preached racism, said, "I don't see anything wrong with hating white people."

Shriver admitted OEO goofed when it gave funds to the project without checking into its purposes. "The facts are no Federal dollars should have gone to Black Arts in the first place," Shriver testified last week. "It was a mistake. I acknowledge it. And as a result, we tightened up on the review of subcontracts under Community Action Grants."

I think the taxpayers would like to know why poverty money continues to be used to sponsor people like LeRoi Jones. Festivals of this type may serve a useful purpose but should we really cloak a "vile racist" with the dignity of Federal sponsorship? Mr. Speaker, I strenuously object and wish to express my indignation that OEO has insisted on making the same mistake all over again on LeRoi Jones.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, March 25, 1966]

No. 9: POWELL PULLS PUNCHES ON POVERTY PROBERS

Representatives ALBERT H. QUIE (R-Minn.) and CHARLES E. GOODELL (R-N.Y.) today termed eight days of poverty hearings thus far "a lily white white-wash."

None of the 54 witnesses requested by Republicans has been called, nor has Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL deigned to even acknowledge our requests. We've had eight days of hearings and listened to virtually nothing but Administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program.

Republicans are alarmed at reports, apparently confirmed by committee staff personnel, that hearings are now closed. If so, we have not been notified. If hearings are cut off now, after merely skimming the surface, without a single critical witness and without a single representative of the poor, it will be a travesty on the legislative process.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade is a 100-page bill drastically revamping and redirecting the poverty war. It is a complete substitute, dealing with every facet and detail of present problems in the war on poverty and proposing a variety of new approaches. It will guarantee true involvement of the poor, bringing the states in as partners in the Opportunity Crusade and giving realistic incentives for employers to develop productive, permanent jobs in private enterprise for the unskilled and the uneducated. This, and other proposals from both Democrats and Republicans, deserve more than the quick brush-over given to the war on poverty in hearings to date.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Monday, March 28, 1966]

No. 10: "WE JUST DON'T KNOW IF IT'S WORTH IT"

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE)

The words of the title are those of an angry school superintendent who has been trying for thirteen months to get a year-round Head Start program approved by poverty officials for Waterloo, Iowa. I place in the RECORD today the detailed account of similar frustrations in six other communities which have been baffled, besieged and befuddled by Poverty bureaucracy.

Having sponsored Head Start three years before the poverty program, my colleagues, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. BELL, and I are dismayed that this program, described by Mr. Shriver as his best, has been so crippled by fuddle-headed administration in Washington. Here are the highlights, or low-lights if you will, of a typical case history, repeated with gory variations in other cited communities:

1. Waterloo, Iowa: Application for $43,600 for a year-round pre-school project was made by the Waterloo school system on February 24, 1965. This was four months after appropriations were made available for pre-school programs by the Congress. Having heard nothing on their year-round application, Waterloo officials applied for, and successfully carried out, a $15,000 summer Head Start project. On August 7, 1965, they resubmitted an application for their year-round project to the Office of Economic Opportunity. In September, they were asked by Michael C. Moore, OEO Area Coordinator, for additional information which was sent. In late September, they received a notice signed by Theodore Berry, OEO Community Action

Director, dated August 23rd, telling them they should allow 60 days for approval of Head Start applications. In October, eight months after their original application, they received a form notice from Dr. Julius Richmond, Director of Head Start, to submit their Head Start preplanning form, which had never been received or heard of prior to then. On November 23rd they were told by C. Edwin Gilmour, Director of the Iowa OEO, to apply through the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One week later they were notified by the OEO Regional Office that their application for Poverty Head Start funds will be processed as "rapidly as possible." On December 22nd, they were asked by Gilmour to withdraw their Head Start application because it could be better taken care of under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

On January 3rd they were notified once again by the Regional Office that their application for Poverty Head Start funds had been received and would be processed as "rapidly as possible." One week later they were notified that they had applied for Head Start on the wrong forms and would have to fill out new 32-page forms. On January 26th they received a memo from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare admonishing them that the opportunity offered under Head Start "is too precious to allow it to slip away." Finally, on February 7th Waterloo officials were notified by Gilmour to come to a meeting to talk about a new summer Head Start program. When asked the status of their year-round Head Start application, Waterloo School Superintendent replied, "Your guess is as good as mine. We're getting to the point where we don't know if it is worth it."

If this sounds like something out of George Orwell's 1984, I suppose someone might sardonically comment that at the present pace it looks like it might be 1984 before Waterloo gets Head Start funds out of Poverty officials.

2. Laramie County, Wyoming: Immediately after successful completion of a summer Head Start program, Laramie officials began preparations for a year-round program. They plunged into what they termed a "maze of bureaucratic involvement," including telephone commitments subsequently reversed, attempts to dictate local salaries, and filing and refiling of forms. By February 1966, the local school had spent $1,500 in staff time, phone calls, and other expenses. School Superintendent Chester R. Ingils bitterly assailed the red tape, autocratic attitude of OEO officials, and announced abandonment of any plans for a year-round Head Start for this year.

3. Port Huron, Michigan: Having meticulously completed a mountain of reports on their summer Head Start program, Port Huron officials were notified that their forms were literally filled with fatal errors. School Superintendent Gerald S. DeGrow called OEO in Washington and was told that reports from all over the country had been misinterpreted because of inexperience in the report-receiving staff at OEO and the whole thing was a "hopeless mess." The Superintendent was informed that OEO had notified all school districts in the country that they had goofed in their reports in order to get the schools to file new reports, giving Uncle Sam's hired nephews another chance at them.

Tearing his hair, Dr. DeGrow asked the man in Washington, "Who shall I have to call to get this straightened out, L.B.J.?" Whereupon he was told, "That wouldn't do much good because *he* probably got one of the letters too."

I am placing in the RECORD today similar incredible accounts of life in the bureaucratic Poverty jungle as experienced by officials from: Salina, Kansas; Minnesota; Denver, Colorado; and North Tonawanda, New York.

Sargent Shriver has described Head Start as his most successful program. We agree, but it appears the success was in spite of, not because of, OEO officials. Our opportunity Crusade would transfer Head Start into the Office of Education to be administered through state and local school systems in conjunction with local community action boards. This action should be taken immediately to insure that Head Start gets the management and administration it deserves in the year ahead.

Is it any wonder that with examples such as these at OEO, multiplied hundreds and hundreds of times, we describe OEO as a "fuddle factory." It is time for a change.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, March 29, 1966]

No. 11: DEMOCRATS ON POVERTY

You could write a book of criticisms of the War on Poverty by quoting Democratic proponents alone, even though they lard their critical statements with lavish praise of scattered results accomplished at extravagant costs. Here are some examples:

"Job Corps dropouts and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior," said Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana.

"New York City has had a disastrous experience thus far in the poverty program," said Congressman JAMES SCHEUER, Democrat of New York City.

"We must try to elevate other programs now mired in the swamp of mediocrity, such as Camp Kilmer; Phoenix, Arizona; Los Angeles and Washington, D.C.," said Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

"There is a riot and a runaway of ineffective programs proliferating all over New York City, but not an effective attack upon the basic problem of poverty," said Congressman HUGH CAREY, Democrat of New York City.

"The rural areas . . . are going to get lost in the shuffle, and have already been lost in the shuffle," said Congressman CARL PERKINS, Democrat of Kentucky.

"I can certainly say that with respect to Los Angeles, and to Title II, the program is in an awful mess, and unless something is done about it, further disorders can be expected," said Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, Democrat of Los Angeles.

"If we have this mayors' veto, then I'm ready to wash this war on poverty right down the drain and forget it," said Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL after hearing that 15 mayors had been given an absolute veto over their local community action programs.

"The fact is that a lot of bleeding-heart PhD's and professional poor people have succeeded in superimposing themselves on what are supposed to be action programs and are converting them in grandiose sociological studies and anti-social protest movements," said Democratic Congressman HUGH CAREY.

The staff has done "a lousy job" getting ready for hearings and "so a good portion of our staff was fired over the holidays," said Congressman WILLIAM FORD of Michigan, with reference to POWELL's $200,000 "investigation" of the War on Poverty.

The solution is obvious and readily available in the Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade, H.R. 13378.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, March 30, 1966]

No. 12: HEADSTART APPLICANTS AND SELECTIVE SERVICE

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

School Superintendent Maurice Friot of North Tonawanda, New York, after five months of being force-fed on the bitter gall of Washington bureaucracy, commented on the administration of the Head Start program:

"The harassing and foot-dragging to which we were subjected was in part a delaying action in order to get the finances straightened out."

"If we had been told in the beginning how much money was going to be made available to us, we could have submitted a proposal which would require that amount of money and saved both ourselves and the Office of Economic Opportunity a lot of trouble."

"It appears to me that people who must make decisions with respect to these programs are very inexperienced."

"Some of the questions we were asked by persons in the New York City Office of Economic Opportunity were ludicrous."

"After we had been put through a long struggle and been subjected to a minute examination with respect to our proposal, it was maddening, and I can use no other word, to have our people attend the training session and find there were people there who had been funded who had not made arrangements for transportation . . . teachers . . . teachers' aides . . . [and] who did not know where they were going to house their programs and so on."

North Tonawanda told poverty officials in August, 1965, they wanted to begin a year-round Head Start program in October, 1965. At their own expense they hired a director, selected children, teachers, and arranged for facilities. They never even received application forms until late November. They were then told there was no prospect of getting funds until March 15. As the School Superintendent put it, "March 15 is a little late to start a full year program."

SELECTIVE SERVICE REJECTION OF HEADSTART APPLICANTS

After North Tonawanda officials submitted 31-page application forms, Poverty bureaucrats got on the phone. As the School Superintendent described it, "We were asked to indicate the number of men who had been rejected for Selective Service from which we were drawing Head Start candidates. I can theorize as to what the relationship between this inquiry and Head Start might be but it did seem a little unnecessary."

Having stirred things up in Washington, North Tonawanda officials were asked by the regional poverty officials to expedite submission of the additional information requested. When told that it was a little difficult to expedite Selective Service information about rejected applicants, the person from the New York poverty office said, "Oh, we didn't mean for you to go to all that trouble." Other nonessential requested information was then waived.

As advocates of pre-school programs three years before the poverty war, we are disgusted at the senseless harassment that seems to have become an inseparable part of Head Start administration. On Monday, March 28, Mr. QUIE, on pages 6855–6859 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, recounted six case histories of Head Start administration that would qualify for lead billing in a bureaucratic sideshow. Countless other examples are available. It is a tribute to the basic merit of pre-school training that its glories still shine through the bureaucratic fog.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade would put Head Start under the Office of Education to be coordinated with other education programs without OEO meddling. It would unclog the channels of communication to allow for the effective implementation of worthy programs.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, March 31, 1966]

No. 13: "BECAUSE I AM THE CHAIRMAN"

(Joint statement, Republican members, ad hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty: Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE, Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL, Congressman ALPHONZO BELL, Congressman OGDEN R. REID)

Not a single poor person and not a single foot soldier from the front lines of the War on Poverty has been heard from in the House Poverty hearings. We have heard from the Sargent, made General, but not from the privates.

Eight days of hearings have produced a whitewash of the poverty program. Just as last year, Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL suddenly and arbitrarily suspended hearings a week ago and yesterday announced, "They are finished." We have already wasted a week since the last hearing that could have been used hearing from those who could tell us what is wrong and what is right with the War on Poverty and how to strengthen it.

Republicans suggested 67 witnesses who know about poverty and could help Congress rewrite the law. Why weren't these witnesses called, or others like them who could testify with authority on the real problems of the Poverty War? Chairman POWELL gave the answer:

"BECAUSE I AM THE CHAIRMAN"

One of the most flamboyant critics of the Poverty War is Chairman POWELL himself. What a sorry answer he gives to the millions of poor people who need and deserve a greater opportunity to change their circumstances. You can't help the poor nor improve the Poverty War from the Caribbean. The solemn obligation of Congress to study the Poverty War in depth, to strengthen it and to overhaul it is once again not being seriously discharged.

Yesterday, Mr. POWELL not only ignored Republicans, but also his own Democratic colleagues on the Committee. He suddenly and unpredictably made ten recommendations. Whatever their merit, no witness in these hearings recommended any of them.

Last fall, Mr. POWELL promised extensive hearings across the country. He now says his recommendations come from "open forums" held by his investigators. If so, they were held in the dark, without the knowledge of Congress, the press, or the public. Not even the Democrats on our Committee knew what was going on last fall, or know what is going right now. Reportedly, the Democrats on the Subcommittee have been caucusing to decide the changes which they, in their collective wisdom, wish to make in the program. Mr. POWELL says he has boycotted those meetings. Instead, he has been privately meeting with Sargent Shriver.

Under these difficult, if not impossible, circumstances we shall endeavor to present constructive changes in the poverty program. Realistic and meaningful help for the poor in helping themselves is an urgent imperative. Mr. POWELL now predicts further riots, but he washes his hands of responsibility.

We have today written a letter to the Chairman indicating the willingness of Republicans to do everything possible to see that the Congressional responsibility is fulfilled. To this end, we have called for the reopening of hearings.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 31, 1966.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We understand that you have concluded all hearings of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the War on Poverty. Both minority and some majority members of the Subcommittee believe strongly that we cannot conscientiously discharge our responsibilities both to the House and to the American people without further meaningful hearings.

Sargent Shriver has always indicated a willingness to testify at the pleasure of the Committee, and there are a number of other witnesses who could make a constructive contribution in more searching hearings to the formulation of effective amendments. It is distressing to us that not a single poor person or representative of the poor has been heard. Further, both minority and majority investigators have indicated in initial reports that anti-poverty programs in several cities must be examined more closely.

Therefore, it is our strong conviction that hearings should be reopened at the earliest possible date.

Indeed, in light of your concern expressed yesterday as to the possibility of further violence in the Watts district of Los Angeles, in New York City—especially in Brooklyn—and in Newark, we feel the Committee and the House have a solemn obligation to do everything possible to insure that more effective programs are implemented immediately to cut through the deep despair in many areas of the country where high unemployment, under-employment, disgraceful slum-lord housing, totally inadequate school facilities and a basic lack of opportunity to participate in the future are the shame of the nation.

As Republican members of the Subcommittee, we are prepared to go any place, any time in connection with our legislative responsibilities to the American people to insure an effective, vigorous and meaningful War on Poverty.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
ALPHONZO BELL,
OGDEN R. REID.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, Apr. 5, 1966]

No. 14: OEO FUDDLE-HEADED AGAIN

"Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you and through you were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were inaccurate. First of all, I would like to give you a chronology of the factual facts," said Deputy Director Bernard L. Boutin of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

He made the statement March 23 in a hearing before the House Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty as he attempted to justify OEO money poured into a run-down hotel in Charleston, West Virginia, that OEO is using as a Women's Job Corps Center.

Today, Congressman QUIE took the House Floor to answer the charge of inaccuracy. He was loaded with a battery of documents including the lease on the hotel.

The documents show that Congressman QUIE is right—Boutin is wrong.

"The Office of Economic Opportunity, through its Deputy Director, has again shown the fuddle-headed, make-it-up-as-you-go approach that has characterized the programs, administration and day-to-day operations of the so-called war on poverty," Congressman QUIE said.

The controversy rages around the run-down Kanawha Hotel in downtown Charleston. It is owned by the Kanawha Hotel Corporation, whose President is Angus Peyton, West Virginia Commerce Commissioner and unsuccessful 1964 Democratic candidate for the State Senate.

"As we consider the huge amount of money—totaling at least $477,839.76 in first-year costs alone—that OEO will have poured out to operate this center, I again say these concessions imply political favoritism," Congressman QUIE said.

The ranking minority member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee offered documentation that shows, he said, "a chronology of the actual facts":

Congressman QUIE's contention that the rental on the property is $94,800 a year is correct, as proved by the lease itself. Boutin had disputed that figure.

That OEO is paying all taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs is correct, as he had said, even down to paying transportation, storage and personal property taxes on the unused hotel furniture.

Originally, Congressman QUIE had said the cost of renovating the structure was $225,000. Boutin claimed $187,000.

"Though listed under various bookkeeping headings, the best figure I can determine after further investigation is closer to $350,000," Congressman QUIE said.

Congressman QUIE also quoted the West Virginia statute showing that his assessment figures on the hotel—challenged by Boutin—are correct.

"This is just another example of the way in which OEO operates its programs, even down to determining costs," Congressman QUIE said. "I might suggest that OEO pay more attention to getting its figures straight."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Apr. 15, 1966]

No. 14A. CREDIBILITY GAP AT OEO—CHARLESTON REVISITED

(Supplement to poverty memo 14)

"Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you . . . were inaccurate." Thus, in testimony on March 23rd Bernard L. Boutin of the Office of Economic Opportunity began a point by point denial of facts presented by ALBERT H. QUIE (R. Minn.) four days earlier with reference to the Charleston, West Virginia, Women's Job Corps Center. The same day Congressman SAM GIBBONS of Florida took the Floor defending OEO and declaring that Congressman QUIE, inadvertently, was wrong.

Further investigation in Charleston not only showed that Congressman QUIE was right but that he conservatively understated the established facts that add up to scandalous poverty profits to a leading Democrat office holder in West Virginia. Congressman QUIE said the Hotel Kanawha was owned by a corporation whose president was Angus Peyton, a prominent Democrat and the present Commerce Commissioner in West Virginia. This is undenied. Congressman QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel Lease provides for payment of $94,800 a year net profit, after the Federal government reimburses for taxes, insurance, utilities and repairs. Mr. Boutin said the rent was $90,000. The fact is that the rent is $94,800 and the Federal government pays, in addition, $4,800 a year for the storage of old hotel property.

Congressman QUIE said assessments in West Virginia were by law 50 percent of market value. Mr. Boutin said they were 40 percent. Chapter 18, Article 9(a), Section 4 of the West Virginia code provides that assessed valuation shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of appraised valuation.

Mr. QUIE said that the Federal government has spent at least $225,000 renovating the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Mr. Boutin said they have spent only $187,000. The fact is the Federal government has spent $345,000 to renovate the hotel into a Job Corps Center. This includes $290,026.60 spent on repairs and installation of equipment, $24,936.77 for electric, heating and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and $30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics liens.

Mr. QUIE said that the Kanawha Hotel was worth about $250,000 at the time it was chosen for a Job Corps Center. Mr. Boutin claimed it was worth $438,000 in 1965 and $508,250 in 1966 (perhaps slyly including in its value $345,000 worth of renovations at taxpayers' expense!) The fact is that reliable real estate brokers in Charleston indicated the Hotel Kanawha was worth about $250,000 prior to renovation. A somewhat older but comparable hotel in Charleston, the Milner-Ruffner, with more land and a more valuable location, sold on February 1st this year for $200,000.

Mr. Boutin defended the Kanawha Hotel expenditures with the claim that annual square foot rental cost is less than one dollar. This figure must have been computed by dividing the erroneous $90,000 per year rental by 100,000 square feet. This becomes an entirely meaningless computation when it is understood that it ignores $4,800 being paid annually for storage of the old hotel furniture, $7,500 paid annually for taxes (including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable), $5,740 paid annually for insurance and $4,800 paid annually for rent in addition to the $90,000 reported by OEO. Certainly a meaningful annual square foot cost figure should include ALL annual expenditures, not to mention $16,000 to settle leases of former tenants and some annual amortizing of the $345,549.51 renovations. Who does Mr. Boutin think he fools by citing such glib and misleading figures?

In summary, the poverty program has spent $345,549.51 renovating a rundown hotel worth about $250,000. A corporation, whose then president is a leading West Virginia Democrat, receives $94,800 per year profit on property worth $250,000. That is a poverty profit of 38 per cent a year. An OEO official described the Charleston Women's Job Corps arrangement as "the very best deal that could be gotten." The taxpayers might be justified in asking "the best deal for whom?"

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, Apr. 6, 1966]

No. 15: ALICE IN BLUNDERLAND: BIRCHERS, FRATERNITY BROTHERS, AND LEFTWINGERS REPRESENTING THE POOR

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

"The doorbell rang on February 23 at the Sigma Pi house, in the 'fraternity row' district east of San Jose State College, and was answered by one of the brothers, 19-year-old Garth Steen."

So began another incredible episode in the War on Poverty. The caller was a poverty canvasser assigned to get the poor out for a meeting that night. Although Steen's family income was in five figures, he had heard about the Poverty War and attended the meeting. Lo and behold, Alice in Blunderland style, poverty officials had managed to interest three people to attend a meeting to select three representatives of the poor. Young Steen returned to Sigma Pi House that night a duly-elected representative of the poor for a three-year term!

Mr. Speaker, Congressman CHARLES S. GUBSER has informed the Congress that the Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission is suffering the torments of all others who have been forced to struggle in the torture machine of the poverty administration structure.

Last December, a John Birch Society section leader, Ray Gurries, was elected a representative of the poor in Santa Clara County. According to a local investigator, the community action board "is shot through with left-wingers—people who are not run-of-the-mill liberals but hardnose activists of every leftist cause that has come along over the past half dozen years."

The local San Jose "Mercury," one of the largest newspapers of Southern California, describes the poverty board in these terms: "It is a jerry-built structure, erected on shifting political sands, to house a program which has a worthy aim. . . . It is run like a football game with an unlimited substitution rule, and a change of rules at the end of every quarter."

The experience of Santa Clara County is far from an isolated one. Congress has failed the sincere and dedicated people who wish to fight poverty. We have written a law without meaningful and realistic standards that would avoid Community Action chaos. What has happened in Santa Clara County is a distortion and perversion of the exciting concept of involving the poor in helping themselves. Many of us warned two years ago that this would happen if we didn't rewrite the President's poverty proposal.

We owe our colleague, the distinguished and able Congressman GUBSER, a debt of gratitude for calling this matter to our attention. On March 9, Mr. GUBSER requested OEO to investigate the situation in Santa Clara County. On March 23 the Deputy Director testified to us in committee that OEO had been on the scene in Santa Clara checking for about eight days. To date, our colleague has not even had the courtesy of an acknowledgment from OEO of his March 9 request. All of us in the Congress are getting mighty tired of the cavalier attitude of officials at OEO.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade, H.R. 13379, would avoid problems such as have occurred in Santa Clara County. OEO would be required to insist on balanced Community Action agencies, including true representatives of the poor as well as local officials and private social welfare agencies. The time is long overdue for Congress to launch a real Opportunity Crusade as a complete substitute for the confusing, controversial and faltering War on Poverty.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, Apr. 20, 1966]

No. 16: THE KANAWHA HOTEL—A LOGICAL CHOICE?

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE pointed out today more errors in the March 23 testimony of Bernard L. Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Boutin was testifying before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Poverty of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Congressman QUIE was attempting to learn more about a feasibility study that had been conducted to determine if the rundown Kanawha Hotel in downtown Charleston, West Virginia, was suitable for a Women's Job Corps Center.

The engineer who conducted the feasibility survey twice said that it was not suitable—and was fired for his trouble. The Kanawha Hotel was leased from the Kanawha Hotel Corp., whose president was Angus Peyton, West Virginia Commerce Commissioner and unsuccessful 1964 Democratic candidate for the State Senate.

Boutin was just one of three OEO officials that Congressman QUIE questioned about the feasibility study. He also asked Bennetta B. Washington, of OEO's Women's Centers Division, who had conducted the study. She said it was OEO's own engineers. Congressman QUIE asked Milton Fogelman, OEO contracting officer, who had conducted the feasibility study. Fogelman said it was Consolidated American Services. He was right. Boutin's version came out like this:

Mr. Boutin: "Survey for this was done by GSA for us. The facilities that were carefully looked at was the Ruffner Hotel, the Holley Hotel, the hotel in question, the Daniel Boone Hotel and the Holiday Inn Hotel."

The "hotel in question" was, of course, the run-down Kanawha.

Congressman QUIE had charged earlier that selection of the Kanawha Hotel, coupled with the $94,800 annual rental and the fantastic cost of rehabilitation which mounted the first-year cost of the site to at least $477,-839.76. "implies political favoritism."

(Boutin also testified before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee that the first-year cost figures advanced by Congressman QUIE were inaccurate. Subsequent investigation showed that Congressman QUIE was right—Boutin wrong.)

As in the case of the cost figures, Boutin's testimony that several sites were "carefully looked at" appears to be inaccurate and misleading.

In order to determine what, if any, alternatives were considered for the location of the Charleston Women's Job Corps Center, Congressman QUIE had the minority investigator of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee make a check, with the following results:

On March 28, 1966, Mrs. Mary Lee Crowley, owner of the Holley Hotel on Quarrier Street in Charleston, said that at no time did she consider leasing the Holley Hotel to the Office of Economic Opportunity or its contractor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. She recalled that early in 1965 a representative of Packard Bell called on her and asked if she would be interested in leasing the hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center. Mrs. Crowley told this man that she was interested in selling the hotel, but not in leasing it. She remembered that his manner was abrupt and her conversation with him was less than five minutes. To her knowledge, no surveys or studies of the Holley Hotel were made by Packard Bell, OEO, or General Services Administration, which Boutin claimed made some studies for the OEO program.

Also on March 28, 1966, Mr. Joe Reiser, Assistant Manager of the Daniel Boone Hotel at Washington and Capitol Streets in Charleston, said that to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the Daniel Boone Hotel were made by Packard Bell, GSA or OEO in contemplation of a Women's Job Corps site. He said no approach or offer had been made to the Daniel Boone management by any representative of these organizations. On April 6, 1966, Mr. Reiser said he had been in contact with Mr. Roger S. Creel, General Manager of the Daniel Boone, who had been vacationing in Miami, Florida. Mr. Creel confirmed that at no time was any offer made to the Daniel Boone management regarding the Women's Job Corps Center and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of the hotel had been made for that purpose.

On April 6, 1966, Mr. Lyman Stanton, President and General Manager of the Holiday Inn Hotel on Kanawha Boulevard in Charleston, told the same story. He said that no approach or offer had been made in regard to the Women's Job Corps Center site and to his knowledge no studies or surveys of that facility had been made.

On March 30, 1966, Mr. Vincent Chaney, Charleston attorney who had represented the Ruffner Hotel for years prior to the sale of the building on February 1, 1966, said that to his knowledge no action had been taken in any way by Packard Bell or OEO in consideration of the Ruffner Hotel as a Job Corps site. His statement was affirmed by Mr. R. G. Lilly, Sr., Charleston attorney and principal stockholder of the family-owned Ruffner Hotel prior to its sale.

Mr. Lilly said, however, that in 1965, when he learned that a Women's Job Corps Center had been planned for Charleston, he was interested but was never approached.

Had he been approached, Mr. Lilly said, he would have been very interested in leas-

ing the Ruffner Hotel as a Women's Job Corps Center for much less than the $94,800 annual rental on the Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. Lilly described the Ruffner Hotel as a six-story building with basement and penthouse which includes about 170 bedrooms. He said the hotel has been leased to the Millner Co. of Detroit, Michigan, during the past three years under an arrangement where the hotel owners received 17 per cent of the gross income. This resulted in the following approximate incomes to the hotel: 1965—$21,000; 1964—$18,000; and 1963—$14,000. Under the terms of the lease, the Ruffner Hotel paid taxes and insurance on the building and its furniture.

Under the Kanawha Hotel-Packard Bell lease, the Office of Economic Opportunity pays taxes and insurance on the hotel and its furniture, as well as furniture storage.

"It seems apparent from these figures that Mr. Lilly would have been glad, as he has said, to lease the Ruffner Hotel for much less than $94,800 a year," Congressman QUIE said in a speech on the House Floor today. "Based on information furnished by responsible Charleston hotel representatives, it is apparent to me the Kanawha Hotel was the only site considered."

"This is in addition to the errors I pointed out previously in Mr. Boutin's testimony before the Ad Hoc Subcommittee," Congressman QUIE said. "As far as I am concerned, so many errors of such a basic and grave nature are enough to discredit Mr. Boutin's entire testimony. This is another example of the chaotic and make-it-up-as-you-go administration that seems to be so much a part of every-day operations at the Office of Economic Opportunity."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, Apr. 21, 1966]

No. 17: ISN'T THERE A DANVILLE SOMEWHERE THAT WANTS POVERTY MONEY?—TWO DOWN—FOUR TO GO

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Overzealous federal poverty officials at OEO apparently crave a community called Danville in the United States that needs poverty money. A month ago, OEO pressed Danville, Indiana, a community of 3,287, to set up a community action board to receive and administer poverty funds. Local citizens resisted, causing Senator BIRCH BAYH to inquire of OEO, "Why Danville?"

The reply came back to Senator BAYH that Danville, Indiana, needed a community action program because they had 1,339 families with annual incomes under $1,000 and 1,979 families receiving Aid to Dependent Children (ADC). On this basis, continued OEO officials, who could deny Danville help? Pressing the matter further, an OEO official visited Danville and to his consternation discovered that their poverty statistics didn't match Danville, Indiana. Quickly recovering, regional poverty officials answerd, "Those figures are for Danville, Illinois—an understandable mistake."

The only difficulty came when it developed that the poverty figures were not for Danville, Illinois, either! At this point, I suppose OEO officials said: "There must be a Danville that fits our pattern of poverty." Sadly, however, a check of the population division of the Census Bureau indicated there were only six Danvilles in the country and none of them fitted the poverty profile prepared by OEO!

Perhaps the news media could now, as a public service, assist federal poverty officials, who dearly wish to help a Danville, by running (apropos of Peter Pan) the following nationwide ad:

"Isn't there someone out there, from a Danville somewhere, who believes?"

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, Apr. 22, 1966]

No. 18: LI'L ABNER COMES TO WASHINGTON—AND STAYS!—OR WHAT'S NEW IN DOGPATCH?

(By Congressmen ALBERT H. QUIE and CHARLES E. GOODELL)

OEO has gone from the sublime to the ridiculous. The War on Poverty now has a comic book stockpile.

In 1964, OEO officials were scratching their heads over how to mass produce Job Corps recruits. Like a Mammy Yokum vision, inspiration struck—have one of America's most popular and creative comic strip artists, Al Capp, produce a comic book to promote the Job Corps. By June, 1965, 501,000 copies of "Li'l Abner and the Creatures from Drop-Outer Space" were ready. With typical fuddle factory fanfare, OEO information Chief Holmes Brown announced the book donated by Al Capp was valued by OEO at between $150,000 and $200,000. OEO personnel were thrilled and excited over Capp's creative contribution. Printing costs were $25,000. Cards were included in the books to be mailed by applicants to the Job Corps.

Then the winds began to change at OEO, Mr. Speaker. Rumor has it that a highly-placed psychologist at OEO felt that distribution of books with cards enclosed amounted to pressuring youths into Job Corps enrollment. Some sages at OEO felt the story portrayed in the comic book was controversial and characters did not fit OEO's image. Besides, how were they going to code, screen and mail to employment offices all the card applications? Nobody in the Great Dogpatch on the Potomac, OEO, had thought of that before they printed half a million books.

Since July, 1965, 435,000 Li'l Abner comic books have been gathering dust in Washington warehouses at a cost of $125 a month. We are long-time admirers of Li'l Abner and the genius of his creator, but we think even Dogpatch's Senator Phoghorn would demand some answers. Why does OEO continue to stockpile laughs while the taxpayer and the poor cry?

Some years ago the beloved Will Rogers remarked that every time Congress made a joke it was a law, and every time it made a law it was a joke. Mr. Speaker, "it ain't amoozin', it's confoozin'."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, Apr. 26, 1966]

No. 19: WHO IS THE "WRONG-WAY CORRIGAN" AT OEO?

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

The Job Corps has been under fire for its superficial and inadequate testing, evaluation, and screening of applicants. It is the conviction of many of us that, at an average cost in excess of $8,000 per enrollee, assignment to a Job Corps camp should be based upon careful professional evaluation.

While constructive critics have been urging Job Corps officials to tighten up recruitment procedures, Job Corps officials have launched a series of new and experimental procedures that might well be called "Blind Man's Bluff."

All of the recruitment gimmicks have the purpose of speeding up the processing time and funneling applicants into Job Corps camps on a crash basis. One experiment, designed to enroll roughly 3,700 applicants, has been the waiver of the medical examination of applicants between April 14th and May 7th.

As one recruitment announcement advertised, those who apply prior to May 7th "will not need a physical examination if they are in good health." How does OEO intend to determine an applicant's health unless he has been examined by a physician?

Other recruitment programs guarantee that Job Corps applicants will be sent to a camp within 24 hours after signing up, three days after signing up, five days after signing up, or 10 days after signing up. Whether the process takes 24 hours or ten days seems to be determined by the area of the country the applicant comes from.

How are these high-powered public relations devices going to improve the haphazard screening procedures that have caused so many problems in Job Corps camps? How are criminal records to be determined and analyzed for proper applicant assignment? How are epidemics of communicable diseases to be avoided at Job Corps centers? Why the assembly-line, supermarket approach at this stage?

Poverty officials earlier indicated they had 152,000 applicants for the Job Corps and couldn't take care of them all. 435,000 Li'l Abner comic books, designed to stimulate Job Corps applications, are gathering dust in a warehouse at taxpayers' expense. One of the reasons given for shelving the comic book approach was a backlog of Job Corps applicants. With a backlog of applicants, OEO launches a series of all-out recruitment programs. The poverty question of the day is, "Who is the 'Wrong-Way Corrigan' at OEO?"

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, Apr. 28, 1966]

No. 20: SILVER-SALARIED JOB CORPS; OR RAGS TO RICHES

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Want a 57 per cent raise? Join the staff of the Job Corps! The 208 staff personnel at Camp Gary (San Marcos, Texas) drawing salaries over $9,000, got an average increase of 57 per cent above their previous salary. Twenty-two of them more than doubled their previous salary. Here are some examples of past and present salaries of Camp Gary personnel:

Position	Previous	Present
Manager of personnel	$5,000	$10,000
Math chairman	4,730	10,080
Citizenship teacher	4,800	10,080
Chairman, commercial skills	4,650	10,080
Welding instructor	3,200	9,780
Teacher, commercial skills	4,500	9,780
Do	4,300	9,780
Auto mechanic instructor	3,800	9,780
Drafting instructor	4,764	9,780
Science teacher	4,700	9,780
Duty officer	4,500	9,493
Physical education instructor	4,600	9,480

The automatic, facile explanation always given by Poverty officials for high salaries is, "We need the best people." Is it really necessary, however, to go this far? Aside from the leakage of poverty funds for extravagant salaries, there is a distressing impact on school systems. What school board can compete with their rich Uncle Sam who apparently has money to burn. 154 of the 208 came directly to Gary from school jobs. Is it necessary to offer $9,780 to a math instructor making $4,887, or to a music teacher making $4,200, in order to attract them to come to Camp Gary? Would a private employer offer these lavish salary increases in his business?

These are the kind of facts that should have been brought out in Congressional hearings. In spite of our efforts, and those of Congresswoman GREEN (D-Ore.), the reason for extravagant costs of Job Corps camps remained a mystery in the hearings. Camp Gary does not stand alone; on the contrary, it appears to be a typical outgrowth of inept administration of the Job Corps.

I have today telegraphed seven other Urban Job Corps Centers for full data on their staff salaries. In the meanwhile, the press is welcome to examine the complete salary records of Camp Gary in my office.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, Apr. 29, 1966]

No. 21: THE PRIVATE WEDDING OF POLITICS AND POVERTY

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE and Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is perpetrating one of the sorriest exhibitions of political partisanship ever witnessed in Congress involving an important national program. His actions constitute an open admission that he and the majority of Democrats on his committee regard the poverty program as pure politics and the private preserve of Democratic political caucus.

Here is the almost incredible sequence of events:

1. Last fall, Chairman POWELL sought and obtained $200,000 for a thorough investigation of the poverty program that he conceded desperately needed it.

2. Only the most superficial investigation was made and no report was issued.

3. In December, the Chairman appointed a three-man task force to "check on" his first investigation.

4. Eight days of hearings were held as a platform for a succession of hurrahs for the poverty war to date. The hearings were so loaded that the only seriously critical witness was poverty director Shriver himself.

5. The Chairman refused to call any of the 67 witnesses suggested by the Republicans. His explanation for not calling any of the witnesses was characteristic: "Because I am the Chairman."

6. Thirty-seven days have been wasted since the hearings were arbitrarily closed, during which time many competent witnesses could have been heard to improve the program.

7. Barring Republican members of the committee, Democrats have held five private, partisan caucuses to try to convert the faltering war on poverty into "a bill we can defend."

8. When a responsible and essentially-accurate newspaper story revealed to the world for the first time what the Democrats had been cooking up in caucus, the Chairman called a hasty press conference to deliver a slashing attack on the reporter.

9. He announced that the poverty subcommittee responsible for this important legislation will have exactly 30 minutes to pass on all amendments to the entire bill.

It is obvious that Chairman POWELL and the committee will not consider seriously any constructive proposals they do not author themselves. Mr. POWELL claimed credit for saving the community action program which he had cut to the bone marrow. The apparent restoration of $150 million still leaves the program below minimum requests. If Mr. POWELL's figures are accurate, the new face lifting of the War on Poverty will cost $1.95 billion, $245 million above the President's budget.

The Quie-Goodell Opportunity Crusade would spend $400 million less federal money. By enlisting private enterprise and the states as partners, it would pump a total of $2.4 billion into meaningful, coordinated programs. In contrast to the new Democratic concoction, the Opportunity Crusade would make all the money needed available for Head Start and would double present funds in Community Action, while legislating careful and proper safeguards against the kind of abuse that has been rampant in the War on Poverty.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Monday, May 2, 1966]

No. 22: SENATOR MANSFIELD ON THE JOB CORPS

(By Congressmen ALBERT H. QUIE, CHARLES E. GOODELL, and ALPHONZO BELL)

We proposed experimental job corps camps three years before the poverty program. We believe in the concept, but we do not believe in the Job Corps program we have today.

Each time we advance specific criticism, the broken record response from poverty officials and their spokesmen in Congress is, "Oh, that's an isolated case and they are just trying to destroy the Job Corps program."

They ignore the almost endless evidence of poor administration, protection rackets, corpsmen forced to live with pipes under their pillows, lack of discipline in camps, and lack of planning for jobs outside of the camp—these conditions seem to prevail across the country.

In the past we have exposed serious faults in the selection and screening of corpsmen, but the mass production psychology prevails. Earlier this year, we cited the case of a a Montana corpsman who shot a lady in a Billings bar. Thereafter, he was not only retained in Camp Breckinridge, Kentucky, but flown with a guard back and forth from Kentucky to Montana several times at taxpayers' expense to attend court proceedings in Billings.

This is not a partisan issue. At the time this incident occurred, Senator LEE METCALF (D-Mont.) said, "The idea of the Job Corps in my opinion is a great idea but this incident is wrong and really burns me up! These drop-outs and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior."

We had hoped our protests and warnings would be the end of this continuing story of shortsighted administration. Now the Democratic leader in the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, has revealed that this regrettable story continues. Here are Senator MANSFIELD's own words spoken from the Senate floor on Wednesday, April 27, 1966:

"Mr. President, one of the major programs within the administration's antipoverty program is the Job Corps. It is my understanding that the program is designed to take youngsters from unfortunate surroundings and expose them to education, training, and guidance, preparing them for a more worthwhile role in our society. The program takes these people from their home environment and places them in camps throughout the country. There are now three Jobs Corps camps in my State of Montana.

"The basic idea of the Job Corps is fine, but I have become somewhat concerned about its implementation, the screening process used in filling the camps and overall inadequacies in the administration of the program. First of all, it seems to me that everyone was in too big a hurry to get the first camps operating, too little time was given to the screening of Job Corps applicants. There is a need to be more selective. There are many who can be helped and who are willing to be helped. These camps should be limited to those who have given some indication that they want to be helped and are willing to try. It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State. There have, as yet, been no major incidents at any of the Montana camps.

"I do not like admonishing the Job Corps but an incident has occurred in Montana which illustrates my cause for concern. Some months ago a juvenile in Billings with a most unfortunate background was selected for the Job Corps. However, before he could be transported to his camp in the Midwest, he was involved in a bar room brawl and shot a patron. His defense was immediately taken over by the Job Corps officials, he was then taken to the camp and returned to Billings, when required by the courts. He was given better counseling, care, and attention than the average individual. Within the past week or so he escaped from camp with a colleague, stole a car and in Indiana was involved in a car accident taking the lives of two people and hospitalizing others in critical condition, including himself.

"I am well aware that there can be bad apples in every program, but it seems to me that there is something wrong. Perhaps it is a matter of lack of know-how and inefficiency on the part of the administrative Job Corps personnel involved. They and those enrolled in the program should have been more selective in the very beginning. Certainly a man with a criminal charge against him should be kept under very close surveillance. Also there is a grave question as to any value this program might be to a person of this nature. The individual involved was given treatment and protection above and beyond that allowed the average citizen, only to have it thrown back at us with more criminal action.

"I do not like speaking in this vein, but I cannot stress too strongly the need for a more careful selection of Job Corps men and an insistence upon efficient and capable administrative and guidance personnel."

It is time Congress imposed some sensible standards on Job Corps administration. Our Opportunity Crusade, offered as a complete substitute for the War on Poverty, in the form of H.R. 13378, would impose careful screening and enrollment procedures.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members poverty subcommittee, Tuesday, May 3, 1966]

No. 23: THE NEW ACCOUNTINGS "RECONSTRUCT YOUR BOOKS"

(Joint statement by Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE and Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

One of the key provisions of the Opportunity Crusade, H.R. 13378, requires preaudits to insure proper accounting procedures before poverty money is granted to a community action agency. The need for such a requirement would seem obvious, yet money has been shoveled forth from Washington without proper accounting safeguards.

HARYOU, in New York City, is bad enough where the suspended Director has been trying to "reconstruct the books" for the past six months so auditors can find out where more than $600,000 has gone. Los Angeles may be in even worse shape. How many citizens are given the right to reconstruct their books when Internal Revenue calls?

Accumulated evidence indicates gross fiscal irresponsibility during the first year's activity of the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency (EYOA), the Los Angeles community action agency. OEO, GAD and private auditors have been swarming over EYOA's books for months without announced results. Serious allegations have been made about the financial accountability of the EYOA. It has been charged that:

1. EYOA did not have records identifying where OEO funds had been spent.

2. Funds had been expended for subcontracts that had not been approved or had been improperly approved.

3. Funds were being commingled.

4. There has been a lack of supporting documentation for voucher claims.

Following a Subcommittee on Poverty investigation of the Los Angeles poverty program, Chairman ADAM C. POWELL said there is "evidence of mismanagement and fiscal dishonesty in the program." Several OEO

audit reports have indicated that Los Angeles records were in "bad shape." In the House hearings this year, Mr. Nathan Cutler, Director of OEO's Audit Division, said the EYOA's violation of letter of credit procedures "could lead to more loose practices than we observed."

It is the obligation of the Office of Economic Opportunity to make a full disclosure of the facts. Waste and diversion of poverty money annoys and frustrates the taxpayer; it infuriates the poor. How can poverty officials explain, for instance, a full-time official in the Los Angeles city school system, William C. Rivera, being paid $75 a day for 28 days (a total of $2,100) by the community action agency during a period when he was supposedly earning overtime pay from the Los Angeles City school funds?

Why is it that every other agency of government must account for its funds, but poverty agencies expect to be given a blank check? It is time the American people were given some answers. It is time the poor, especially, were given some answers. It is time for a true Opportunity Crusade that will minimize such abuses and get the poverty money where it will effectively help the poor.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, May 11, 1966]

No. 24: WHIP CRACKS, TROOPS MARCH

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

As Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL cracked the whip, Democrats on the House Education and Labor Committee this week obediently shouted down all Republican amendments to correct present abuses in the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Not a single voice was raised in closed-door Committee meetings to deny that both programs have serious and continuing deficiencies; yet Democrats goose-stepped away from any substantial changes. The following Republican proposals were summarily rejected on straight party line votes:

1. Careful procedures for evaluation of Job Corps enrollees to identify youths with criminal records and insure adequate provisions to cope with their problems in Job Corps camps without major disruptions.

2. Authority to Job Corps camp directors to enforce standards of conduct and deportment with disciplinary powers, including the power to dismiss enrollees when necessary to preserve the opportunities for others.

3. Establishment of Military Career Centers for young men unable to pass physical or mental tests for military service.

4. Limitation of salaries of Job Corps staff to no more than 20 per cent increase over their previous salaries without specific approval of the Director.

5. Establishment of an Industry Youth Corps to provide productive jobs and training for young people in private industry.

6. Transfer of the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps from OEO so that they will be fully coordinated with existing manpower retraining programs.

7. Provision for job counseling and intensive testing on admission and at least three months prior to anticipated graduation of Job Corps enrollees.

8. Establishment of community advisory groups to provide appropriate job opportunities or training for Job Corps graduates.

9. Revision of the Neighborhood Youth Corps for school drop-outs or potential drop-outs to provide separate out-of school and in-school programs, with careful standards for each.

While Democrats caucus privately in confusion and dissention, they unite in Committee to chant down constructive proposals to revamp the mismanaged War on Poverty.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, May 13, 1966]

No. 25: ROCKING CHAIR VERSUS ROCK-AND-ROLL, OR COMMUNITY RELATIONS ATROCITIES IN ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

(By Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL)

A first requirement in successful operation of a Job Corps center is good community relations. In St. Petersburg, Florida, Job Corps officials have acted out a textbook version of how not to promote good community relations. In April, 1965, they opened a Women's Job Corps Center in the Hotel Huntington in a quiet area surrounded by residential dwellings for retired people. The rental of the Hotel Huntington for 18 months totaled more than its appraised value. Community resistance and resentment were overwhelming. At the time, an OEO spokesman, referring to Women's Job Corps Centers, said, "The St. Petersburg Center is the first. If any mistakes have been made, the responsibility is mine and I will learn from them."

After one year, OEO had graduated 42 enrollees from the St. Petersburg Center at a cost of $1,646,601, averaging $39,205 per graduate. The monthly cost of the St. Petersburg facilities is by far the highest of any Women's Job Corps Center in the country.

Training and classroom facilities were spread over four separate locations in St. Petersburg, and the Pinellas County School Board, the Center's sponsor, has been locked in continuous struggle and controversy with OEO, caushing them now to terminate their contract.

Having blundered so disastrously in their selection of the Huntington site and in promoting good community relations in this first Job Corps operation, OEO has now demonstrated their "new look" in community relations and demonstrated how they have learned from past mistakes. On May 4, with great gusto, OEO announced the Center will be moved to the old luxury Soreno Hotel under a 14-month contract for $3.1 million Amazed local officials lost no time in reacting. On May 10, the St. Petersburg City Council passed an ordinance precluding the use of the Soreno Hotel for a Job Corps Center. On May 11, the School Board refused to extend the current contract for use of school facilities. Protests rose from every corner, including community businessmen and planners who found the Job Corps location in direct contradiction of redevelopment and rehabilitation plans for that area of the city. The Governor has indicated he will try to veto the project.

It would appear that Job Corps officials have leapt from the frying pan into the fire, and they owe Congress and the people of St. Petersburg some explanations:

1. Did any community officials agree to the Soreno Hotel location before it was announced?

2. Could the dreamers at OEO come up with any location that would cause more community disruption in St. Petersburg?

3. What possible basis did they have for selecting a community like St. Petersburg for a Job Corps site in the first place?

4. What accounts for the apparent obsession at OEO to rejuvenate old hotels in unsuitable locations?

5. Under present policies can they hold out any hope to the American taxpayers that they will ever get their cost per Job Corps graduate down to as low as $20,000, without counting dropouts as graduates?

My colleague, Congressman QUIE, and I are particularly affronted by Job Corps bungling because of our long-time sponsorship of the Job Corps approach. Three years before the War on Poverty, we proposed experimental skill centers for young people who need to be liberated from their immediate environment in order to respond to educational training. The Education and Labor Committee this week has rejected summarily a whole series of Republican amendments to tighten up Job Corps procedures and to counter the mass production psychology that still seems to prevail at OEO.

Our 100-page Opportunity Crusade, as a complete substitute for the poverty war, would require proper planning, consultation with local officials and sensible economic management. It would direct Job Corps officials by specific provision of law to "stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees in community life."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Friday, June 3, 1966]

No. 26: PEDERNALES POVERTY OR "WE DIDN'T HAVE A POVERTY PROGRAM"

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

After spending $190,815 on a Neighborhood Youth Corps program, the project coordinator of La Grange, Texas, said, "We didn't have a poverty program. We didn't operate it as a poverty program. We took the position that if young people were loafing we'd put them to work and do a lot of good."

After a series of articles exposing a gross and general disregard for eligibility standards in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, the Houston Post commented: "One of the worst fiascos in the history of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Texas occurred in Pasadena last summer as the federal anti-poverty program got underway on a crash basis."

"We had no definite guidelines from the federal government as to who should be enrolled," said Pasadena's Mayor Doyal.

"We didn't understand the Youth Corps to be strictly a poor-folks program," said Rev. Harry L. Johnson, chairman of the selection committee. "Our determination of who should be picked first was not strictly on the basis of poverty. We felt there could be kinds of poverty other than material poverty that perhaps some needed jobs for spiritual or other reasons."

In many cases, the Corpsmen's parents said their children's participation was not because of economic need. Most parents said they didn't understand the program was for helping only the poor. The Reverend Johnson said it was possible some youths were hired from the alternate list who "just wanted to support a car. If they went down the list far enough," he said, "it is possible a boy with a father and mother who made $20,000 a year could have been hired."

Some specific examples of the youths enrolled in the Texas Neighborhood Youth Corps programs were:

1. Enrollees who were college students, although the Neighborhood Youth Corps regulations held that college students were not eligible;

2. A 17-year-old son of a City of Pasadena secretary and an operator for a big chemical company, both working. The mother was Mayor Doyal's secretary for about a month soon after he took office last May but she pulled no strings to get her son in the Corps;

3. A 17-year-old Corpsman, the son of an engineer for Brown & Root, Inc.;

4. A 16-year-old youth, the son of a home building contractor;

5. A 16-year-old, the son of the personnel and safety director of a big industrial firm;

6. Many other Pasadena enrollees who were children of employees at a chemical plant and a refinery whose wages ran in the neighborhood of $3 or more an hour.

Pasadena's Mayor Doyal said he never heard of the so-called $3,000 income "poverty level" until about September and never heard of the graduated-by-size-of-family income standards of July 8 until a reporter told him about them in February, 1966.

This is the program that is supposed to help poor youngsters who are school dropouts or likely dropouts for reasons of poverty. Unfortunately, poverty programs in the Pedernales country are more typical of the nation than exceptional. We urge the adoption of the Republican Opportunity Crusade which would prevent these and many other abuses in the present poverty war.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Monday, June 6, 1966]

No. 27: JOB CORPS URGENTLY NEEDS REPUBLICAN AMENDMENTS

(Joint statement by Congressmen ALBERT H. QUIE and CHARLES E. GOODELL)

As early advocates of the Job Corps concept, but vehement critics of its implementation thus far, we were pleased to read in yesterday's papers about a secret White House memorandum calling for a few changes in the Job Corps. Unfortunately, the proposed changes do not go far enough and even more unfortunately the Job Corps Director today denies that most of the changes will be made.

We have proposed a large number of major changes including careful and coordinated selection of enrollees; transfer of the Job Corps to be administered under the Manpower Retraining Act; careful standards on staff salaries; emphasis on community relations in the locale of Job Corps camps; firm discipline and full authority in Job Corps directors to set rules of conduct and discharge enrollees; special evaluation and provision for the needs of enrollees with criminal records; effective involvement of State and local officials in Job Corps camps; testing of enrollees at appropriate intervals and provision of suitable job opportunities or other assistance upon graduation.

The Republican Opportunity Crusade provides a complete overhaul of the Job Corps. Its need is self-evident. It is sad to have the Director of the Job Corps deny that even the inadequate changes suggested in the White House memo are being seriously considered. Republicans have continuously made constructive suggestions for revamping the Job Corps, too often ignored by both the press and Job Corps officials. The changes outlined in the alleged White House memorandum were offered by Republicans as amendments in Committee this year along with many, many others. They were voted down on straight party line votes.

In addition to corrective measures, Republicans continue to urge creation of Military Career Centers to be administered by the Secretary of Defense in assisting volunteers to qualify physically and mentally for military service.

The obvious fact that the Job Corps Director continues to reject substantial and constructive changes in the Job Corps program, makes it even more imperative that Congress itself impose needed standards by law.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, June 7, 1966]

No. 28: FURTHER COMMENTS FROM DEMOCRATS ON POVERTY

(By Congressman CHARLES GOODELL)

While continuing to vote automatically for a War on Povery program that is clearly in deep trouble, Democrats are often critical in their public comments. Here are a few:

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, criticizing the screening of Job Corps applicants—"It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State."

Senator WALTER MONDALE, speaking of difficulty in getting programs funded—"There was nothing in writing. No guidelines for expenses were established. It is no surprise that Minnesotans working for anti-poverty are often frustrated."

"We have a right to written, understandable rules," MONDALE said, "and officials must assume there is some local wisdom."

Senator R. VANCE HARTKE: "I question the continuation of poverty programs, such as the youth camps. There are too many unanswered questions about operations at centers such as Camp Atterbury and Camp Breckinridge."

Governor John B. Connally, after a meeting with Shriver about the poverty program in Texas—"OEO does not seem to understand that we are not working for them, but with them and we want them to work with us."

Congressman BERT BANDSTRA, in his statement printed in the Subcommittee hearings—"A knowledge gap between Washington anti-poverty officials and local workers in the war on poverty leads to 'administrative confusion' that could very well prove fatal to the program."

Congressman AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, speaking in Los Angeles—"The community development program as adopted by Congress is not functioning as it was set up. What is being done to this program is a crime."

Congressman ROBERT E. SWEENEY of Cleveland, describing the Job Corps—It is "fantastically expensive failure . . . It is costing taxpayers $11,252 a year per enrollee . . . I believe this money can be better used by the Office of Education, the Department of Labor and the military education channels."

Senator ALBERT GORE, Tennessee—"The Office of Economic Opportunity is a grossly-disorganized affair and while I hope some order will be brought out of current chaos, I become more doubtful daily."

Senator J. F. Patterson, Missouri Senate Democrat, explaining why he and other Democrats joined a Republican minority in the Senate to defeat the appropriation of state funds to implement poverty programs—"I'm getting a little fed up with going home every weekend and consistently having voters laugh in my face about all the Federal programs we are buying in Jefferson City."

Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director of the National Urban League, said: "Year-round antipoverty programs were grossly inadequate and during the spring there is a flurry of government action to produce something for the summer to keep it cool. We question whether the real intent is to promote equality or to stop riots."

The time is long overdue for Democrats to stop just talking about the poverty program and join Republicans in doing something about it. The Republican Opportunity Crusade, H.R. 13378, would correct existing abuses, completely revamp the faltering War on Poverty, and truly involve the poor, the states, and private enterprise in meeting the very real and very urgent problems of the poor. The Opportunity Crusade would cost the Federal Government $300,000,000 less than the War on Poverty, while more than doubling the money for Headstart and Community Action. A total of $2.4 billion would be available from private enterprise, state, local and Federal sources in contrast to the $1.75 billion in the War on Poverty.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, June 8, 1966]

No. 29: BUREACRACY BANDWAGON

(By Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE)

In a speech on March 30, 1966, my colleague Congressman WILLIAM AYRES alerted the Congress that "The Big Money is in Poverty." He reported a burgeoning bureaucracy of civil servants at the Office of Economic Opportunity which is draining money away from programs intended to help the poor. Mr. AYRES made his statement in an attempt to avert the bad leakage of funds.

The plea apparently fell on deaf ears, however. For during the month of April there has been a mad scramble to get on the bureaucracy bandwagon at OEO. From March to April there was a gain of approximately 10 percent in personnel at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

According to the monthly report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the increase of 204 warriors at the Office of Economic Opportunity was one of the largest increases in personnel of any federal agency that month.

I call on Sargent Shriver to explain this drastic increase in staff. Somewhere this continuous growth of his bureaucracy must stop. I call on him to remember his own words when he was arguing for the passage of President Johnson's War on Poverty in 1964.

"There is no contemplated huge new bureaucracy."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, June 15, 1966]

No. 30 POLITICS AND POVERTY IN CHICAGO

(Joint statement by Congressmen ALBERT H. QUIE and CHARLES E. GOODELL)

"I can do as I darned please." Those are the words of Chicago's poverty director, Mr. Deton Brooks, when it was revealed that he was co-chairman of a citizen's committee to raise money for a Democratic Congressman. Mr. Brooks has presided over the expenditure of about $30 million in Chicago.

As the director of the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity, Mr. Deton Brooks receives a salary of $22,500 a year. He claims exemption from the Hatch Act.

Deton Brooks and poverty officials like him all over the country should be clearly covered under Federal law prohibiting political activities. It is shocking to hear Mr. Brooks proclaim that he is not, and should not be restricted in his political activities. For the past two years, as Mr. Daley's lieutenant, he has presided over one of the largest poverty programs in the country. That program is totally unrepresentative of the poor people it is designed to serve. It clearly violates the intent and will of Congress. Appointments to the Executive Committee, neighborhood councils and staff are completely controlled by the Mayor and those he appoints.

Republicans have urged since the beginning of the poverty program that all poverty employees be clearly prohibited from political activities. Our amendments were arbitrarily rejected by the overwhelming Democratic majority in Congress. It is ridiculous, but true, that only Job Corps employees are clearly prohibited from political activities under the poverty law. Under the Hatch Act, itself, it appears that some other state and city employees, such as Mr. Brooks, may be prohibited from political activity. It is obvious from his comments that Mr. Deton Brooks sees nothing wrong with mixing politics and poverty money. The well-oiled Daley machine whirs on, drowning out the anguished cries of the poor who were supposed to have a significant role in Community Action Boards.

We urge Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Civil Service Commission and the United States Attorney to investigate this case thoroughly. We further urge the Congress to enact the Republican Opportunity Crusade as a complete substitute for the misfiring political War on Poverty. The Opportunity Crusade will clearly bar partisan activity by any poverty worker; it will also guarantee true representation of the poor on Community Action Boards, double the money in the Community Action programs over Administration pro-

posals, and eliminate the confusion, corruption and political chicanery infesting the present poverty war.

The Democratic committee bill in the House has now belatedly added a section purporting to apply the Hatch Act to all poverty workers. Publicity has caused Mr. Deton Brooks to be dropped summarily as co-chairman of the citizens' fundraising committee for a Democratic Congressman. Of course, a number of solicitation letters have gone out with Mr. Brooks' name on the letterhead as co-chairman. Once again, it would appear that the Democrats are ready to lock the barn door after the horse is stolen.

The example of Mr. Deton Brooks in Chicago does not stand alone, although this is the first case that has come to our attention in which a Community Action director has defended his action in supporting the campaign of a Congressman who serves on the Congressional committee which writes the poverty legislation. On October 31, 1965, the distinguished columnist Richard Wilson said:

"The big city political machines have not been equal to the demands of growing urbanization. They thrive on poverty, unabsorbed minorities, religiosity. Favoritism is cultivated as an art. Honesty, justice and efficiency are equally uncomfortable in city hall."

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, June 16, 1966]

No. 31: JOB CORPS SALARY EXCESSES—NO END IN SIGHT

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE)

Over one-third of the employees, 38 per cent, making over $6,000 at five men's urban Job Corps centers received over a 20 per cent increase to join the War on Poverty. Nobody seems to deny that excessive salary increases did occur and still do occur in large numbers in the Job Corps.

The examples of the increases at the five centers—Ft. Custer, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Camp Breckinridge, Morganfield, Kentucky; Camp Kilmer, Edison, New Jersey; Ft. Rodman, New Bedford, Massachusetts; and Camp Atterbury, Edinburg, Indiana—could be given ad infinitum.

I do not have the time here to list all the examples, but a quick check of the payroll records indicates even more incredible instances of persons who received over a 50 per cent increase from their previous salaries. I will place in the RECORD today the complete list of those persons, but here are just a few examples:

Center	Position	Increase	Previous salary	Present salary
		Percent		
Custer	Chief group life supervisor	98	$4,800	$9,515
Do	Vocational instructor	82	4,368	7,950
Breckinridge	Counselor instructor	98	4,392	8,700
Do	Vocational instructor	64	4,560	7,500
Atterbury	Chief security	140	5,004	12,000
Do	Supervisory test administrator	73	5,196	9,000
Kilmer	Manager	159	5,800	15,017
Do	Personnel supervisor	216	3,005	9,506
Rodman	Director of curriculum	75	10,300	18,000
Do	Instructor of physical education	70	5,000	8,500

This scandalous situation continues in the Job Corps, but all attempts of Republicans to correct it have been rejected by the Democrats. Republicans proposed an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act that would limit salary increases of Job Corps personnel to 20 per cent above their previous salary, unless otherwise authorized by the director. This amendment was rejected in committee by the Democrats on a straight party-line vote. The Republican Opportunity Crusade, which includes full safeguards against poverty program excesses, incorporates this amendment which would guard against salary abuses.

It is time that something be done about this appalling leakage of poverty funds. Enrollee costs of the Job Corps can never be brought down to a reasonable level as long as payroll costs continue at the levels just cited. We cannot let the good potential of the Job Corps be continually sacrificed.

We urge the adoption of the Republican Opportunity Crusade.

Position	Increase	Previous salary	Present salary
CUSTER JOB CORPS CENTER			
	Percent		
Chief group life supervisor	98	$4,800	$9,515
Do	59	6,000	9,514
Do	96	4,848	9,514
Vocational teacher	55	5,760	8,900
Orientation counselor	55	5,200	8,050
Vocational instructor	82	4,368	7,950
Staff trainer	50	4,980	7,500
Counselor	50	5,000	7,500
Vocational instructor	82	3,860	7,010
Public information reporter	50	4,680	7,000
Captain, F. & S.	50	4,500	6,783
Group life supervisor	59	3,952	6,300
Do	51	4,160	6,300

Position	Increase	Previous salary	Present salary
BRECKINRIDGE JOB CORPS CENTER			
	Percent		
Acting director, vocational training	65	$7,800	$12,900
Supervisor of general education	50	6,396	9,600
Counselor instructor	98	4,392	8,700
Do	211	2,700	8,400
Vocational instructor	59	5,100	8,100
Orientation instructor	63	4,800	7,800
Vocational instructor	64	4,560	7,500
General education instructor	84	3,420	6,300
ATTERBURY JOB CORPS CENTER			
Dentist	90	6,420	12,192
Chief security	140	5,004	12,000
Dentist	127	5,196	11,820
Unit coordinator	400	1,800	9,000
Supervisory test administrator	73	5,196	9,000
Psychologist	77	4,800	8,496
Dispatcher	50	1,500	7,560
Health, physical education, and recreation	50	5,040	7,560
Security investigator	71	4,416	7,560
Custodial supervisor	65	4,140	6,840
Supervisor, CX	53	4,464	6,840
Resident adviser, III	229	2,076	6,840
Stock record supervisor	100	3,420	6,840
Tester, II	52	4,356	6,600
Health, physical education, and recreation	102	3,120	6,300
Resident adviser, II	100	3,120	6,228
Do	147	2,520	6,228
Physical education and recreation, II	132	2,688	6,228
Do	71	3,363	6,228
Do	448	1,095	6,000
Assistant maintenance supervisor	100	2,000	6,000
Resident adviser, II	60	1,512	6,000
Do	111	2,844	6,000

Position	Increase	Previous salary	Present salary
RODMAN JOB CORPS CENTER			
	Percent		
Director of curriculum	75	$10,300	$18,000
Senior resident counselor	76	6,800	12,000
Instructor, business education	82	5,500	10,000
Instructor, math economics	51	6,300	9,500
Assistant head, physical education	59	5,500	8,750
Instructor, D. P. laboratory	55	5,500	8,500
Instructor, physical education	70	5,000	8,500
Maintenance manager	92	4,160	8,000
Assistant department head	131	3,250	7,500
Night duty officer	75	4,000	7,000
Do	75	4,000	7,000
Security administrator	82	3,840	7,000
Tutor counselor	72	3,952	6,800
Unit supervisor counselor	76	3,860	6,800
Instructor II, business education	54	4,200	6,500
Tutor counselor	81	3,600	6,500
Instructor II, physical education	86	3,500	6,500
Tutor counselor	50	4,200	6,300
Do	156	2,340	6,000
Do	100	3,000	6,000
Do	110	2,860	6,000
Do	92	3,120	6,000
Purchasing administrator	78	3,380	6,000
Tutor counselor	50	4,000	6,000
Do	65	3,640	6,000
Do	140	2,500	6,000
Do	68	3,580	6,000
Do	186	2,100	6,000
Recreation specialist	138	2,520	6,000
Do	233	1,800	6,000
Do	54	3,900	6,000
KILMER JOB CORPS CENTER			
Dentist	330	3,998	17,201
Manager administrator	468	2,704	15,392
Manager	159	5,800	15,017
Contract administrator, senior	54	9,200	14,18
Administrator, vocational services	313	3,307	13,645
Dentist	315	3,120	13,000
Administrator, educational services	60	7,758	12,418
Education resident specialist	69	6,800	11,502
Administrator, personnel	81	5,980	10,795
Administrator, food services	103	5,190	10,546
Supervisor	60	6,550	10,504
Do	305	2,600	10,442
Administrator, avocations	52	6,800	10,317
Administrator, social activities	53	6,600	12,900
Administrator, security	92,	5,200	10,004
Personnel supervisor	216	3,005	9,506
Administrator, mat control	69	5,439	9,214
Supervisor, activities section	59	5,750	9,131
Analysis systems programer	155	3,536	9,006
Counselor	85	4,800	8,902
Social activities sponsor	79	4,250	8,715
Foreman of guards	109	4,160	8,694
Education specialist	287	2,200	8,507
Supervisor, skills	60	5,200	8,320
Athletic activities sponsor	55	5,300	8,237
Education specialist	61	4,900	7,904
Senior instructor	50	5,200	7,779
Education specialist	71	4,500	7,717
Special athletic activities, senior	99	3,840	7,654
Supervisor	89	4,000	7,561
Athletic activities sponsor	81	4,160	7,530
Counselor	526	1,200	7,509
Instructor	189	2,600	7,509
Do	65	4,160	7,509
Counselor	106	3,640	7,509
Do	51	4,988	7,509
Senior instructor	90	3,952	7,509
Counselor	56	4,804	7,509
Administrative assistant	124	3,350	7,488
Instructor	58	4,680	7,405
Do	58	4,680	7,405
Education specialist	68	4,420	7,405
Do	54	4,800	7,405
Do	50	4,900	7,363
Do	53	4,800	7,342
Do	63	4,500	7,322
Recreation specialist	142	3,005	7,280
Specialist, FA	62	4,500	7,280
Instructor	53	4,700	7,145
Activity athletic sponsor	72	4,160	7,145
Instructor	65	4,316	7,134
Specialist	140	2,860	6,864
(Unspecified)	120	3,120	6,864
Do	52	4,500	6,822
Do	77	3,848	6,802
Do	64	4,160	6,802
Education specialist	104	3,328	6,802
FA specialist	74	3,920	6,802
Administrative assistant	90	3,536	6,729

Position	Increase	Previous salary	Present salary
KILMER JOB CORPS CENTER—continued			
	Percent		
Recreation specialist	79	$3,608	$6,458
Group leader, senior	76	3,640	6,396
Do	53	4,160	6,365
Do	206	2,080	6,364
Do	86	3,380	6,302
Do	51	4,160	6,302
Do	142	2,600	6,302
Do	130	2,724	6,271
Do	51	4,160	6,271
Do	61	3,900	6,261
Garage mechanic	50	4,160	6,240
Social activities specialist	71	3,640	6,209
Group leader	139	2,600	6,209
Do	139	2,600	6,209
Specialist, FA	199	2,080	6,209
Group leader	99	3,120	6,209
Craft specialist	84	3,380	6,208
Group leader	138	2,600	7,178
Do	95	3,120	6,074
Do	92	3,120	6,001
Do	80	3,328	6,001
Do	65	3,640	6,001
Do	92	3,120	6,001
Do	51	3,972	6,001
Do	92	3,120	6,001
Do	80	3,328	6,001
Do	61	3,733	6,001
Do	65	3,640	6,001
Do	50	4,000	6,001
Do	77	3,380	6,001
Do	173	2,200	6,001
Do	114	2,808	6,001
Do	131	2,600	6,001
Do	65	3,640	6,001
Do	100	3,005	6,001
Do	65	3,600	6,001
Do	80	3,328	6,001
Do	110	2,860	6,001
Do	58	3,900	6,001
Do	65	3,640	6,001

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Wednesday, June 29, 1966]

NO. 32: WHO'S KIDDING WHOM; OR JOB CORPS FIZZLE

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE)

The following is an editorial that appeared in the Modern Grocer magazine of May 27, 1966:

"A few months back Modern Grocer received a 'hot' telephone call from Washington. Someone at the Job Corps headquarters asked for help in placing young men trained for supermarket work. 'Fine,' was the reply. 'Give us the facts and we'll do a story.'

"The facts came soon enough; a New York regional office was designated to which to apply and Modern Grocer editors hurried and wrote the story. We did more. We called up some key people whom we knew needed personnel and referred them to the Job Corps. We sat back then, waiting to see doors swing wide open and Job Corps graduates pour through.

"The doors did open. Key people in the stores phoned in, wrote; there were even personal calls. With what results? To date note a single candidate for a job has been supplied by the Job Corps. Calls to the New York office, letters, have turned up zero. In a word, they don't have people ready yet.

"Is this the way the Government does things? Is the Government playing some sort of game in which big expectations are raised but nothing happens? We think this matter of jobs and of stores needing people badly, who are not available, directly affects our entire economy and we ask, 'What's with the Job Corps? Who's kidding whom with the people's money?' "

All of this is indeed strange when you consider that OEO claims 6,013 graduates of the Job Corps to date, of whom only 2,526 have jobs, have gone into the armed services, or back to school. Where are the 3,487 Job Corps graduates who have supposedly been prepared for employment?

[Republican poverty memo, Republican member Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, July 19, 1966]

NO. 33: OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE VERSUS WAR ON POVERTY AMENDMENTS (H.R. 13378 VERSUS H.R. 15111)

(Joint release by Congressmen ALBERT H. QUIE, CHARLES E. GOODELL, ALPHONZO BELL)

After two years of the War on Poverty, many serious deficiencies are apparent. The Democratic majority on the Education and Labor Committee has refused to hold full and constructively critical hearings, for which the Rules Committee has taken the unprecedented action of admonishing them in a recent report adopted 14 to 1. The committee bill ignores most of the deficiencies and in many instances compounds them. Testimony denied the House, but received in the Senate, supports the direction of the Opportunity Crusade, as do investigations carried on independently by Republicans around the country.

The Opportunity Crusade proposes to unite local, state and Federal governments with private industry in launching a comprehensive program of training, education and motivation for the poor. By involving all segments of our economy, $2.4 billion will be committed to the program, of which only $1.4 billion will be Federal funds. This is contrasted to the $1.75 billion program, all Federal funds, that is planned by the 100 per cent Federal War on Poverty. The attached table sets out a comparison of proposed expenditures of anti-poverty funds under Opportunity Crusade and the War on Poverty.

The following features of Opportunity Crusade will, we believe, result in a more effective and productive program against poverty:

1. The Office of Economic Opportunity will be stripped of all its present programs except Community Action and VISTA. All training programs will be coordinated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of the Labor Department; the education programs, including Headstart, will be administered by experts in the Office of Education; the work experience program, which embraces a variety of psychological and sociological problems as well as employment problems, will be administered by the experts in HEW; the small business loan program will be administered by the experts in the Small Business Administration; and the Farmers Home Administration loan program will be administered by the experts in Agriculture.

2. Opportunity Crusade, which will cost the Federal Government $300 million less, will double the funds available for Headstart and place more emphasis on state and local responsibility.

3. The Job Corps program, which has suffered from severe criticism across the country because of excessive expenditures, maladministration and uncoordinated, unrealistic implementation, will be completely revamped. This bill provides for a more intelligent evaluation and screening of applicants; coordination with existing manpower and vocational programs; more effective security and discipline in the camps; the dismissal of enrollees convicted of felonies; and a $5,000 restriction on the annual cost per enrollee.

4. New camps will be set up under the Secretary of Defense to equip for military service on a volunteer basis young men from poverty backgrounds who cannot meet Selective Service standards.

5. Community Action funds will be more than doubled; at least one-third true representation of the poor on policy-making boards will be required; and continued flexibility of local programs will be assured by eliminating earmarked and restrictive funding.

6. The bill provides for a new Industry Youth Corps where private employers will be given a realistic incentive to hire untrained young people between 16 and 22 with one-third of their wages paid while they undergo on-the-job training for meaningful permanent employment.

7. The bill avoids the arbitrary and rigid $12,500 ceiling on salaries in the Committee bill, recognizing direction of some of the urban programs would justify larger salaries. Instead, Opportunity Crusade would require approval by the Director of any salary increase in excess of 20 per cent over previous salary.

8. Careful administrative guidelines are written into all programs under the Opportunity Crusade to eliminate the confusion, delay, and frustration which have plagued the War on Poverty.

9. The employment service would be automated to provide high-speed, reliable joining of individuals with jobs.

10. The Labor Department would institute a national skill survey to pinpoint the thousands of skilled job categories for which qualified applicants cannot be found, as recently recommended by a bipartisan Joint Economic Committee report.

11. The Opportunity Crusade will enlist the state and local governments as partners with the Federal Government. It provides realistic incentives for private employers and individuals to join the public agencies in an all-out effort to provide education, jobs, better housing and dignity for the poor. It will require true involvement of the poor.

Comparative proposed expenditures of opportunity crusade and the war on poverty

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Opportunity crusade commitment	Opportunity crusade authorization	Committee proposal	Administration proposal
Total	2,434	1,462	1,754.5	1,745
Job Corps	170	170	200.0	228
Skill		80		
Conservation		40		
Military career		50		
Neighborhood Youth Corps	382	225	496.0	300
Industry Youth Corps	150	50		
Summer Youth Corps	106	80		
In-school	80	60		
Out-of-school	46	35		
Community action	867	700	323.0	466
Urban CAP	360	324		
Bonus	108	54		
Rural CAP	307	276		
Bonus	92	46		

Comparative proposed expenditures of opportunity crusade and the war on poverty—Con.

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Opportunity crusade commitment	Opportunity crusade authorization	Committee proposal	Administration proposal
Earmarked community action programs			130.5	121
Employment service	25	25		
Skill surveys	5	5		
Automation	20	20		
VISTA	25	25	31.0	26
Headstart	644		352.0	327
Regular	444			
Bonus	200			
Adult basic education	44	40	26.5	30
Rural loans and migrants	55	55	57.0	65
Small business incentives	12	12	4.5	5
Work experience	200	200	119.0	160
Administration	10	10	15.0	17

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, July 21, 1966]

No. 34: "TAXPAYERS' MONEY SHOULDN'T BE USED TO TAKE SIDES IN POLITICS"

(By Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Those were the words of an irate citizen of Durham, North Carolina, after nine poverty staff members participated in partisan efforts to get Durham residents to Democratic precinct meetings. The Community Action Agency, Operation Breakthrough, used four of its vehicles to provide transportation to the Democratic precinct meeting.

Subsequently, OEO and officials of Operation Breakthrough admitted a mistake and supposedly barred future incidents of this nature. Three weeks later staff members of Operation Breakthrough, using private automobiles as well as vehicles leased by the North Carolina Fund, actively solicited votes and transported voters to the Democratic primary in Durham. The North Carolina Fund is financed by state and Foundation money, as well as Federal poverty grants.

Unfortunately, this is just another example in a long series of incidents involving partisan use of poverty money in communities across the country.

Other problems abound in the Durham poverty war in spite of a promising potential in some aspects of the program. In addition to partisan political involvements, Operation Breakthrough staff and vehicles were used to picket city officials and community and business leaders. In a housing dispute, poverty staff and vehicles were even used to picket the private residence of a Negro leader who was attempting to mediate the issue.

Investigation of the Durham poverty program reveals the following additional circumstances that have impaired the efficiency and disabled the potential of the program:

1. Top personnel have exploited their positions of authority in personal relationships with staff employees, creating serious morale and personnel problems.

2. Various departments of the Durham poverty program are poorly coordinated because of a lack of firm leadership and direction. Since the Executive Director has resigned effective July 25, 1966, it is urgent that responsibilities of supervisory staff be clearly defined and coordinated by the new director.

3. The accounts of the Durham poverty program are grossly delinquent and there has been a complete breakdown in communications between accounting and the programs themselves. This information has been verified by recent fiscal audit.

Detailed publication of personnel and administrative deficiencies at this time could only further impair Operation Breakthrough. Firm, forceful and independent action by OEO and the local leadership of Operation Breakthrough is imperative if the deficiencies of the program in Durham are not to reach scandalous public proportions.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, July 26, 1966]

No. 35: POVERTY GRANTS FOR THE YET UNBORN

(By Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL)

Recently, Washington poverty warriors announced a $43,511 grant to a four-county Community Action program in Missouri. With their usual businesslike efficiency and thoroughness, OEO described the area to be served as follows: "Approximately 120,000 needy persons are found scattered in every town and along rural roads in an area 60 miles long and 40 miles wide."

Their poignant description raised a vision of a 60-mile swath of poverty cut through the beautiful Missouri terrain.

Then the area Congressman got interested. Adding up his own figures, he calculated that the four counties contained a maximum total population of only 105,000 persons. He was understandably perplexed as to where the 120,000 needy persons were to be found. The Congressman notified OEO that they were telling the world that everyone in the area was impoverished, plus several thousand yet unborn.

Hasty recalculations by OEO whittled the figure of needy persons down to 80,000 of the 105,000 population. In the face of continued disbelief by the Congressman and the citizens of the four counties, OEO finally agreed that there were probably only about 5,000 needy families in the area.

The $43,511 grant was to the Daniel Boone Human Development Corporation for administering and staffing of a Community Action program in St. Charles, Lincoln, Warren and Montgomery Counties in Missouri.

Earlier this year, OEO admitted that its Washington profile of poverty for Danville, Indiana, not only exceeded the population there but failed to fit any Danville in the nation. It would appear that Mr. Shriver's computerized poverty machine in Washington continues to grind out distorted poverty statistics and a seemingly endless procession of fuddles. The fuddle factory, known in the alphabetic jargon of government as OEO, continues to live up to its name.

As if the Community Action grant was not enough, $163,000 was recently announced to set up legal services for the poor in nine counties of Missouri. As the Congressman put it, "The local bar associations didn't even know this was going to be done. This isn't the way you get ahead." It turned out the application was submitted by a law professor who is a consultant to the Washington office of OEO.

After criticizing the high salaries "for jobs that are not clearly defined" and heavy overtones of politics in the poverty program, the Democratic Congressman representing this area, the Honorable WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, announced to the press that, although he favored the poverty war last year, he will vote against continuing the program this year.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Thursday, Aug. 11, 1966]

No. 36: THE PRESIDENT'S CLUB AND POVERTY

(By Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE and Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL)

A new and suspicious situation has come to our attention involving President's Club contributions and a million dollar contract in the poverty program.

Late in 1964, the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington was seeking a qualified engineering firm to provide guidance in the selection of Job Corps sites and to furnish engineering services to Job Corps centers. Mr. E. Hunter Smith, Jr. (Chief of the Job Corps Installation and Logistics Division) by memorandum of December 22, 1964, specified five major requirements for such a firm, including an "immediate capability" and "a Washington, D.C., area operational office." Mr. Smith recommended to Mr. Milton Fogelman, OEO Contract Officer, four firms "known to be experienced in these types of services who have expressed interest" (Lublin-McGaughy and Associates, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.; Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall, 1725 I Street; H. D. Nottingham and Associates, Arlington, Virginia; and Mills, Petticord and Mills, 3308 14th Street, N.W.).

Two weeks later, the contract was granted to Consolidated American Services, Incorporated (ConAm), a firm unmentioned and unrecommended in the Smith memorandum. It turned out that ConAm had a one-man office in Washington, D.C., and did not meet several important requirements outlined in the Smith memorandum.

The original contract was estimated at $500,000 and is now being phased out by OEO after expenditure of $1,350,000. The size and cost of the contract depended upon continuing task orders from OEO.

A subsequent audit reveals that "no evidence was found that other potential contractors were canvassed though several located in Washington, D.C., were known." It also found "matters which may not be in the Government's best interest."

The Senior Vice President of ConAm was W. C. Hobbs. According to the records of the Clerk of the House, W. C. Hobbs, listing addresses of ConAm offices in California and Washington, contributed $1,000 to the President's Club on September 28, 1964; $1,000 to the Democratic National Committee on May 4, 1965; and $1,000 to the President's Club on March 11, 1966.

ConAm personnel informed our investigators that they had not done this type of work for the Government prior to the OEO contract. A new Management and Engineering Services Division of ConAm was established in November, 1964, two months before the OEO contract. I understand that with the expiration of the OEO contract, the Washington Management and Engineering Services Division of ConAm is now being discontinued.

The total cost of establishing and maintaining the Washington Office of ConAm was charged to the OEO contract. Auditors have made the following comment:

"In our opinion the selection of a Washington, D.C., firm could have resulted in significant monetary savings to OEO, particularly as regards employee travel costs, relocation expenses, furniture and lease expenses, and other start-up costs. This appears to have been possible with little effect upon the immediate availability and know-how of technical manpower needed by OEO

since ConAm found it necessary to recruit an almost entire staff."

W. C. Hobbs joined ConAm in March, 1964, and with the expiration of the poverty contract has now been separated from ConAm.

There are other discrepancies and problems in connection with the ConAm contract. The facts cited herein, however, require a full and immediate investigation:

How did Hobbs and ConAm get the inside track at OEO?

Why were four apparently qualified firms ignored and a fifth firm that failed to meet important specifications chosen?

What connection was there between the $1,000 contributions to the President's Club and the apparent arbitrary selection of ConAm for this contract?

A simple denial of any relationship is not enough. The taxpayers and the Congress of the United States deserve a full, detailed explanation of this unusual selection procedure that gave a million-dollar poverty contract to a one-man Washington office whose Senior Vice President was coincidentally a continuing member of the President's Club.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Monday, Sept. 26, 1966]

No. 37: CON AM: THE MILLION DOLLAR POVERTY FUDDLE

(By Congressman CHARLES E. GOODELL)

"The most frustrating experience of my business life," says Chief Con Am Engineer. "From the outset the Con Am situation was confused and at times completely ineffective. It was apparent OEO was not equipped to effectively guide a program of feasibility studies and rehabilitation of Job Corps Center Facilities."

These are the words of Mr. Dan Miller, the chief engineer hired especially by Con Am to supervise their million dollar poverty contract. On August 11th we revealed that OEO arbitrarily chose Con Am (Consolidated American Services, Inc.) to evaluate Job Corps sites, although Con Am did not meet OEO's own specifications and at least four qualified firms were available. Coincidently, Mr. William C. Hobbs, operating a one-man Con Am office in Washington, has given $3,000 to the President's Club and the Democratic National Committee. The contract, recently terminated, totalled $1,350,000.

In June 1965 Con Am hired Mr. Dan Miller as their chief engineer on this poverty contract. Mr. Miller in a sworn affadavit continues as follows:

"It was apparent to me the selection of several sites were politically motivated (Kanawha Hotel, Charleston, West Virginia; Camp Rodman, Massachusetts; and Camp Atterbury, Indiana). Despite Con Am reports recommending abandonment of several sites, OEO disregarded these recommendations and proceeded with contract awards. William Hobbs on several occasions, indicated he had been instructed by OEO to pass favorably upon sites, which in the opinion of competent engineers, were not as suitable as alternate sites would have been.

"Con Am eventually built a staff of approximately 60 people. Mr. Hobbs, in the Spring of 1965, attempted to conceal the activities of certain personnel from me; however, I was generally aware these people were working on matters other than OEO business and their salaries and travel expenses were being vouchered for payment with OEO funds.

"In the Spring of 1965, Hobbs hired a retired military Colonel (name not recalled) who was assigned to matters not involving OEO. This man came to me after about two months and expressed concern that he was signing OEO vouchers and receiving OEO checks. The Colonel feared a Congressional investigation would divulge this situation and his career and reputation would be jeopardized. This individual resigned because of this fear.

"I am convinced an audit of reimbursement costs on the Con Am contract would reveal a number of these irregularities."

Mr. Miller summed up the situation in these words: "In my professional opinion, Con Am was not equipped to perform this service satisfactorily and I feel subsequent developments confirmed this. The Con Am project was the most frustrating experience of my business life. I became very much interested in the theory and philosophy of the Job Corps Program and felt the program was being jeopardized by OEO bureaucracy and political favoritism."

Mr. Miller is a respected and distinguished engineer who was acclaimed by Con Am officials as a "well qualified man." After his brief frustration with government waste and boondoggle he returned to private employment at a high level of responsibility. I have requested GAO to make a full investigation of the Con Am contract.

[Republican poverty memo, Republican members Poverty Subcommittee, Tuesday, Sept. 27, 1966]

No. 38: OEO'S CONSULTANTS

(By Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE)

Previous revelations about personnel and salaries at the Office of Economic Opportunity indicates that OEO has produced more bureaucratic wealth than any comparable agency.

During the debate last year, you will recall a list of all OEO consultants was placed in the record. Recently, examination of OEO's consultant lists raises serious questions about personnel practices at that agency.

The Civil Service Commission advises that there are 112 vacancies at OEO in Grades GS 15–18. Coincidentally, as of July 1, 1966, there were approximately 200 consultants on the payroll and the majority were in the $60–$100-a-day bracket. A number of these "consultants" have played prominent roles as full-time top-level functionaries since the Administration's anti-poverty program was launched in October, 1964. Among these were Edgar Cahn, Special Assistant to the Director, and Lewis Eigen, an Associate Director of the Job Corps.

The answer to the obvious question "Why does OEO maintain full-time consultants rather than fill existing GS vacancies?" may be one or more of the following:

1. The consultant device is being used to pay at a higher level than permitted by Civil Service Standards;

2. Individuals are being hired at a consultant rate higher than their qualifications and credentials justify; or

3. Sargent Shriver cannot make up his mind what personnel to retain.

When one realizes that OEO has more personnel in supergrades than the Office of Education, which is budgeted for twice what OEO is, it is no small wonder that OEO tries to hide high-salaried people. The law and Civil Service regulations clearly provide that consultants may not be used when jobs call for full-time, continuing employment. Perhaps OEO officials can produce a technicality by which they evade the clear intent of the law, but the abuse is apparent and flagrant.

I have furnished the Civil Service Commission with a detailed list of OEO consultants and have asked for a full report on OEO consultant-hiring practices. I have also requested the General Accounting Office to investigate the matter. I place in the RECORD at this point the list of OEO consultants.

Two years have produced a series of mismanagement incidents in OEO. No Federal agency has had more management difficulties than OEO. No agency has had such hasty personnel turn-over than OEO. No agency has abused its privileges in the use of high-paid consultants as OEO. The excuse that the program is new can no longer be used. We can correct much that is wrong with the program by adoption of the Republican substitute entitled the Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966. But faulty management of OEO over two years can only point to the Director. The first order of business, to get this faltering agency on the road to victory is to replace its Director, Sargent Shriver.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, at this point I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the words of Moses Maimonides in the 12th century when he wrote about the eight steps in the duties of charity are apropos as we study the merits of this legislation. He said that the first and lowest degree of charity is to give with reluctance: "the gift of the hand—not the heart."

The highest—and I read here from Maimonides:

> Lastly, the eighth and most meritorious of all is to anticipate charity, by preventing poverty; namely, to assist the reduced fellow man, either by a considerable gift, or loan of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in a way of business; so that he may earn an honest livelihood; and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity.

When you reduce this whole legislation to its lowest common denominator, that is what we are talking about. This whole massive effort has been directed at one thing, getting people off of charity; getting people out of poverty; getting them into the stream of the Nation's economy.

This debate has quite properly brought out the mistakes that have been made—and mistakes have been made. It would be an insult to the intelligence of Congress to say that this massive program has worked perfectly all the way. Our colleagues on the minority side have performed a useful service in calling some of these mistakes to public attention. I might say that on our side, the chairman of this subcommittee and various other Members of Congress have moved swiftly to correct the mistakes as they became known to the public.

But let us not obfuscate the real issue. The real issue is that this program has been a massive effort for the first time in the annals of recorded history to do something about poverty. Man has talked about trying to eliminate poverty since the beginning of time, but it has been this Congress and the previous Congress, the Congress of the United States, that evolved a program of trying to do something about it.

The test here is: is it working? Yes; we could spend hours talking about its shortcomings, but let us also say something about its positive aspects.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] and I talked to the late Ray Hilliard shortly before he died. He was the head of the welfare department in Cook County, which takes in Chicago. Ray Hilliard told us that since this program got started, he had been able to remove from the public relief rolls of Cook County 17,000 people; 17,000 people

taken off of relief and given a new lease of dignity on life. Today they are gainfully employed.

I recently talked to one of those people and I said, "How does it feel?" It was a man we trained to be a chef. He and his family had been on relief for a long time. We trained him to be a chef. He is now earning $110 a week. I talked to him and asked him, "How does it feel?" He said, "Mister, you do not know what it feels like to come home now and be greeted by my kids as a breadwinner instead of a reliefer."

Now, how do you put a dollar tag on that kind of constructive progress that we have made in that one family, and what effect will it have on his children and their children? The only way that you are going to break this tragic chain of poverty is to have these people taught a skill.

Ray Hilliard told us an even more startling fact. I found it almost incredible and impossible to believe. He insisted it was correct and Ray Hilliard was an honorable man. He told us at the time he talked to us when we were in Chicago holding this investigation, that at that time he did not have one able-bodied adult male, capable of working, on the relief rolls of Cook County. We all shook our heads in disbelief. We did not think it could be possible. He said, "We have all of these programs and these people are in training programs, and they will be hired as soon as we complete the training programs."

Now, this is meaningful progress.

I would like to see this Congress instruct the House Committee on Education and Labor to establish within its ranks a permanent oversight committee that would function year around to make sure that the legitimate complaints and the weaknesses of the program as they develop are called to the attention of a proper congressional legislative authority for action. Such a subcommittee now exists in our full committee and I believe the House should make it a permanent subcommittee of our full committee, so the Office of Economic Opportunity will know that an arm of the House is constantly looking over its shoulder.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see this Legislative Oversight Committee see that the spirit of this act is being carried out, that letters like my colleague, the gentleman from New York, read a little while ago, will not happen again.

But, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that basically this program is working.

Mr. Chairman, in Chicago our Community Action workers have contacted more than 500,000 people who are either underemployed or who have been unemployed for some time; people who have migrated to Chicago and all the other large cities because they have been automated out of their jobs on the farms of America and in many of our Southern communities; people who are unable, unprepared for urban life, people who know nothing about urban life, and in many instances, tragically, people who are unemployable because they cannot read and have had absolutely no experience in factory work.

Mr. Chairman, these people have been contacted by our Community Action workers. These people have been channeled into meaningful training programs and they are being helped so that some day we will be able to take them off the public dole and they may contribute as taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this program has now overcome its initial growing pains. Certainly there were many mistakes made, and I would be the last to deny it, and I have pointed out those mistakes myself, as they were made, because, as I said earlier, this is the first massive effort that any nation in the history of the world has undertaken to get to the very roots of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, we in Chicago have an antirodent program. You might say what has that got to do with poverty? It has a great deal to do with poverty. You cannot get people to develop a sense of dignity and pride and you cannot have families develop a sense of hope when rats are crawling through their homes and over their beds.

So, Mr. Chairman, the experience and the progress which we have made through a part of the community effort has been immeasurable.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you and to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that as you examine the various parts of this program—and our committee has examined it—the majority staff has done a good job in calling attention to the many shortcomings of the program. I say to you, you will find much in this program that will make every Member of Congress proud and will make every citizen of this country proud who took on this great challenge to humanity.

Mr. Chairman, in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent in Illinois, my constituents are going to benefit from these programs. My constituents eventually will see their real estate taxes cut as people now on relief will be able to get jobs to get off the public dole and become taxpayers themselves.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 1 additional minute.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if we take each and every family off relief and put them in the stream of the economy, my friends, then we shall realize what this means to the taxpayers of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are in our sixth year of continuous prosperity. This is no accident. It did not just happen.

Mr. Chairman, every time we take a family off relief and put it into the stream of the Nation's economy we are helping the entire economic structure, because this family then becomes a consumer, creating jobs for their fellow Americans, who produce the products the family needs.

And, Mr. Chairman, this is why I say, certainly, there have been mistakes.

But, Mr. Chairman, I urge this Congress to stay with this program and this Committee—and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] for the magnificent work he and his committee have done in bringing before us a meaningful program, one that we can rally behind.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we go along, new programs will be undertaken, and that other suggestions will be made as to how best to carry out this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this Oversight Committee is established, so that when the bill comes before us again in 1968, we can incorporate its recommendations.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] whether or not he agrees with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] that a special oversight committee should be set up in the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. GIBBONS. I understand we have one and it is sitting right here right now.

Mr. AYRES. My reason for asking the question was I wondered if this would be applicable under the new rules that you adopted?

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

Mr. AYRES. I would like the gentleman from Florida to answer because he has been the instigator of a lot of this.

Mr. GIBBONS. As you know, under the new rules that we voted for 27 to 1 the other day, the committee can adopt whatever subcommittees they wish to have. If the committee when it meets the next time wishes to have an oversight committee of this sort, then the committee can adopt a rule establishing that oversight committee and naming the Members to it and carry out the functions that have been outlined here. That is within our prerogatives under the new rules.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I think that they have answered my question satisfactorily.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to point out that this subcommittee has done an excellent job. They are all experts on this program. I certainly would have no objection and as a matter of fact I would recommend that this committee continue its functions because they have done a good job and they today are probably more expert on this antipoverty legislation than any Member in this Congress.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to inquire as to the status of the time and ask the desires of my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] as to the remainder of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make a very short, dispassionate closing statement just to explain

what we are going to do tomorrow as far as the procedure is concerned unless the gentleman from Minnesota wants to use the remainder of his 3 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I will hang on to my 3 minutes in this case.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes right now to make this statement.

Mr. Chairman, in this evening's Washington Star, there is a headline "GOP Hits Poverty Bill, Shriver's Ouster Is Urged."

Of course, most of us knew that this probably was going to be the headline, but press releases usually go out a little ahead of the speeches.

I have here a brief speech that was prepared, not by me, but by some of the people who are assisting me in rebutting the points that are raised. I will not take the whole time of the House to read about the number of additional people who are on the staff down there and rebut the rest of the arguments that have been made about the GS levels. If the Members are seriously interested in this, they can read it in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. If that statement has any reference to me on anything I have said, I would appreciate if you would read it in the RECORD now.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I will read the statement.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the pending bill earlier in the day, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] charged that the Office of Economic Opportunity was, in effect, abusing Civil Service personnel procedures by employing over 200 highly paid consultants, when there are, according to the gentlemen, vacancies for 112 employees of GS–15 and supergrade level.

Mr. Chairman, on the surface this charge appears damaging to OEO. But in fact, like other charges that have been periodically made by the gentlemen against OEO, it turns out that the gentlemen do not have a leg to stand on.

Mr. Chairman, the facts are as follows: There are, it is technically true, 112 OEO vacancies at the GS–15 and supergrade levels, as of September 1. Of 12 GS–18 slots, 11 are filled; of 16 GS–17 slots, 15 are filled; of 20 GS–16 slots, 12 are filled; and of 219 GS–15 slots, 117 are filled. There are also, it is true, 211 consultants presently on the OEO payroll. However, of those 211 consultants, only 47 are employed on a full-time basis—the 164 others are only intermittent consultants, who may serve for 1 day or 2 days or a month, or once a week. One of the full-time consultants and three of the intermittent consultants serve without compensation. The full-time consultants are paid an average of $60 per day, or about equivalent to a GS–14; the intermittent consultants get paid an average of $70 per day, or about equivalent to a GS–15—GS–14, step 1 earns $58.08 a day, GS–15 step 1 earns $67.52 a day.

But just as significant, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that, while 102 so-called vacancies technically do exist at the GS–15 level, actually most of these slots are filled with highly competent GS–13's and GS–14's, people who show exceptional promise of being able to eventually win promotion to the GS–15 level. Thus, in practice, OEO is not only fully in accord with civil service procedures, but is actually setting a fine example of economy and personnel administration.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it should be emphasized that while, under the President's fiscal 1967 budget, OEO's authorized average grade level is GS–9.5, in actuality, as one of the present, the average OEO grade level is only 8.93—an amazingly low figure, and one that is well below the average for the Federal Government as a whole.

So endeth my speech. I do not think I maligned the gentleman too much in that. I did not intend to if I did.

I will be glad to yield the floor if the gentleman from Minnesota would like to use the remainder of the time. I will not say anything about him on the remainder of my time, so you do not need to worry.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I agree that the gentleman from Florida did not say anything about me. This speech was written by someone else, evidently down in OEO. But I might point out just one name that I mentioned in my comments earlier: Edgar Kahn, who was paid at the rate of $70 a day, which would be in excess of $14,000. It is true that the permanent employees were at somewhat lower figures, for the most part, but some were higher—$100 a day, $85 a day, and so forth, which were substantially more than $14 a day. But the question arises mainly about the OEO consultants who are on a permanent basis rather than an intermittent basis, people like Mr. Kahn who is for 2 full years and who is not placed in a permanent status.

My understanding of civil service regulations is that they are only supposed to work 130 days in 1 year, and they would then either go on a permanent status or they would not work any more in that year. That is my big gripe—not with the intermittent employees, but with the permanent employees.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I could not follow precisely the figures that were indicated by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] as to the utilization of budgeted GS levels, but it would appear that most of the utilization in OEO puts them above those in the Office of Education.

The major point made by me today was that the Office of Education runs $3.5 billion worth of programs, and yet OEO is budgeted at the higher GS levels for up to twice as many people while spending $1.5 billion.

In addition, they have taken on this large number of consultants.

I think the points that were made today by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and by me have not been contradicted. We indicated these were the budgeted figures. If OEO is not utilizing the full budgeted allocation for high-salaried individuals, I would say it would indicate they could cut down on their allocation for salaries.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved for myself some time in order to close. I do not intend to yield any more time, because I understand, under the rule, I have the right to close. I do not intend to use any more time until majority Members have used the balance of their time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding the gentleman from Florida is going to close the debate, I will be glad to use up my 1 minute. So the gentleman will not think I will come back at him, and I do not believe he will think that, I will not say anything in this time that will require some debate—and if it did, I know the gentleman would yield, so I will be glad to yield back the 30 seconds of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized in order to close the debate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, we have come to the close of I do not know how many quorum calls and I do not know how many hours of debate. We started off with 8 hours of debate, and, of course, we both yielded back some time yesterday.

I had reserved this time to answer all the damages that had been done to us during the general debate, but it is not worth using that time, because obviously we have not been done any great damage in this debate.

I will take the few minutes of remaining time and say what I believe the orderly procedure should be tomorrow.

When we rise here and when we go next into the reading of the bill, we intend to read the first four lines of the bill. At that time the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

We are doing this so that the substitute can be printed in the RECORD and be available for Members of the House as a whole, so they will not have to run all over the Congress looking for copies of the substitute. It will all be in the RECORD for them tomorrow. We want to do that so we will be perfectly fair with our opponents about this matter.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York at this point.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe there will be copies of Mr. QUIE's bill at the desks if we want to look at it in bill form.

Mr. GIBBONS. That is perfectly all right. I was doing this not to run up the Government Printing Office bill, but because Mr. QUIE wanted to have it immediately available for all Members.

Second. I hope we can move expeditiously through this 5-minute debate tomorrow under the 5-minute rule, and that we can hold quorum calls to zero. We will certainly do our part on our side of the aisle. We hope we can have a dignified and distinguished debate tomorrow and proceed to a vote as early as possible on the merits of all the amendments.

I might state that as far as our side is concerned, we have perhaps a couple of amendments. We are certainly open-minded about anybody else's amendments. If they will submit them to us in advance, we will try to make an advance judgment on them, so if there is an area of agreement, we can agree, and if there is disagreement, we will all know about it ahead of time.

I have been trying to get copies of the amendments from Mr. GOODELL and Mr. QUIE, that is these other 114 amendments, and we still have not gotten them, but we will be generous with the other side tomorrow and try to unravel them as the 114 amendments are presented.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I have not counted the amendments myself, so I do not know where the 114-figure came from. But the amendments that Mr. GOODELL and I have are included in the "Opportunity Crusade" substitute. There may be additional amendments that other Members have, and I cannot speak for them, but for the two of us, these are our amendments. So if the Members will read the "Opportunity Crusade" substitute which has been available since last January, these are our amendments that we will offer.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, does Mr. GOODELL have anything he wishes to say at this point?

Mr. GOODELL. No.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, if any other Members have any amendments to offer, we on the Democratic side will try to evaluate them and be as open as possible toward them.

This is a tough piece of legislation. It is 41 pages long. It makes massive changes in this year's Economic Opportunity Act as it has been carried on up to this point. I believe these changes really are constructive.

With that comment, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of the time we may have.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty has my support. I say this because I have watched the program develop and grow in the counties and towns of southeastern Ohio where Appalachia meets the rural Midwest, and where the need for economic opportunity is great indeed. I have tried to play a role in getting antipoverty programs underway in the 10th District, and I have been truly heartened at the progress that is being made.

Many difficulties faced the war on poverty in the 10th District. Pockets of economic and educational need were scattered over a large area. There often was little if any history of cooperation between the different towns and counties on the problems of the poor. Local resources were often lacking. Experienced and expert personnel were few and far between. And there was opposition from ill-informed and misguided individuals and groups. But the program was launched, and, despite stubborn obstacles, has won widespread local support and a growing degree of success.

Practically all the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act are operating in the 10th District, Mr. Chairman. There are several bicounty and multicounty CAP agencies, which have fostered an unprecedented degree of intercounty cooperation on social and economic problems. There are many neighborhood youth corps projects and Headstart projects, all of which have been of tremendous benefit to the poor teenagers and young children who have participated. The institute for regional development at Ohio University in Athens has become a model center for regional planning, technical assistance, and program development, and has received several grants from OEO. Vesuvius Job Corps Center in Lawrence County has quietly become an outstanding example of a successful Job Corps conservation center, and is also a place where VISTA volunteers are effectively working to overcome the ravages of poverty. Lawrence County is the site of a large work-experience program which stresses useful work on highway beautification projects. And several rural antipoverty loans have been made to 10th District residents.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the war on poverty is working and that it must be extended and expanded. The demand for new programs, and for refunding existing programs, continues to grow all across the State of Ohio, and I strongly believe that we must meet that demand to the greatest extent possible. Sargent Shriver has called the war on poverty a "hand up" program rather than a "hand out" program—I think that is a very good way of putting it, and I think it is time for this Body to give the war on poverty a hand. Mr. Chairman, I support the pending bill.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15111.

In this day and age, with much talk of economy, it might be more politically advantageous in certain areas of my district to speak against this bill, but I believe there has been much good done by the various programs under this legislation. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, we have cut wherever and whenever feasible and will continue to do so in the interest of economy and proper spending.

It would be foolish for me to state that there has been no wrong or misdirection in some instances, but I believe this was the exception and not the rule.

We all know that rarely do the news media publish that which is good, but more often than not they publish the sensational and the bad.

This legislation before us seeks to coordinate and bring together under one roof many varied programs which have been spread through various agencies, thus avoiding duplication and waste. By this legislation and amendments thereto, the loopholes of waste and poor programing are expected to be closed.

To give some idea of the good, let us just examine a few examples—

Under the Job Corps, manpower training and education, persons who are without a trade are being taught a trade in industry where there is a shortage of employees. These same persons are now being given the opportunity to become taxpayers instead of being a drain on our tax dollars—without this training they might be on welfare rolls for years or jailed.

The people are being taught to help themselves so that they may help others. We might say our forefathers did it on their own, they were not given this help—yes, this is true, but it also is true that the opportunities were greater in a nonskilled economy of yesterday than today in a world of mechanization. Also, should we not try every means to cure ill rather than to let it just fester and hope it will cure itself? I believe the old adage of yesterday a "stitch in time saves nine" applies today as it did in yesteryear.

A recent report by Hon. Harold W. Tucker, Chief Librarian, Queens Borough Public Library, clearly points out the good achieved under this program—good achieved for all people of every race, color, and age. The following are just a few quotes from parents as to the program:

> Evyan looks forward to visiting the library and is very proud to talk about it. She has begun to tell stories of her own and sings the new songs she learns.
>
> The children are Korean, as you know, and I thank you for giving them the opportunity to verbalize.
>
> I brought my boy to some programs while my wife was expecting a baby. I am spending more time with him now and answer questions asked by him.
>
> I think if my six-year-old had had the program, maybe he would be like my three-year-old, who wants stories read to him at home and has developed the ability to sit quietly.

Recently I received letters from a nun of the Teaching Order of Ursuline Sisters who is a friend of the family, telling me of her work under the poverty programs. Sister Margaret Mary wrote me and I quote a part of her letter dated July 24, 1966:

> We are 4 Sisters working on a Headstart project * * * The children are 4 and 5 years old, about 80% of them * * * some have no fathers, one has a father in a V.A. Hospital * * * with no hope of release * * * It is nice to see that the families that need the program are really getting it * * * Some children did not know what grapes were * * * some had never seen rice * * * One little fellow we noticed picked up all the leftover fruit from lunch. The social worker found that he took this home where the rest of the family of ten had only this for food while awaiting their welfare check * * * no father * * * These families are all white except for one Puerto Rican family * * * I guess I never realized this would be so on Long Island.

Continued quotes from Sister Margaret Mary and her letter dated August 1, 1966:

> This must be the fifth week of the program and it is amazing to see the progress * * * When they started, many were scared and

uncertain * * * very rarely were sentences used * * * only one or two words at the most * * * Now they know the names of all the objects in the room and now use sentences * * * they can organize little games and play better with each other and share toys. * * * There are Lutherans, Baptists, Methodists, Catholics, and Jewish children mixed in this group—no prayers are said. Another feature of the program is meetings with parents which meetings include the Director, Social Worker, and Nurse, where all problems are discussed and solutions sought.

Mr. Chairman, what price tag do we put on saving one mind—one person—this program is saving many a body, mind, person, and community.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. These amendments expand the program where needed, correct inequities in the present program, and will substantially improve the programs of the war on poverty. The proposed changes represent extensive study and research, and take advantage of the experience gained over the past year and a half the antipoverty program has been in operation. I do feel, however, that $1.7 billion is insufficient. Yes, the war on poverty is a costly program; but let us remember that even more costly are the social ills of poverty—unemployment, slum housing, poor health, crime, and juvenile delinquency. There have been disappointments and inadequacies in our massive war against poverty, but we must revitalize the program and continue the job we have begun.

I am particularly concerned that the community action programs not be cut; rather, they should be expanded. These programs are proving their usefulness and we must not lose the valuable ground we have already gained with their operation.

New York City, with its many complex problems, should be given a proportionately larger share of funds for these programs.

I am pleased the bill provides for stronger expanded Headstart efforts. This has been one of the most successful of the antipoverty programs. The cycle of poverty can be broken first by dealing with young children. This summer over 560,000 deprived preschool children in the United States were given educational, social, cultural, nutritional, and medical attention to properly prepare them for kindergarten and first grade. In addition, a year-round program for 3- and 4-year-olds has benefited over 200,000 youngsters, and a winter Headstart enrollment of 193,000 is anticipated. With the expanded Headstart efforts provided in this bill, the program will be able to flourish for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I support the provision for $88 million for special job training in the public service professions. This proposal is designed to reach the hardcore unemployed and to provide them with subprofessional jobs in the public services, such as in health and hospital areas, in schools, municipal offices, and libraries. If adopted, this proposal will not only provide work for chronically unemployed individuals, but it could be a catalyst to alleviate some of the shortages in health personnel which now exist and which are likely to increase with the medicare program. It is a promising way to begin to meet this problem.

The $22 million authorized in the bill to continue a program of legal services to the needy has my wholehearted support. Our antipoverty drive for new opportunities in employment, better health, and education, will fall short of our goals unless a program of legal assistance can be extended to the very poor. The poor and uneducated are the most intimidated. They live in a maze of consumer credit laws, public assistance and housing requirements, and immigration laws. The Office of Economic Opportunity legal services program directs its attention and the community's resources to the needs of those afflicted and disadvantaged by poverty. The American Bar Association, leaders of local bar groups and various legal aid agencies are cooperating with the Office of Economic Opportunity in the program.

H.R. 15111 sets aside $12.5 million for programs of prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction. It is a proven fact that dope addiction is a symptom of poverty. New York will benefit more than any other area from these funds, although it is a limited amount. I support any effort on the part of the Federal Government to combat the plague of narcotic addiction.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot take the time to comment on all of the proposed amendments, but I would like to say that I favor the expansion of the job training programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the proposed coordination of the work experience program with the manpower program. The Job Corps has been successful in providing school dropouts an opportunity to learn skills and face the world with new hope. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has given thousands of the young unemployed an opportunity to earn money, to find work, to break away from the hopelessness of poverty, and become respectable citizens instead of tax burdens.

In my city of New York, the war on poverty is increasing in volume, expanding, and bringing more neighborhood groups into operation. In my area, south Bronx, we have three community progress centers in operation. I resist any effort to reduce or eliminate funds for the many important and sorely needed activities of our community action programs. We are not waging a struggle to support our poor—the program is not one of charity—but an all-out effort to allow the poverty stricken to develop and to use their capabilities, to climb the ladder of independence, to give them economic opportunities.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the discussion thus far of H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966. Let me say at the outset that I agree with some of the observations that have been advanced on this floor to the effect that administration of this tremendous effort to eliminate poverty from our national life could be improved. If the Office of Economic Opportunity had not made some administrative mistakes in the 2 years since it was first established; if as broad and as new and as complex a program as this had been carried out without any blunders, without any waste, without any mistakes in judgment—I would be deeply impressed, indeed. In fact, I would be a little frightened of how ordinary mortals could cope with the supermen who were in charge of this undertaking.

Some mistakes are bound to creep into any new program in its first 2 years. In fact, mistakes of substantial proportions are often found in far more permanent programs with far less complicated goals, even after generations of operation. Administrators, whether career civil servants or political appointees, do share our humanity with us, and like all of us, like even the most vigorous critics of the OEO, they are fallible.

The question that concerns me is not whether or not there have been mistakes. It is, rather, "Has there, or has there not, been an effort made to get on with the job?" It is a source of deep pride to me, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, where this program had its birth, and as a member of the Democratic Party, which is responsible for this program's conception, that the effort is being made.

There is an old and pervading argument against trying to do anything for the poor. This argument contends, first, that the poor are poor because it is good for their character, and secondly, that it is useful to have the poor around in order to hold down wage costs. I find the second argument is seldom stated aloud, though we hear the first on every side. I note, however, that it is usually the successful, those who have either never known poverty or have risen from it, who feel that efforts to help the remaining poor are bad for their moral fiber. I have seldom heard the very successful suggest that they need their own moral fiber improved by having some of their affluence removed. Their concern is usually directed toward those who, by remaining poor, have, it is implied, retained that strength of character which, the affluent insist, affluence removes. To my colleagues in this House—none of whom may be said to be in real poverty—I offer a bit of reassurance. I do not really think their presently comfortable circumstances has hurt their character. And I really do believe that the Nation can make the daring experiment of trying to help the poverty stricken share some of that affluence, some of that material well-being, which we think of as characterizing this richest Nation in the world's history.

If, Mr. Chairman, we shrink back from this effort because we think there may be further administrative foulups, then, by the same token, we should simply dissolve the Government of the United States, and our State and local governments and creep home to pull the blankets up over our heads and stop living altogether. Our fallibility begins with our birth. Our life histories are histories of attempts, sometimes successful, sometimes not, to reach up and out—

from where we are—to something better and higher and bigger and beyond us. And the greatest failures are not those who try and fail, but those who fail to try altogether.

It is in this spirit that I commend the President, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the many dedicated people who are associated with him in an effort to eliminate poverty from our life.

The job can be done, Mr. Chairman. A century ago, Mr. Chairman, wise and good men assumed it would be impossible to eliminate slavery from our country, and impossible for the country to survive the effort to do it. Slavery, we were told, was divinely ordained as a punishment for sin, and the slaves were really better off than they would be fending for themselves. But we abolished it, and today we wonder how it was ever tolerated.

Sixty years ago, I dare say, wise and good and learned men would have asserted that it was impossible to eliminate any of the great killing diseases. But, by the generosity of the American people, with the substantial contribution of Federal and State public health and medical research bodies, we have eliminated many of them, and are on our way to eliminating others.

Twenty years ago, when the thunders of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were still echoing in our ears, wise and prudent men thought it was impossible for the human race to exist much longer—that the nuclear genie would soon turn on us all. He may. But here we still are, 20 years later. And we have not wiped ourselves out. And we have learned better than any preceding generation of humanity ever knew what it is like to live in the suburbs of Armageddon. We have not eliminated war or the threat of war. But we are trying. And in trying, rather than in passively accepting what we once thought inevitable, we are truly earning the blessings of our children, and of our Father.

So it is with the war on poverty, Mr. Chairman. We can nit-pick until the snow falls, and we will never be done with the catalog of administrative shortcomings. We can come to the conclusion that this program will upset old relationships, disturb old complacencies, and that rapid and successful completion of the effort is far from assured. And, on that basis, we can avert our eyes and try to shed our responsibilities. Or, Mr. Chairman, we can face squarely the difficulties, the trials and tribulations that lie before us. We can take responsibility for the failures that are mathematically certain to happen, and we can courageously take action to go on with the struggle anyway.

Victory over poverty is not assured, Mr. Chairman. But the need for that victory—and the need to struggle against poverty—is as certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun. If we are to rid this Nation of the shame and scandal of incredible want in the midst of unbelievable wealth—if we are to be true to our own stated aspirations and ideals—we can do no less.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, on January 15, 1965, a group of 30 young men arrived at the Catoctin Job Corps Conservation Center near Thurmont in western Maryland.

They were the first Job Corps volunteers in the Nation, which now number about 28,750 young men and women: Catoctin was the first of 106 Job Corps centers to open.

A recent check of that first group of 30, showed that 16 completed their training and went to work, entered the Armed Forces, or returned to school, and 9 still were in the program. Five had left before completing their training.

A look at the center now shows the great amount of work the young men have performed to make the center a showplace for the many visitors who come there each week. An examination of Catoctin Mountain Park also shows the great amount of work the young men have performed to improve facilities for the public.

We have heard a lot of loose talk about the feelings of neighboring communities toward Job Corps centers. There is no question about the feelings of nearby Thurmont. Mayor Roy W. Lookingbill recently wrote to Sargent Shriver, stating in part:

> Sentiments here when the center was announced were very anti-Job Corps. Probably this was due to the fear of the unknown . . . After sixteen months' operation at Catoctin we can truly say that Job Corps has been an asset to our small community.

I feel that Catoctin is typical of Job Corps centers around the Nation, and what happened at Catoctin and Thurmont is happening at most of the other 105 centers.

Given the chance, Job Corps is doing the job which had been set for it. Job Corps is providing the basic education and work skill training needed by the thousands of unemployed school dropouts in the Nation. Not all of the young people who come into the program are taking advantage of the opportunity—but no one expected perfection. However, enough young men and women are benefiting from the program to make it very worthwhile.

Many Job Corps centers are graduating young men and women on a regular basis now that they have been operating a year or more. Job Corps is issuing figures of certified placements and these show that of nearly 10,800 graduates, nearly 4,300 young people have been placed; the actual number of placements is much higher with certification lagging substantially behind employment.

Sixty-four percent of those placed have found meaningful employment at an average wage of $1.68 an hour. Their performance on the job has been very good, according to word from the companies which are hiring them.

Twenty-five percent of them have been accepted by the Armed Forces. You must remember that before coming to Job Corps, more than 40 percent of those eligible for the service were unable to qualify.

The remaining 11 percent have gone back to school, with more than 30 of them going on to college. It is interesting to note that many of them, who had the ability and needed only the motivation, are going to college through the Upward Bound program, another OEO antipoverty program.

You might say that this result is not an outstanding success. But you must remember it is only the beginning. Most centers are now just completing their first year and beginning to have graduates.

In the coming months, the results will show clearly that the decision to invest in the future of young people was a sound one. Spending between $5,800 and $7,700 a year on each of these young people is an investment which they will repay as wage earners and taxpayers—and the investment will reduce greatly the money needed for welfare payments.

The Parks Job Corps Center near Pleasanton, Calif., has established an enviable record in its first 15 months of operation.

The center has graduated more than 800 young men of which it has verified placement reports on 635—464 have gone into employment, 142 into the Armed Forces, and 29 to continued and advanced education.

The young men are being given training for entry level jobs in electronics, food preparation and service, automotive repair, business machine operation and repair, landscaping and nursery work, building maintenance, and other occupations in which there is a present demand for workers, a demand which is expected to continue into the future.

The Parks center has done its job well in education and training. And they also have done well in finding avocational pursuits for the young men.

The young men of Parks have demonstrated surprisingly high ability in art work. They have set up a small farm for young men with an interest in this area, and residents of surrounding communities have donated animals to the farm. It may be the only farm in the country which boasts of regular domestic animals along with a llama.

Litton Industries, which operates the center, has shown the way in a number of innovations at Parks.

It has set up an accelerated night class program for young men who want to get their high school equivalency certificates and the response has been excellent.

It has concentrated heavily on counseling, with the result that the young men have been assisted in their personal and group problems.

The Parks center staff has created a graduate dormitory. This is for young men who are nearing the completion of their training. They are instructed in how to act when seeking employment, how to dress, how to fill out employment applications and the many things they need to know on entering the job market and becoming members of the community.

The Litton operations at Parks, under the able direction of Dr. Steve Uslan, is being reflected throughout the large company. A number of Litton affiliates are hiring young men and women who are completing training, not just at Parks but at other centers.

The company recently established a foundation, which has funded work-study scholarships for the young people

of Job Corps. Several weeks ago Litton announced the 29 winners of these scholarships, who will be going back to school with Litton paying the tuition, fees, and the cost of books and the young people having the opportunity to earn their living expenses.

It is heartening to see a Job Corps center operating so well as Parks; it is equally heartening to see a major business firm like Litton Industries taking such a major role in the war on poverty. The Camp Parks contribution to victory in the war on poverty is increasingly felt, and it is our clear duty to see that such progress continues.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the war on poverty is a controversial campaign. There are those who would end the fighting by emasculating the program. If they achieve their aim, they will be doing a tragic disservice to the poor of the Nation and to the Nation itself because poverty breeds contempt for our way of life.

I will be the first to admit that there have been mistakes made by our antipoverty forces. This is to be expected. We are attacking a complex problem as old as mankind and it is not to be simply and expeditiously dealt with.

I am hearing from some of the Arizonans who are directly involved in this war. Hear what they say:

The Community Action program brought our people out to where they can hold their heads up and look for a brighter future. Our people have started to climb with the helping hand of the CAP and if the bill should be defeated it would drop our people so far down it would take a miracle to bring them up again.

That is from the Gila River Indian community.

From City Councilman Cody C. Eden of Winslow, comes word of the child care center established as part of the migrant program. He says:

The work the center is doing with the two, three and four year old children is nearly unbelievable. One child, three years old, had never had solid food, only milk, until he came to the center. Other children could only speak the language spoken in their home until coming to the center.

Mayor Sal Portillo, of Miami, worries:

Some public comment tends to validate speculation that appropriations to bolster our country's forces engaged in the "second front," the war on poverty, may not be increased; but to the contrary. If it is true, we are not firmly committed to those within our American states who are unable to provide for minimum needs; who are the victims of an unbalanced economy to which all of us have contributed.

The St. Johns Chamber of Commerce wants everyone to know:

We are firmly convinced of the need for strong and coordinated community action programs to solve our human resource problems. While much has been done, we have just begun to see the results. Much more needs to be done.

William F. Hendrix, principal of one of Tucson's largest high schools, says:

The Neighborhood Youth Corp program was received at Amphitheater High School with a great deal of enthusiasm and anticipation of worthwhile results . . . We used the program to advantage, providing job experience for the students and income which has enabled many of them to stay in school.

These are samples of the kind of support the poverty war has in Arizona. My files are not without complaint, of course—too little money too late, some worthwhile proposals not approved, too much delay in processing applications, and so forth.

But though benefits and impact are sometimes difficult to measure, I feel progress has been made both in the cities and in the rural areas.

One of America's most economically depressed groups—the Indians—have been active in poverty programs. The State of Arizona has received more than $8.5 million in grants to reservations. Most of our 81,000 Arizona Indians are involved in community action programs—a wonderful record.

These Indian programs have been imaginative with long-range objectives. They include community development which has been successful in organizing many Indian communities in self-help projects. Thousands of Indian youngsters have been given the opportunity to learn through the Headstart program. Remedial and other special education programs have been launched for older Indian children.

The war on poverty is doing a real service to many Arizonans, Indian and non-Indian, and I strongly support its continuation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966".

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CLERK. Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966".

Findings and declaration of purpose

SEC. 2. It is the finding of Congress that, in spite of the impressive historical record of this Nation in offering unrivaled opportunities for advancement to our citizens, much remains to be done. Artificial barriers and indigenous backgrounds too often inhibit the full development of individual potential. It is not enough, however, simply to launch a program with compelling and persuasive objectives. A realistic program to help restore dignity and hope to those who are unable to sustain themselves in modern society is our urgent imperative. A program which merely raises expectations and administrative salaries without meaningful results fails to meet the dynamic requirements of our society. Those citizens who are to be served by government programs must have a significant role in helping themselves. Expenditures by government to do things to beneficiaries, rather than in partnership with beneficiaries, is a miscarriage of the true congressional purpose of dignifying human lives.

It is therefore the policy of the United States to provide these individuals at low levels of income and education with the power and hope necessary to raise themselves above the levels of poverty.

To accomplish this objective it is the intent of Congress that the needs of the very young be given first priority. Sensible and diverse programs emphasizing education, health, strengthening of the family and productive jobs must have maximum local and individual participation. Community action, involving the poor at policymaking levels with officials and citizens of talent and experience, is the indispensible ingredient of success. Permanent, productive jobs, with personal dignity and independence must be provided primarily by private enterprise. It is the role of government to stimulate, educate and provide incentives. All levels of government must participate in a meaningful way. It is the intent of Congress that this Act shall launch an opportunity crusade for the isolated Americans imprisoned by poverty.

TITLE I—JOB CORPS

Part A—General

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 101. The purpose of this title is to provide residential centers to assist young men and women who are unable to cope with their present family or community environments to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship, to increase their skills for employment, to enhance their ability to respond to programs of education, training, and work experience, and to prepare themselves for jobs in a free enterprise economy.

Job Corps

SEC. 102. In order to carry out the purposes of this title there is hereby established a Job Corps in the Department of Labor to be administered, in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary").

Composition of the Job Corps

SEC. 103. (a) The Job Corps shall be composed of young men and women who—

(1) have, at the time of enrollment, attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-two,

(2) are permanent residents of the United States or are natives and citizens of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as nonimmigrants or as parolees under section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

(3) meet such other standards of enrollment as may be prescribed by the Secretary, and

(4) have agreed to comply with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) No person may be an enrollee in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Secretary may determine in special cases.

Allowance and Maintenance

SEC. 104. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Secretary may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Secretary may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

(b) Upon termination of his or her enrollment in the Corps, each enrollee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed $50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That under such circumstances as the Secretary may determine a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not

exceeding $25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a member of his or her family and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Secretary. In the event of the enrollee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

Application of provisions of Federal law

SEC. 105. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, an enrollee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(b) Enrollees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

(c)(1) Enrollees under this part shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection:

(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction of supervision of the Corps.

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be $150, except that with respect to compensation for disability accruing after the individual concerned reaches the age of twenty-one, such monthly pay shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d)(1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756(d)(1)) shall apply to enrollees.

(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the enrollment of the injured enrollee is terminated.

(d) An enrollee shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

(e) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Secretary for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

Part B—Skill Centers

Establishment of Centers

SEC. 111. The Secretary shall provide for the establishment and operation of skill centers at which enrollees assigned thereto will be provided, wherever possible, under simulated or actual employment conditions, education, training, and other activities designed to develop the motivation, work discipline, and the skills necessary for the successful pursuit of a vocation after leaving the Jobs Corps.

Operation of Centers

SEC. 112. (a) To the extent possible, the Secretary shall establish and operate skill centers provided for in this part through contracts with private industry.

(b) Contracts entered into under this section shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to insure that the profits accruing thereunder are reasonable and subject to renegotiation in the event they are excessive for any reason, as determined under standards which shall be established by the Secretary.

Part C—Conservation centers

Establishment of Centers

SEC. 121. The Secretary shall provide for the establishment and operation of conservation centers in rural areas at which the Secretary shall provide, in coordination with other manpower development and training programs under his jurisdiction, for basic education, training, motivation, and work discipline of youths who (1) are so deficient in education, skills and work habits, that they are unable to qualify for acceptance in skill centers or other applicable manpower development and training programs, or (2) indicate a special interest in conservation or outdoor recreational activities as a continuing pursuit and are unable to qualiy for other programs because of educational deficiencies.

Operation of Centers

SEC. 122. The Secretary shall establish and operate conservation centers through agreements with Federal, State, and local agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas. Enrollees in conservation centers shall be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility, and including agreements for a botanical survey program involving surveys and maps of existing vegetation and investigations of the plants, soils, and environments of natural and disturbed plant communities.

Part D—Military career centers

Establishment of Centers

SEC. 131. The Secretary shall provide, through agreement with the Secretary of Defense, for the establishment and operation by the Secretary of Defense of military career centers at which enrollees assigned thereto will be provided education, training, and other activities to prepare them for military service. Such centers shall be so operated as to equip the enrollees for a successful military career.

Enrollment in Centers

SEC. 132. Enrollees in military career centers shall be persons who (1) have evidenced an interest in the possibility of qualifying for a military career or have expressed a special preference to become an enrollee in the military career center and (2) are not qualified for military service, but who show promise of becoming qualified for such service through preparation received in a military career center.

Operation of Centers

SEC. 133. The Secretary of Defense shall have full and complete authority to design, program, and administer the military career centers and shall have complete authority over enrollees in said center. The Secretary of Labor's sole responsibility in connection with the military career centers shall be the screening and referral of applicants.

Part E—Administration

Selection and Assignment of Enrollees

SEC. 141 (a) The Secretary shall provide for the selection of persons for service in the Job Corps. He shall select for enrollment only persons he believes are unlikely to be able to benefit from education or training in any other facility or program and require a change of family or community environment in order to respond adequately to such education or training.

(b) The Secretary shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

(c) Each applicant for the Job Corps shall undergo physical and mental examinations under standards prescribed by the Secretary. Inquiries shall be made of appropriate State bureaus of identification to determine any parole or probationary restrictions that may apply to individual applicants. Applicants shall be finger printed in accordance with procedures followed for military inductees, and inquiry shall be directed to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other appropriate agencies to determine criminal violations by said applicant, criminal charges pending against said applicant, or other similar information. Criminal violations by said applicant shall not disqualify the applicant from the Job Corps but special evaluation of the distinctive nature of said applicant's problems shall be made and provision made for suitable treatment and handling.

(d) The Secretary shall report to the Congress any time a Job Corps center established more than six months has more staff personnel than it has enrollees.

(e) Job Corps officials shall, wherever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life.

Community Advisory Groups

SEC. 142. The Secretary shall promote the formation of community advisory groups to develop community programs which will provide appropriate job opportunities or further training for graduates of Job Corps programs. Wherever possible, such advisory groups shall be formed by and coordinated under the local community action board.

Job Counseling and Placement

SEC. 143. The Secretary shall provide testing and counseling for each enrollee at appropriate intervals and at least three months prior to the enrollee's scheduled termination date. Data derived from such counseling and testing shall be sent to the agency of the Department of Labor situated in the area in which the enrollee proposes to reside, as well as to the community advisory group provided for under section 142, for that community. Upon the termination of an enrollee's service in the Job Corps, all records pertaining to such enrollee (including data derived from his counseling and testing) shall be made available immediately to the officials of the Department of Labor administering the program nationally. Such agency shall develop suitable job opportunities for the enrollee or, where appropriate, shall make arrangements for further education or training for enrollee.

Regulations; Standards of Conduct

SEC. 144. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to govern the conduct of enrollees in the Job Corps, subject to the limitations and special provisions in this title. The Secretary shall also establish standards of safety and health for enrollees, and furnish or arrange for the furnishing of health services.

(b) In the case of Job Corps enrollees charged with violation of State criminal statutes, the Job Corps shall provide the cost of attorney and other legal services only in circumstances where adequate provision for such representation of indigent defendants is not provided under applicable State law.

(c) Any enrollee in the Job Corps who is convicted of a felony committed during his

enrollment shall be immediately dismissed from the Job Corps.

(d) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations should be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

(e) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps centers, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority as provided under regulation set by the Secretary.

Relationships with States

SEC. 145. (a) No center shall be established under this title within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this title. The Secretary may, pursuant to such regulations as he may adopt, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.

Use of Local Public and Private Education and Training Agencies

SEC. 146. Wherever practicable education and vocational training for enrollees in the Job Corps shall be provided through local public or private educational agencies or by vocational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training unless such education or training can be provided within the Job Corps more effectively or with reduced Federal expenditures.

Discrimination Prohibited

SEC. 147. In the selection of enrollees or staff in the Job Corps, and in the administration of the Job Corps program, no discrimination shall be permitted on the basis of a person's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Oath of Allegiance

SEC. 148. Each enrollee (other than an enrollee who is a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 103(a)(2) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required by this section.

Limitation on Administrative Costs

SEC. 149. The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the cost of operating Job Corps centers (exclusive of capital costs including costs of construction and renovation) shall not exceed $5,000 per enrollee in such centers.

Authorizations of Appropriations

SEC. 150. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE II—NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Part A—General provisions

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title (1) to enable needy young men and women to continue their education at the secondary school level through in-school programs, carried on by public and other nonprofit agencies, which contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or contribute to the conservation and development of natural resources and recreational areas, and (2) to provide programs of out-of-school on-the-job training for needy, unemployed young men and women to enable them to return to school or assist them to become self-sustaining while obtaining the training necessary for a successful career in a vocation.

Establishment of Neighborhood Youth Corps

SEC. 202. In order to carry out the purpose of this title there is hereby established a Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Department of Labor, to be administered in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "Secretary").

Development of Programs

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall encourage and assist qualified community action boards (as defined in section 328) in the development, through contracts, of in-school programs and out-of-school programs which will qualify for assistance under this title. In the absence of a qualified local community action board, the Secretary shall, where appropriate, develop such programs through direct contracts with qualified applicants.

Selection of Enrollees

SEC. 204. (a) Selection for enrollment in programs assisted under this title shall be made by qualified community action boards or other qualified applicants, in accordance with agreements with the Secretary.

(b) No person may participate as an enrollee in programs under this title unless—

(1) he has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two;

(2) his income and his family's income does not exceed the standard of poverty established by the Secretary that takes due account of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining;

(3) in the case of in-school programs he is in need of remunerative employment to resume or continue his education;

(4) in the case of out-of-school programs, he is unemployed and in need of interim remunerative employment;

(5) in the case of out-of-school programs, he has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling; and have concluded that further school attendance by him in any regular academic or vocational program is no longer practicable under the circumstances.

(c) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(d) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private nonprofit organizations.

Payments

SEC. 205. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out purposes of this title shall be used within any one State.

Oath of Allegiance

SEC. 206. The provisions of section 149 shall apply with respect to enrollees in programs assisted under this title and to all officers and employees any part of whose salaries are paid from sums made available under this title.

Part B—In-school programs

SEC. 211. (a) Any qualified community action board, or in any community in which there is no such board, any public or private nonprofit agency which the Director determines to be qualified, desiring assistance for an in-school program shall submit an application to the Secretary which shall contain such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) The Secretary shall approve an application under this section only if he finds that—

(1) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either a qualified community action board or the Secretary and a public agency or a private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(2) The program will enable student enrollees to resume or to maintain school attendance;

(3) The program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;

(4) The program will not result in the displacement of employed workers, jeopardize the potential employment of workers not aided under this title, or impair existing contracts for services;

(5) The rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical area, and proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

(6) The program will be coordinated to the maximum extent feasible, with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of enrollees in such program and sponsored by State or local public educational agencies: *Provided, however*, That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, im-

provement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or, where appropriate, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(7) The employer shall pay at least 10 per centum of the enrollee's wage during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and shall pay at least 25 per centum of his wage during each succeeding fiscal year.

(c) In approving applications under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to applications for projects with high training potential.

Part C—Out-of-school programs

Applications

SEC. 221. Any qualified community action board, or in any community in which there is no such board, any public or private nonprofit agency which the Director determines to be qualified, desiring assistance for an out-of-school training program shall submit an application to the Secretary which shall contain such information as the Secretary may require.

Industry Youth Corps

SEC. 222. (a) There is hereby established under the Neighborhood Youth Corps a program to provide employment of youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-two in private, profitmaking enterprises. The Secretary is empowered to make such regulations as he shall deem necessary to insure that private employment of such youths shall be under such conditions and terms as to meet all requirements of public and private nonprofit programs, and to insure that participating youths benefit from their employment without exploitation or unreasonable profits by the employer.

(b) Programs to provide employment for youths under this section shall only be approved if they are implemented through contracts between a qualified community action board and employers under conditions of supervision and regulation by such said qualified community action board.

Approval of Applications

SEC. 223. The Secretary shall approve an application under this part only if he finds that—

(a) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either a qualified community action board or the Secretary and a public agency or a private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) either—

(1) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or

(2) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or

(3) on local projects provided under section 222 of this part by contract between the qualified community action board and the employer.

(b) Enrollees in the program will be employed under a contract or agreement between either the qualified community action board or the Secretary and an employer under which the enrollees will be provided on-the-job training that meets the following requirements:

(1) The training content of the program is adequate, involves reasonable progression, and holds promise that it will result in the qualification of trainees for suitable employment.

(2) The training period is reasonable and consistent with periods customarily required for comparable training.

(3) Adequate and safe facilities and adequate personnel and records of attendance and progress will be provided.

(4) The enrolleee will be compensated at such rates, including periodic increases, as may be deemed reasonable under regulations of the Secretary, considering such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services.

(5) No enrollee will be permitted to participate in the program for more than a year, except that an enrollee may be permitted to participate for one additional year if it is ascertained that (A) he will benefit from an additional year under the program, (B) his employer is making adequate provision for his possible long-term employment, (C) he is unable to qualify for suitable employment without part of his wages being paid from sources other than his employer or for other training suitable to his needs, and (D) consideration has been given to the feasibility of the employer paying a larger portion of his wages in view of his experience and training.

(6) Adequate provision is made for supplementary classroom instruction where appropriate.

(7) The training will increase the employability of the enrollee in occupational skills or pursuits in which the Secretary finds there is a reasonable expectation of his permanent employment.

(8) The employment of the enrollee must not displace employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

(9) In the event the employer is a private, profitmaking concern, the employer shall pay at least 66⅔ per centum of the enrollee's wage.

(10) In the event the employer is a public or nonprofit agency, the employer shall pay at least 10 per centum of the enrollee's wage during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and at least 25 per centum of his wages during each succeeding fiscal year.

Part D.—Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 231. The Secretary shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purposes of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $225,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, of which $50,000,000 shall be reserved to administer and conduct the program provided under section 222, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE III—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Part A—Urban community action programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 301. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for new and imaginative programs for urban communities to mobilize and coordinate their resources to combat poverty through total involvement of individuals and groups concerned and meaningful communication, planning, and implementation at the local community level.

Qualified Urban Community Action Boards

SEC. 302. A community action board shall be qualified to conduct, administer, or coordinate programs under this Act, or any other provision of law, only if—

(a) the membership of the board contains representatives of local government, social welfare and public service agencies, local school systems, the general public, and representatives of the poor comprising at least one-third of the membership of the board;

(b) the representatives of the poor are selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor; and

(c) in communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision is made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

Approval of Community Action Programs

SEC. 303. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Director may approve a community action program for support under this part if he determines such program—

(1) includes component programs all of which are focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and which provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith;

(2) has, if policy is determined by smaller constituent groups of the community action board, such as an executive committee, true representation of the poor proportionate to that attained on the community action board itself;

(3) provides that any component board which exercises jurisdiction only in a single impoverished area or neighborhood of the community, is representative primarily of and selected by the residents of such area, and is given power to initiate and disapprove programs for that area;

(4) includes provisions for reasonable access of the public to information including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the board engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with regulations of the Director;

(5) is organized and designed to coordinate, to the extent feasible, all programs at the community level primarily affecting the poor, and to eliminate duplication, conflict, and waste in such programs as well as to assist in altering or eliminating ineffectual programs;

(6) includes arrangements with a reputable private, and independent auditing firm to preaudit all grants and programs under this title to insure that adequate records are kept and fiscal controls enforced; and

(7) includes provision for a complete audit of the books six months after the initiation of a program and annually thereafter.

(b) The Director shall not approve a community action program to be carried out without the approval of a qualified community action board already serving an area unless he determines that—

(1) the proposed program is of a demonstration or experimental nature and does not conflict with any component program being carried on by the community action board,

(2) the program is of such a nature as to be unsuitable for inclusion in the overall community action program, or

(3) the program is required to meet an urgent and temporary emergency need of the poor.

(c) The Director may approve a community action program to be carried out by a public or private nonprofit agency which is not a qualified community action board in any area which is not served by a qualified community action board (or, if served by such a board, the program meets the requirements of subsection (b)) and the proposed program would qualify as a component of a community action program.

Definition

SEC. 304. For the purposes of this part, the term "urban community" means an area determined by the Director, on the basis of the latest information available from the Bureau of the Census, to have a population

of more than seventy-five thousand, except where the Director, under authority of section 314, designates an area having a population of more than seventy-five thousand and less than one hundred and fifty thousand as a rural area.

Part B—Rural community action programs

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for new and imaginative separate programs to meet the unique and distinctive problems of the rural areas in mobilizing and coordinating their resources to combat poverty through total involvement of individuals and groups concerned and meaningful communication, planning, and implementation at the community level.

Qualified Rural Community Action Boards

SEC. 312. A community action board shall be qualified to conduct, administer, or coordinate programs under this Act, or any other provision of law, only if—

(a) the membership of the board contains representatives of local government, social welfare and public service agencies, local school systems, the general public, cooperative extension service, technical action panels under rural community development, and representatives of the poor comprising at least one-third of the membership of the board;

(b) the representatives of the poor are selected by a process such as neighborhood meetings in areas of concentration of poverty in which the poor participate to the greatest degree possible in light of the special problem of separation, isolation, and communication which prevail in rural areas.

Approval of Community Action Programs

SEC. 313. Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the Director may approve a community action program for support under this part if he determines such program—

(a) meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (4), (5), (6), and (7) of section 303(a), and 303(b).

(b) provides that any community action board operating within established county or municipal borders under a qualified overall board with broader geographical jurisdiction shall meet the requirements of section 312 and is given power to initiate and disapprove programs for that area.

Definition

SEC. 314. For purposes of this part, the term "rural areas" means any area determined by the Director, on the basis of the latest information available from the Bureau of the Census, to have a population of seventy-five thousand or less, except that in exceptional circumstances he may designate as a rural area any area having a population of less than one hundred and fifty thousand.

Part C—Administration

Allotments to States

SEC. 321. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for carrying out sections 322 and 323. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. Twenty per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted among the States as the Director shall determine. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of public assistance recipients in such State bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States;

(2) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the annual average number of persons unemployed in such State bears to the annual average number of persons unemployed in all the States; and

(3) the remaining one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under eighteen year of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with incomes of less than $1,000 in all the States.

(c) The Director shall divide each State's allotment under subsection (b) into two parts, one of which may be used only for urban community action programs, and one of which may be used only for rural community action programs. Each such part shall bear the same ratio to the amount allotted as the urban population or rural population, as the case may be, of the State bears to the population of the State, as determined on the basis of the best data available from the Bureau of the Census.

(d) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this title; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced: *Provided*, That any amount originally included in that part of the State's allotment reserved for use for urban community action programs may be used only for such programs when reallotted, and any amount originally included in that part of the State's allotment originally reserved for rural community action programs may be used only for such programs when reallotted. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(e) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Financial Assistance for Development of Community Action Programs

SEC. 322. The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs.

Fnancial Assistance for Conduct and Administration of Community Action Programs

SEC. 323. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with qualified community action boards to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this title, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this title except that where the Director approves a program under section 303(c) he may make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies to pay part or all of such programs.

(b) No grant or contract authorized under this title may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system, or provide for any preschool or early-school program, whether or not designed to prepare educationally deprived children.

(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; the extent of persistent unemployment and under employment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidences of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

Technical Assistance

SEC. 324. The Director is authorized to provide, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance thereunder through grants to, or contracts with qualified community action boards, or, in communities not served by such a board, through grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit agencies.

Research, Training, and Demonstrations

SEC. 325. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations pertaining to the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That no such program shall conflict in any way, in any area, with any existing community action program. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed $30,000,000.

Limitations on Federal Assistance

SEC. 326. (a) Assistance pursuant to sections 322 and 323 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, and for each fiscal year thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

(b) The expenditures or contributions made from non-Federal sources for a community action program or component thereof shall be in addition to the aggregate expenditures or contributions from non-Federal sources which were being made for similar purposes prior to the extension of Federal assistance. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for

determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

Participation of State Agencies

SEC. 327. (a) The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of such programs.

(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title.

Qualified Community Action Boards

SEC. 328. The Director shall certify the name, and area served, by each board which is a community action board as defined in section 302 and which he finds to be competent to carry out the functions assigned qualified community action boards by any provision of this Act.

Part D—Volunteers in Service to America

SEC. 331. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train and—

(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combatting poverty at a State or local level; and

(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers shall be on such terms and conditions as the Director may determine, but volunteers shall not be referred or assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

(c) The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training and to volunteers assigned pursuant to subsection (a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed $50 per month, such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

(d)(1) Each volunteer shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 149 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

(2) All volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 105 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 105(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under the Classification Act of 1949.

Part E—Voluntary assistance program for needy children

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 341. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

Authority To Establish Information Center

SEC. 342. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children.

(b) The Director shall appoint an administrator whose full-time duty shall be to give effect to this program.

(c) It is the intent of the Congress that the section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children.

Part F—Office of Economic Opportunity

Establishment of Office

SEC. 351. (a) The Office of Economic Opportunity established by section 601 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby continued as an agency of the United States. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and two Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director and the Assistant Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) The compensation of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(c) The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

Authority of Director

SEC. 362. In addition to the authority conferred upon him by other sections of this Act, the Director is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this title to—

(a) appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions and, except as otherwise provided herein, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), except that, of the personnel so appointed, not more than one in every one hundred and fifty shall be in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949;

(b) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however*, That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(c) appoint, with regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act; and members of such committees, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Director, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in subsection (b) with respect to experts and consultants;

(d) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this title and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this title and authorize the redelegation thereof;

(e) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(f) accept in the name of the Office, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this title, any money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(g) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Status (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(h) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 4154 of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

(i) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(j) collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(k) expend, without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation, funds made available for purposes of this title (1) for printing and binding and (2) for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by

him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this clause (A) except when necessary in order to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this title, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and (B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) or the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of such Committee) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and

(1) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such functions and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

Information Center

SEC. 363. In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this title are utilized to the maximum extent possible, and to insure that information concerning such programs and other relevant information is readily available in one place to public officials and other interested persons, the Director is authorized as he deems appropriate to collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute such information, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset to such cost), and make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation.

Part G—State bonus community action program

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 371. It is the purpose of this part to provide assistance to the States to enable them to join as partners with the Federal Government in programs carried out under this title.

Allotments to States

SEC. 372. (a) From the sums available to carry out this part for a fiscal year, the Director shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount being allotted as the amount allotted such State under section 321 (other than subsection (d) thereof) bears to the amount allotted all the States under such section for such fiscal year.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced.

State Plans

SEC. 373. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Director a State plan which—

(1) provides for the creation of a State office of economic opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") which shall be the sole State agency responsible for carrying out the State plan;

(2) provides that in formulating its program to be carried out under this part, priority shall be given programs to meet the special needs of the State;

(3) provides for carrying out, or supplementing the financing of, community action programs which are eligible for assistance under other parts of this title, but are not being, or are being inadequately, assisted thereunder;

(4) provides for the establishment of a commission in the State to make a study to determine means by which programs carried on under this title may be effectively coordinated with other local, State, and Federal programs, and to report its recommendations to the State agency within one year;

(5) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Director to perform his duties under this part and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Director finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(6) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this part;

(7) provides for the establishment of a program to insure that salaries of professional staff personnel shall be reasonable with due consideration of salary incomes of said individuals in previous employment.

(b) The Director may approve any State plan which meets the requirements of subsection (a), but he shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Payments

SEC. 374. (a) The Director shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this part, from its allotment under section 372, an amount equal to the expenditures of the State in carrying out such plan. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Director; and may be made in such installments as the Director may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments.

(b) The Federal share for each State shall be 50 per centum, except that with respect to expenditures on account of the State commission provided for in section 373(a)(4), the Federal share shall be 90 per centum.

Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

SEC. 375. (a) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering a State plan approved under this part, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 373, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Director shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Director under section 373 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Director, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Director thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Director or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Director may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Director as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Director to take further evidence, and the Director may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Director shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Director's action.

Part E—Authorizations of appropriations

SEC. 381. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title (other than parts D and G thereof) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967. For the purpose of carrying out part D of this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for such fiscal year; and for the purpose of carrying out part G of this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for such fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as to the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE IV—PRESCHOOL, EARLY SCHOOL AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Amendment to Title II of Public Law 874

SEC. 401. Title II of the Act of September 30, 1950, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Special Bonus Grants; Preference for Pre-School and Early School Programs

"SEC. 213. (a) The Commissioner shall, in carrying out his duties under this title, require that preference over grants for all other programs shall be given to grants for carrying out preschool and early-school programs designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to undertake successfully the regular elementary school program.

"(b) Each local educational agency shall be eligible to receive a special bonus grant under this section in any fiscal year if (1) it received a basic grant for the preceding fiscal year, and (2) more than 65 per centum of

the funds expended in carrying out the programs provided for in the application submitted under section 205 were expended for carrying out preschool and early-school programs designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to successfully undertake the regular elementary school program.

"(b) The amount of a grant under this section shall be equal to the amount by which the expenditures for such preschool and early-school programs exceeded 65 per centum of the amount expended in carrying out the programs provided for in such application.

"(c) If the sums appropriated or made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year are not sufficient to pay in full the total amount which all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such fiscal year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably: *Provided*, That in no event shall the aggregate grants under this section for a fiscal year exceed $100,000,000."

TITLE V—ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Statement of purpose

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to assist the States to develop programs of functional instruction in the English language and mathematics for individuals who have reached the age of eighteen, but whose deficiencies in these subjects are such that they are prevented from obtaining permanent employment, commensurate with their real ability, or entrance into other education or training programs; and to promote new approaches to the special needs of those who have poor employment possibilities because of such factors as inadequate education, lack of motivation, poor attitude or appearance, and other significant disabilities related to their derivation in poverty; and to, wherever appropriate, provide a new type of specialized, functionally oriented basic education through the use of nonprofessional, noncertified personnel teaching limited curriculums as prescribed by the State.

Establishment of Adult Basic Education Program

SEC. 502. In order to carry out the purpose of this title there is hereby established an Adult Basic Education Program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be carried out in coordination with other programs under the direction of the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commissioner").

Grants to States

SEC. 503. (a) From the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this title, the Commissioner shall make grants to States which have State plans approved by him under this section.

(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, to—

(1) make grants to qualified community action boards, or where a community is not served by such a board, to a local educational agency, to assist in establishment of pilot projects by local educational agencies, and private school agencies, relating to instruction in public schools, or other facilities used for the purpose by such agencies, of individuals described in section 501, to (A) demonstrate, test, or develop modifications, or adaptations in light of local needs, of special materials or methods for instruction of such individuals, (B) stimulate the development of local educational agency programs, and private school agency programs, for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities, and (C) acquire additional information concerning the materials or methods needed for an effective program for raising adult basic educational skills;

(2) assist in meeting the cost of local educational agency programs, and private school agency programs, for instruction of such individuals in such schools or other facilities; and

(3) assist in development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to adult basic education programs.

State Plans

SEC. 504. (a) The Commissioner shall approve for purposes of this title the plan of a State which—

(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title (including such funds paid by the State to qualified community action boards, private, nonprofit agencies, and local educational agencies);

(4) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority looking toward provision of such health information and services for individuals described in section 501 as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under programs conducted pursuant to grants under this title; and

(5) sets forth a program for use, in accordance with section 503(b), of grants under this title which affords assurance of substantial progress, within a reasonable period and with respect to all segments of the population and all areas of the State, toward elimination of the inability of adults to read and write English and conduct elementary arithmetic computations, and toward substantially raising the level of education of individuals described in section 501; and

(6) provides for maximum utilization of nonprofessional, noncertified teachers of limited curriculums, as prescribed by the State, of a functional, as distinguished from academic, nature.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Allotments

SEC. 505. (a) From the sums allocated for grants to States under section 503 for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine, and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. The remainder of the sums so allocated for a fiscal year shall be allotted by the Commissioner on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have attained age eighteen and who have completed not more than five grades of school or have not achieved an equivalent level of education, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out its State plan approved under this title; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

Payments

SEC. 506. (a) From a State's allotment available for the purpose, the Federal share of expenditures, under its State plan, for the purpose set forth in section 503(b) shall be paid to such State. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner; and may be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously made overpayments or underpayments; except that no such payments shall be made for any fiscal year unless the Commissioner finds that the amount available for expenditures for adult basic educational programs and services from State sources for such year will be not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such sources during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 504(a) and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make grants to a community action board or a private nonprofit agency as provided for in section 503(b), the Commissioner shall arrange for making grants to such board or agency on an equitable basis from the State's allotment under section 505.

(c) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum, and for each succeeding fiscal year shall be 80 per centum.

Operation of State Plans; Hearings and Judicial Review

SEC. 507. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any

failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this part (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under section 504 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement or proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Teacher Training Projects

SEC. 508. The Commissioner shall allocate funds from graduate and teacher training programs assisted by the Federal Government under the National Defense Education Act and other applicable provisions of law to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 501, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Commissioner may be or pursuant to regulation determine.

Small Neighborhood Programs

SEC. 509. In carrying out this title, special consideration shall be given to the support of small neighborhood programs adapted to the customs and practices of the residents that normally produce resistance to participation in more formal programs of adult basic education.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 510. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if different, the agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult basic education in public schools whichever may be designated by the Governor or by State law, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the Governor or by State law;

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, except that if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult basic education in public schools therein, it means such other board or authority;

(3) The term "private school agency" means an association or corporation operating or conducting programs of adult basic education, no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully incur to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 511. The Commission shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VI—RURAL LOANS AND MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 601. It is the purpose of this title to provide a separate program of specialized assistance to residents of rural areas relying substantially on agricultural pursuits for income, who show promise of maintaining their livelihood in agriculture, or, with the liberalized benefits provided herein, show promise of ability to supplement their income or maintain or support themselves in nonagricultural enterprises.

Part A

SEC. 602. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, acting through the Farmers' Home Administration, to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not exceeding $3,500 outstanding at any one time to any low-income rural family where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to—

(1) acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon,

(2) operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized, including but not limited to the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and equipment, or

(3) participate in cooperative associations; and/or to finance nonagricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

(b) Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

(c) In carrying out this part in areas served by qualified community action boards, the Secretary shall utilize the services of such boards in developing programs under this part.

Cooperative Associations

SEC. 603. The Secretary is authorized to make loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

Limitations of Assistance

SEC. 604. No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Secretary determines that—

(a) the providing of such assistance will materially further the purposes of this part, and

(b) in the case of assistance provided pursuant to section 603, the applicant is fulfilling or will fulfill a need for services, facilities, or activities which is not otherwise being met.

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 605. Loans pursuant to sections 602 and 603 shall have such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) There is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) The credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs:

(c) The amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) The loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Treasury may determine to be consistent with its purposes;

(e) With respect to loans made pursuant to section 603, the loan is repayable within not more than thirty years; and

(f) No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part to, or in connection with, any corporation or cooperative organization for the production of agricultural commodities or for manufacturing purposes: *Provided,* That packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance.

Part B

Assistance for Migrant, and Other Seasonally Employed, Agricultural Employees and Their Families

SEC. 611. (a) The Secretary is authorized to develop and implement programs of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which aid migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families, by bettering or helping them to better their present living conditions and providing programs which develop individual skills for permanent employment as well as developing permanent employment possibilities.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants under this part to States to encourage them to develop a program, coordinated through regional arrangements or State compacts, to provide minimum standards of housing, sanitation, education, transportation, and other environmental conditions.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make grants under this part for special programs (1) that will operate on mobile basis, following a migrant community through its entire seasonal flow, or (2) that provide return transportation and other appropriate assistance for migrants employed in seasonal operations who remain in an area after termination of their seasonal employment with the expectations of permanent employment, but are thereafter terminated from such employment.

(d) From the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part, the Secretary may reserve up to $1,000,000 to be used to conduct a study of methods of decasualizing the labor market, including, but not limited to, studies of the migrant labor streams and alternate occupations for migrants which will effect considerable reductives in the distance traveled by the worker, of training programs to adapt the worker to mechanized agricultural processes, and of training programs to

prepare workers for complete removal from the migrant stream.

Part C

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 621. The Secretary shall carry out the program provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VII—SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS LOANS AND INCENTIVES

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to supplement the Human Investment Act of 1966 by assisting in the establishment, continuation, expansion, and strengthening of small business concerns owned by individuals who qualify under poverty standards set by the Director, and to assist in the establishment, or expansion of small business concerns which, by the nature of their business, hold substantial and continuing promise of employing substantial numbers of individuals with inadequate backgrounds of educational experience or skills.

Loans, Participations, and Guaranties

SEC. 702. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years, to any small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and regulations issued thereunder), or to any qualified person seeking to establish such a concern, when he determines that such loans will assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, with particular emphasis on employment of the long-term unemployed: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made, participated in, or guaranteed if the total of such Federal assistance to a single borrower outstanding at any one time would exceed $25,000. The Administrator may defer payments on the principal of such loans for a grace period and use such other methods as he deems necessary and appropriate to assure the successful establishment and operation of such concern. The Administrator shall encourage, as far as possible, the participation of the private business community in the program of assistance to such concerns.

Coordination With Community Action Programs

SEC. 703. No financial assistance shall be provided under section 702 in any community for which the Director has approved a community action program pursuant to title III of this Act unless such financial assistance is determined by him to be consistent with such program.

Loan Terms and Conditions

SEC. 704. Loans made pursuant to section 702 (including immediate participation in and guaranties of such loans) shall have such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) There is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) The financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) The amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) The loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Administrator may determine to be consistent with its purposes: *Provided, however,* That the rate of interest charged on loans made in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) shall not exceed the rate currently applicable to new loans made under section 6 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2505); and

(e) Fees not in excess of amounts necessary to cover administrative expenses and probable losses may be required on loan guarantees.

Limitation on Financial Assistance

SEC. 705. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another or in financing subcontractors to enable them to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 706. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE VIII—WORK EXPERIENCE

Statement of Purpose

SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to train and equip individuals inured to the perpetual cycle of public assistance and welfare to become self-supporting and capable of sustaining their families. In carrying out this purpose the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall have exclusive Federal authority and shall utilize and coordinate the facilities and programs available at State and local levels, including to the extent possible, those in the private and voluntary sector. The Secretary shall give special emphasis to equipping individuals with the motivation, discipline, and training necessary to hold permanent jobs in private, profitmaking enterprises.

SEC. 802. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall determine eligibility for programs under this title with due consideration to meeting the following criteria:

(a) Training offered to participants shall be constructive from the standpoint of upgrading the employability of individuals;

(b) Eligibility for public assistance of individuals and families shall continue without diminution during periods of participation;

(c) Participants may engage in gainful employment without pay from their employers for limited periods up to a maximum of two years: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall determine that they are not being exploited as a source of free labor;

(d) Participants employed under this title shall not displace or adversely affect regular employees (including substitute workers) or additional workers who would otherwise be hired by employers participating in the program;

(e) Employment by private, profitmaking enterprises, or public or private nonprofit agencies, shall be approved by the Secretary only if the Secretary determines that there is a reasonable chance that the employer will hire the individual participant upon successful completion of the agreed upon training;

(f) All participants in the program shall be provided basic education as an integral part of their training if they have need for such education;

(g) To the extent possible, the Secretary shall utilize all existing Federal, State, local, and private programs to provide training and education to participants;

(h) In the event there is no existing program of education or training available to participants, the Secretary is authorized to make grants or contracts to provide such programs of assistance;

(i) In determining eligibility under this title, special emphasis shall be given to individuals with less than eight years of formal schooling who lack the background for effective performance as employees and citizens.

Payments for Experimental, Pilot, and Demonstration Projects

SEC. 803. In order to stimulate the adoption of programs designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to secure and retain employment or to attain or retain capability for self-support or personal independence, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to use funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this title to make payments for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315), subject to the limitations contained in section 409(a) (1)–(6), inclusive, of such Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a) (1)–(6)), in addition to the sums otherwise available pursuant there. Workers in farm families with less than $1,200 net family income shall be considered unemployed for the purposes of this title. The costs of such projects to the United States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purposes of this title.

Authorization of Applications

SEC. 804. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the two succeeding fiscal years. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

TITLE IX—AUTOMATING THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

SEC. 901. Section 103 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415), as amended is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary of Labor is directed, using every appropriate facility, to develop, compile, and make available 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. In the administration of this Act, the Secretary shall give the highest priority to performing the duties prescribed by subsections (a) and (b) of this section with particular emphasis on identifying and publishing those occupations, skills, industries and geographic areas in which the supply of qualified workers is insufficient to meet existing and foreseeable future needs. The sum of $50,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor is further directed to develop and establish in the United States Employment Service a program for matching the qualifications of job applicants with employer requirements on a local, interarea, and nationwide basis. Such program shall be designed to provide a quick

and direct means of communication among local offices of the Service in the interarea and nationwide referral, recruiting, and placement of unemployed and underemployed workers, and the referral of workers to industries which need them wherever located throughout the Nation. In the development of such program, the Service shall establish a network utilizing electronic data processing and telecommunication systems for the storage, retrieval, and communication of job and worker information. The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection."

SEC. 902. Section 104 of said Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. The Secretary of Labor shall make such reports and recommendations to the President as are 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 1967) a report pertaining to manpower requirements, resources, utilization, and training. Such reports shall contain a specific and detailed account of the administration, utilization, and operation of the functions and activities prescribed by section 103 of this Act."

TITLE X—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Repealers; Effective Dates

SEC. 1001. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby repealed, effective June 30, 1966.

(b) This Act shall become effective June 30, 1966.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), during the period between June 30, 1966, and January 1, 1967, the authority granted under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 may continue to be utilized to the extent necessary to permit the orderly transformation of programs being carried on under that Act into programs to be carried on under this Act. The authority to carry on a program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 until January 1, 1967, shall be exercised by the officer charged with carrying out a similar program under this Act.

Economic Opportunity Council

SEC. 1002. (a) There is hereby established an Economic Opportunity Council, which shall meet at least quarterly to consult and devise methods to insure that antipoverty efforts conducted by all segments of the Federal Government are coordinated.

(b) The Council shall include the Director, who shall be Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of Selective Service, and each other agency who has primary responsibility for a program being carried out under this Act.

Labor Standards

SEC. 1003. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings and works which are federally assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

Reports

SEC. 1004. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, each officer charged with carrying out a program under this Act shall prepare and submit to the President for transmission to the Congress a full and complete report on the program he carries out for such fiscal year.

Definitions

SEC. 1005. As used in this Act:

(a) The term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title III such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and the term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the foregoing and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) The term "agency", unless the context requires otherwise, means department, agency, or other component of a Federal, State, or local governmental entity.

(c) The term "family", in the case of a Job Corps enrollee, means—

(1) the spouse or child of an enrollee, and

(2) any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee.

Preference to Community Action Programs

SEC. 1006. To the extent feasible and consistent with the provisions of law governing any Federal program and with the purposes of this Act, the head of each Federal agency administering any Federal program is directed to give preference for any application for assistance or benefits which is made pursuant to or in connection with a community action program approved pursuant to title III of this Act.

Political Discrimination; Political Activity

SEC. 1007. (a) No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or belief of any person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act because of his political affiliations or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

(b) No person whose compensation is paid, in whole or in part, from sums appropriated to carry out this Act shall take an active part in political management or in political campaigns, and no such officer or employee shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. This section shall not apply to officers or employees of the United States.

(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated subsection (b), it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the person concern, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective action.

Limitation of Staff Salaries

SEC. 1008. No person whose compensation exceeds $6,000 per annum and is paid, in whole or in part from sums appropriated to carry out this Act shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 per centum the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the head of the agency who is charged by this Act with the administration of the program in which he is employed may grant exceptions for specific cases.

Prohibition of Federal Control

SEC. 1009. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorized any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

TITLE XI—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

Public Assistance

SEC. 1101. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

(1) the first $85 plus one-half of the excess over $85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under title I, II, or III of this Act or any program assisted under such title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan;

(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under such title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual; and

(3) no grant made to any family under title VI of this Act shall be regarded as income or resources of such family in determining the need of any member thereof under such approved State plan.

Mr. QUIE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, 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. 15111) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks in the general debate on the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, which has just been concluded, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to reiterate what I said to the gentleman last night. I hope under the circumstances, since we came in early today and will come in early tomorrow, there will be no indication or effort on the part of the committee to foreclose debate at any given time.

Mr. GIBBONS. I reiterate my answer of yesterday today. I would hope we could move expeditiously through the debate without any curtailment of debate.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have observed that in spite of all our efforts to get to the large number of amendments, there have been nine quorum calls in the past 3 days. I hope that the gentleman on the other side will recognize where they have come from and keep that in mind when they hold us down on time. We have tried very hard. I hope they are not suggesting we have been trying to delay this.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that this afternoon I took the time to count the membership on the floor of the House. Although we do not make a quorum call on a percentage basis, the gentleman might be informed that the attendance was as poor on that side as it was over here.

I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would say to the gentleman that a quorum call can only be made when there are fewer than 100 Members on the floor.

We are considering major legislation which involves many people in this country who are supposedly to benefit, as well as the taxpayers. I believe the least that can be asked is that there be 100 Members of Congress here to listen to the debate.

Many of us have done a lot of work on this program, and spent a lot of our time and of our own money investigating, trying to improve it.

I might say that the only quorum call which was called by a member of the committee on this side was called by me, when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] went into the well. The gentleman has done a great deal of work on this, and there was a scattering of Members present. The Members of Congress, we feel, should hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

CONDITIONS IN ORTHOPEDIC WARD, U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY or Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep feeling of regret, but also with a strong sense of obligation to brave young Americans who are fighting for the cause of freedom in Vietnam, that I address myself to my colleagues in the House of Representatives today.

I regret having to make this report because I deeply regret that the conditions which prompt my report are so alarming that I must bring them to your attention immediately. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the hopelessly inadequate staff of the orthopedic ward at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Philadelphia where seriously wounded Americans, veterans of Vietnam, are awaiting care.

I visited the orthopedic ward at the Naval Hospital in Philadelphia yesterday. I found that in this ward, where many of the most seriously injured of our Vietnam casualties are receiving care, there is a desperate need for additional nurses, medical corpsmen and, especially, orthopedic surgeons.

Today, the patient load in the orthopedic ward is 253. At this time last year there were only 130 patients in this ward. Because the medical corpsmen and nurses are constantly being rotated, many of them are unable to become thoroughly familiar with the routine in this ward. This renders them unable to give these patients the care they need, and unable to lend the assistance the staff of surgeons needs.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited with Cpl. Thomas Jordan, a former Bethlehem, Pa., high school and Michigan State University football star, who was severely wounded in Vietnam. I made this visit at the request of his distraught parents, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Jordan, of Bethlehem.

While at the hospital I learned that Cpl. Myron Romanyshyn, of Allentown, Pa., also was a patient there. So I extended my stay to visit with him as well.

Corporal Jordan has been a patient at the naval hospital for 6 months. At one time, 7 days passed before the dressing on his wound was changed.

Corporal Jordan faces the possible amputation of his left foot. But Mr. Speaker, before that young man must accept such a loss, I want to be absolutely certain that everything humanly possible has been done to save his foot. I do not believe there is anyone among us who would settle for less.

That means that there must be an adequate staff which can provide the care and close attention his wounds require. But the conditions I found at the naval hospital in Philadelphia fail to give me the assurance I am seeking.

One year ago there were three staff and six resident orthopedic surgeons serving the orthopedic ward. Today there are four staff and six resident orthopedic surgeons serving this same ward, an increase of only one despite the fact the patient load has doubled.

At the present time, there are more than 100 amputees requiring care. I visited with some of these amputees and found, despite their loss of limbs, that their morale is incredibly high.

I do not in any way accuse the staff there of failing to perform their duty. I am sure they are going beyond the call of duty in caring for these wounded, and they deserve every credit. This small staff is working day and night to save these men's lives.

But I do condemn our failure to provide them with additional assistance so that the level of the care can be substantially improved.

The very nature of the war in Vietnam—the guerrilla warfare, the booby-trapped and mined jungles and marshes—gives rise to extremely severe wounds in which flesh is torn and mutilated. Wounds such as these require extreme care and attention to guard against infection which could force amputation or cause death.

Both Corporal Jordan and Corporal Romanyshyn praised the staff for the care they provide with their limited numbers. But both informed me that their meals are served hours later than normal—breakfast at 10 a.m., lunch at 2 p.m., and dinner at 7 p.m.

I am concerned, too, by the condition of the hospital facilities themselves. The amputees are housed in converted World War II buildings. I am convinced that something must be done to provide far better hospital facilities for the care of these men.

Unless something is done to remedy the conditions under which this hospital is being operated, I am afraid that the morale of these wounded will be seriously lowered and that a decline of morale might be accompanied by a total in terms of physical condition. We dare not permit this to occur.

I have the highest praise for Capt. C. S. Stroud, Jr., hospital commander, and for Dr. M. C. Wilbur and Dr. Leo Willett, the chief and assistant chief of orthopedic surgeons, respectively. These men are career officers and are making extreme personal financial sacrifices in forsaking private surgical practices for the love of their country.

These doctors are making every effort to save lives and mend human bodies. These doctors are engaged in daily fights against infection of human bodies. These doctors should not be forced to fight side battles against inadequate hospital facilities and insufficient staff.

THE CASE OF ARTHUR KINOY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, great interest has been expressed in the case of Arthur Kinoy, who was found guilty of disorderly conduct by Judge Harold H. Greene as a result of participating in a boisterous argument with the Chair during the Pool subcommittee hearings. Since there is such interest in the House in this case, I include today Judge Greene's finding. I quote briefly therefrom:

It is clear to me from the testimony that what occurred here is that the defendant tried to outshout the chairman. The chairman had to gavel him down; he had to tell him to sit down, and the defendant continued to shout and to be very loud in attempting to overcome the rulings of the Chair.

Following the ruling of the court, Judge Greene permitted Kinoy to speak. In the long dissertation which ensued, Kinoy made the following statement:

I make no plea for mercy. I have no regrets or remorse for what I have done. I will do it again and again and again and again.

The decision is as follows:

[In the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, Criminal Division, Criminal action No. DC 23093-66]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA V. ARTHUR KINOY, DEFENDANT

(Official transcript of proceedings before Judge Harold H. Greene, finding of the court and proceedings thereafter, August 19, 1966)

The trial in the above-entitled matter was resumed before Judge Harold H. Greene in courtroom No. 16, Criminal Division Building, at 10:00 o'clock a.m., pursuant to the continuance on Thursday, August 18, 1966.

Appearances:

On behalf of the District of Columbia: Clark F. King, Esq., Assistant Corporation Counsel.

On behalf of the Defendant: Philip Hirschkop, Esq., 1513 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, KIng 8-7777; William Kunstler, Esq., 511 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York; Morton Stavis, Esq., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey; John deJ. Pemberton, Jr., Esq., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10010; Jeremiah Gutman, Esq.; Miss Beverly Axelrod, Attorney-at-Law; Frank Donner, Esq.; Ira Gollobin, Esq.; Armin Rosenkranz, Esq.; Shellie F. Bowers, Esq., 635 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001, MEtropolitan 8-2234.

FINDING OF THE COURT

The COURT [GREENE, J.]. I am going to find the defendant guilty.

There are two aspects to this case, as I see it. First, there is the conduct of the defendant prior to the action of the marshals in touching him and, then, his conduct subsequent to the action of the marshals.

What is involved here, to me, seems like a simple factual issue. There is no grave constitutional problem here. Everyone agrees, I think—I certainly do—that a lawyer may and must and should be vigorous, and I think everyone also agrees that there are certain bounds which he may not overstep.

It is a simple question here: Did this defendant, under these circumstances, overstep those bounds? In my judgment, he did.

It is clear to me from the testimony that what occurred here is that the defendant tried to outshout the Chairman. The Chairman had to gavel him down; he had to tell him to sit down, and the defendant continued to shout and to be very loud in attempting to overcome the rulings of the Chair.

When an attorney has objections to a ruling by a judge or by a committee chairman, he may and should state them vigorously. But once he is overruled and once he is gavelled down and once he is told to sit down, he may not persist. No tribunal, in my view, can function properly if those who appear before it can continue to argue and to shout, once it has been made plain what the ruling is and what the Chair expects.

Some quotes were given to the Court from a California case, I believe it was. There is a decision of our Court of Appeals, *Jones* v. *United States*, 151 F. 2d 289, in the so-called "Sedition Case" in 1944. At that time the Court of Appeals indicated:

"Whenever counsel or a defendant on trial or a witness oversteps the bounds of propriety and refuses to heed the admonitions of the court or to obey in the presence of the court a lawful order of the court, he commits an act of contempt. Appellant, in persisting to address the court in relation to a matter about which the court had already ruled, after being repeatedly warned, was guilty of conduct subversive to due and orderly procedure in the courtroom, and tending to obstruct the due administration of justice, and such an offender ought to be, and properly was, disciplined."

When mistakes are made, when the tribunal oversteps the bounds of proper procedure and proper propriety, there are remedies. When it's the court, the matter can be taken on appeal. When it is a legislative tribunal, of course, there is no review as such. But there are remedies. There are remedies of a political nature. There are appeals to public opinion. There is speech; there is expression. All of these are fortunately available. I do not believe that the freedom of the bar to function depends upon an attorney's being permitted to outshout the presiding officer.

Now, as Judge Friendly said recently in another context—and I am quoting—again citing the *Terry* case: "Even a right so basic as that to speak in one's own defense must sometimes yield, as was held in Ex parte Terry, * * * to the overriding necessities of maintaining order in the court-room or of protecting officers of the court."

Now, I want to quote finally from Justice Black, who has had good common sense and regard for liberties of the people and for whose views I have the greatest respect. He said recently in the Library Sit-in Case, *Brown* v. *State of Louisiana*—this was a dissent, but his views are well-known regarding the First Amendment and other constitutional liberties—he said this:

"Public buildings such as libraries, school houses, fire departments, court houses, and executive mansions are maintained to perform certain specific and vital functions. Order and tranquility of a sort entirely unknown to the public streets are essential to their normal operation."

And he went on to say:

"And it should be remembered that if one group can take over libraries for one cause, other groups will assert the right to do it for causes which, while wholly legal, may not be so appealing to this Court."

If this defendant can be permitted to disrupt the proceedings of the House Un-American Activities Committee, other persons and other groups in far more vigorous fashion, in far more extreme fashion, can disrupt other proceedings of other tribunals, and many of these persons can be likely to be far more adept at this sort of thing than a person of this defendant's integrity and background. To permit this to happen is no service to civil liberties as I see them.

Now, even if we accept the proposition that there was no disorderly conduct up to the time of the touching by the marshal, which I do not accept—I find that there was disorderly conduct up to that time—there certainly was disorderly conduct after that. The conduct of the defendant was sufficient at least to cause the Chairman to have him ejected from the hearing room. Yet, when that was attempted to be done, he continued to be loud and boisterous and to resist. At that time he was no longer making any legal point on behalf of his client, but he was simply resisting loudly being ejected and that, too, in my view, was disorderly conduct.

I find the defendant guilty of the offense.

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1966, Dr. Max Rafferty, superintendent of public instruction and director of education of the State of Califorina, delivered an address to the Daughters of the American Revolution which was reprinted in the DAR magazine. Because I think the sentiments contained therein reflect those of an overwhelming majority of American citizens, I insert the above-mentioned address in the RECORD at this point:

A LETTER FROM VIETNAM

(By Max W. Rafferty, superintendent of public instruction and director of education, State of California)

Your distinguished National Defense Chairman quoted from a letter which she had received not to long ago, and like her, I, too, get lots of letters. I get them in my capacity as an educator from mothers whose children are spending too much time on home work, and from fathers whose children aren't spending enough time. I get complaints from teen-agers who are being put out of school and complaints from other teen-agers who aren't being allowed to get out.

Parents write me agonizingly about school discipline and teachers write me bemoaningly about home discipline, and so it goes. Over the years, I have learned to answer these as best I can, meanwhile developing the attitude of objective detachment recommended by certain of the great philosophers; but once in a great while, once in a blue moon, I get a letter which none of my nicely prepared form answers will fit at all, one which makes ridiculous any attempt at philosophical detachment on my part.

Such a letter came across my desk quite recently. It was soiled and stained and a little the worse for wear. With its San Francisco Armed Forces postmark, it had obviously come a long way and here is what it said:

"I hope you will excuse two things: first that I am using a pencil, and second that I am writing to somebody I have never met. The first is easily explained. I am setting in a little Viet Nam village somewhere north of Saigon and the other guys in my platoon are using the only ballpoint pen in the outfit.

"It would take a little longer to explain why I picked you to write to. Maybe it is because we were all talking a few minutes ago about where we went to school—you know, stuff about teachers we had known, football, basketball, courses we have taken,

why some of us dropped out of high school early—things like that.

"Now that I am off duty for a while I have been doing some thinking and some wondering, too. Anyhow, I happen to know your name. I know you are the head of the schools in my home state, and I figured if anyone could answer my questions you ought to be the man. I told the guys I was going to write you because they are the ones who thought up most of the questions they want to know the answers to, so here goes.

"1. The first one is real simple: How come none of us ever heard of this place before we took off for it? Oh, sure, we knew it was somewhere in Asia, but Asia is a mighty big place. Shouldn't our teachers somewhere along the line have told us at least where it was and what its capital is, and how the French used to own it and how it was they got thrown out eleven or twelve years ago by the same bunch of commies we are fighting today? Why did we have to spend so much time down in the grades studying all about the home and the community, and the trip to the dairy and all that stuff?

"I remember my class used to take field trips to the bakery and up to the mountains to see the lake. We had us a ball, but somehow over here most of us think we got shortchanged somewhere in school. Oh, they taught us a lot about how to be a good committee member and how to share democratically with our peers, and even how to build the Panama Canal out of blocks; but this sort of thing just doesn't seem to help us very much over here.

"What we needed to know was who these people are and how they got here in the first place, and how many of them there are and what they call their cities, and what they eat and what they wear, and a whole mess of things like that. Quite a few of us don't really know what is coming off over here, and we've got a hunch the guys over by the Berlin Wall may be in the same spot as far as all those European countries are concerned.

"My school spent a lot of money on me, I guess, and I liked school fine while I was in it. I'm not quite so sure I like it now. I found out, you see, how much it didn't teach me. My question: Why didn't it?

"2. We were all arguing a little while ago about what communism really is and why the Vietcong is ready to die for it. Our Captain sat in on part of the bull session and he reminded us that people have been willing to die for all sorts of crazy causes over the years. Look at all those Germans who died for Hitler, of all people, and the Japanese who died because they thought their Emperor was some kind of a god.

"This answered one of our questions, I guess, but it raised a lot more. Why was it that the Captain had to be the one to tell us this? Why hadn't we heard, way back in school about the Crusaders and the Huns and all those other people the Captain told us about today, who went into far countries centuries ago to fight and die? Most of us had never heard of any of them. As far as we knew, we Americans were the very first to do this kind of thing.

"But the thing that really bugged me was that nobody seemed to be able to tell exactly what communism is. One guy said it was atheism. Another one said it wanted to rule the world. Somebody else said it was kind of like socialism, but a lot of us figured out that couldn't be because the English have socialism and they aren't commies. Even our Captain wasn't much help at this; he started looking at his watch about then and finally had to take off, he said.

"We didn't talk about it but I'm willing to bet that none of us could have told what capitalism is. I had read a little about it since I was sent out here, but nearly all the guys would say it was democracy or American business, or something like that. This doesn't really tell what it is, does it? How come we Americans bog down when we try to define the thing we are fighting for as well as the thing we are fighting against?

"How can we fight as well as these commies who have been taught ever since they were kids to worship communism and to die for it gladly? You know, I just can't remember any one of my teachers I ever had who told me straight out I ought to love my Country just like I love my mother, and for the same reason. Oh, I'm sure a lot of them felt that way, they were fine people, but they just didn't seem to want to talk to us kids much about that.

"Why not? Is there something in the law that prevents our teachers from telling their pupils how grand and how great and how free the United States of America really is?

"No wonder some of our fellows come back brainwashed from the commie prison camps. I'd trade all the courses I ever had back in school in social living and senior problems and ninth grade orientation and student leadership for some good solid classes in economics and civics and world geography. These are the things we need over here. How come I never got them?

"3. Ever since I was back in the first grade I heard all about the importance of cooperating with the rest of the world. We were taught that the United Nations had been set up to keep the peace and all we Americans had to do was cooperate with it and do our share and there wouldn't be any more war, ever.

"From what I hear, we did our share pretty well. We loaned everybody money and got darned little of it back. Everytime any country anywhere got into any trouble, we were the ones to help bail it out. I never heard of anybody else doing it—just us. We taxed ourselves more than any other people in all history, and most of the taxes went to bolster up a bunch of little countries most of us had never heard of, and that turned out to be the very first to kick us out and burn down our embassies and insult our Flag just as soon as they got half a chance.

"I guess my question here is: Why didn't our teachers tell us that cooperation has to be a two-way street? These communists over here don't cooperate worth a darn. They poison their bullets and they sow the jungle trails with spiked boobytraps, and they slaughter our wounded. They throw bombs into our barracks and kill us while we sleep. They torture and dismember their own countrymen who refuse to go along with them. They don't talk peace because they don't want peace. They never have. They never will.

"This isn't what I was taught in school. They told me there that everybody wanted peace more than anything else in the whole world. I've learned out here that this just isn't so. They told me down in the grades that if we Americans just helped everybody else out and didn't go around starting any wars, there wouldn't be any wars. This was a downright lie, as it turned out. What I want to know now is: Why were we lied to?

"Finally, what's with these college professors and these university presidents who are stabbing us in the back these days? Don't they know that everytime they permit their campuses to be used for this 'give blood to the Vietcong' rally stuff, and everytime they let their students out of classes to lie down in front of troop trains and burn their draft cards, it encourages Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung to prolong this war out here just that much longer? Don't they know this—or is it just that they don't care? But every single day this war is prolonged, more of us over here are going to get killed.

"They told me back in school that treason consists of giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Well, I can testify to two things right now: First, that the commies are our enemies, all right; and, secondly, that these demonstrations back home give them one heck of a lot of aid and comfort. If this isn't treason, what is?

"Now, I can't understand our college authorities permitting their students to help our enemies, but there is one thing I can understand even less: why the folks back home let them get away with it! After all, these colleges and universities are mostly tax-supported, aren't they? Why aren't our mothers and our fathers and our cousins and our neighbors out demanding that these friends of our enemies be booted out, whether they turn out to be students getting a free education at public expense when they ought to be over here helping us, or professors drawing fifteen-to-twenty-thousand-dollar-a-year salaries to preach aid to communism and sick surrender to those who are trying to destroy us?

"Maybe it's just that there aren't enough of us over here yet. Maybe when another 100,000 or 200,000 or half a million of us are over here in the jungles, the college authorities and the legislators back home will listen to us then and do at long last what they should have done in the first place: Clean that mess up!—that mess which is turning our colleges and our universities into breeding grounds for treason and nesting places for sabotage and for subversion.

"Well, these are the things my friends and I would like to know the answers to. Maybe nobody knows the answers; but if you do, will you let us know? A lot of us over here are beginning to wonder."

He signed his name and gave his outfit. In due time and across long distances, his letter came to me. I puzzled over it. I don't mind telling you I worried over it. Yes, I guess I even prayed a little over it. Finally, after a whole lot of soul-searching I wrote some kind of letter in reply, but I knew even as I sent it that I hadn't really answered him. There's a big difference, you know. And even my lame and inadequate reply never reached him, as it turned out. By the time my letter had been passed along to that little village north of Saigon, my G.I. correspondent had moved on—permanently, his questions forever unanswered.

And yet they must be answered by all of us for the sake of all of those who serve us overseas, in silence, in obscurity, too often in pain. Someday they will come back to us, the young men who survive the green hell which we, their elders, have sent them to, and when they do the answers must be ready, not only for their sake but for their children's sake after them.

So will you join me this evening in a letter to Viet Nam? It goes this way:

"DEAR JOE: Did you ever notice how parents who love their kids so often seem to spoil them? They want things to be so good for the youngsters in the years ahead that they tend to lose sight of how things really are. We wanted everything to be so right for you—a world at peace, a Nation where tolerance and helpfulness and comfort and abundance would be the rule, not the exception; a way of life in which everyone would be happy and at ease, and would walk shoulder to shoulder into a future fair beyond all the dreams of men. This is what your grandfather wanted for his kids after he had licked the Kaiser in 1918. What he got, instead, was the Great Depression and World War II.

"It was what your Dad wanted for you in '45 after he had smashed the Nazi octopus. What he got was the Cold War and Little Rock and Watts, in installments.

"He saw his younger brothers march off to Lebanon and Korea and to the Dominican Republic, and now he sees you struggling there in the quicksands of Southeast Asia and his heart bleeds a little inside him. 'What went wrong?' he asks; and so do you.

"Well, what went wrong was what always goes wrong when you live in a dream world.

The public schools as I have watched them and worked with them for a quarter of a century were given over, lock, stock and barrel almost a generation ago to a bunch of educational theorists from Columbia University Teachers College who had decided, unilaterally, that the only thing worth teaching to children was the ability to adjust comfortably and happily and easily to their environment.

"The assumption, you see, was the one we were all making at the time, namely, that our future environment was going to be so affluent and so secure, and above all so peaceful, that adjustment to it would constitute the supreme goal in life. History and geography were old stuff. So was civics. After all, we were going to have a new world now, weren't we? The new spirit of perfect international understanding and brotherhood would see to that, wouldn't it? Besides, there was only one really major power in the whole world then which could ever disturb the peace again, that power which had all the A-bombs and all the Navy and all the Air Force and, above all, all the money—us.

"So feed the kids cooperation—cooperation at any cost. Get them to love everybody under the sun, and in order to do this make them believe that everybody under the sun loves us. Never mind if it isn't quite true yet. Surely—surely, if our American children grow up loving the world, the rest of the human race is bound to reciprocate, isn't it?

"And if the schools just don't have enough hours in the day to teach arithmetic and spelling and English grammar, history and geography, and to get in all this new 'life adjustment' stuff like social studies and social living and senior problems, group dynamics and democratic sharing and peer group socializing, why then the fundamentals of human learning will just have to take a back seat for a while—and they did, Joe; for twenty-five years and more they did.

"This is why you didn't know the capital of Indochina. You were too busy back along the years building igloos like Muk-Muk, the Eskimo boy. This is why you didn't know whether Berlin was in East or West Germany. You were too busy learning how llamas were harnessed like little Pedro from Peru.

"This is why you didn't learn a lot of things, Joe, and one of these things was why America is worth dying for, and always has been. It got to be kind of square after World War II to admit you loved your Country. We had been openly and unashamedly patriotic for too long, I guess, from 1941 to 1945, for some of us to hold still for, so we kind of soft-pedaled the Spirit of '76 and 'My Country, right or wrong.'

"It looked, after all, as though before too long all the nations of the world were going to beat their swords into plowshares and join in one big planetary union, and in a One World universal peace like this national patriotism would be a bit out of place—down-right embarrassing.

"We were so sure it was coming, Joe—so sure—that we educated you for a world which never was and which never came to pass. You see, we forgot one thing: that the rest of the world was teaching its kids something entirely different. The Russians? They were raising a generation to believe that they were destined to bury us and their leaders told them that every day. The Chinese youngsters? They were conditioned from birth to regard Americans as devils out of hell. South Americans in many places were told from infancy that we North Americans should be spat upon at sight.

"Much of the rest of humanity, thanks to the films we exported to them so thoughtfully, regarded us as half fools, half gangsters.

"We were the only ones, Joe, to preach tolerance and cooperation—yes, and love—to our children in the schools. Was this wrong? No. It is never wrong to love your enemies. It's just that your generation, Joe, was brought up to believe, not just that you should love your enemies, but that there were no longer going to be any enemies to love. We taught you to be decent and kindly and charitable, and I think overall we succeeded pretty well; but we should have taught you, too, to be armed and ready to defend your lives and your liberties in a world which too often returned neither your decency nor your love. In a word, we should have given you the facts. Instead, we gave you our own hopes, our own dreams, our own fatal illusions.

"We teachers tried to give you education in your schools, Joe. Sometimes it was a little watered down, that's true, but it was education, nonetheless, while across the Atlantic and the vast Pacific the children of Asia and much of Europe were being given not education at all but indoctrination. The solution was not to have indoctrinated you but it was to have prepared you for life in an indoctrinated world, and this we did not do, and herein lies the shame and the folly of all of us who sent you half around the world to learn at the cost of your tears and your blood what we should have taught you as a little child.

"We didn't lie to you deliberately. We didn't mean to hurt you, God knows. We just ended up kidding you, that's all, and it is no real defense to say that all the while we were kidding ourselves, too, all of us—kidding ourselves by letting twenty-five years of life adjustment progressive education adjust immortal lines like these right out of the curriculum of your school, Joe:

"'Ay, tear her tattered ensign down! Long has it waved on high,
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky.'

'By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their Flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard 'round the world.'

'The breaking waves dash'd high
On a stern and rock-bound coast.'"

Try these lines on the children in your own neighborhood if you want first-hand proof of what a generation of life adjustment education has done to America's young. I know, it may be argued that the mere mouthing of rhymed couplets and the parroting of phrases from great speeches by children will do nothing to instill understanding of our Nation's past and faith in her future. This is true, but to the same extent that reciting the wedding vows in itself will do little to insure a happy marriage. Few of us would feel genuinely married without this moving spiritual experience at the outset of our voyage across the perilous seas of matrimony, even so is the case of the great stories, the great poems, the great speeches which summarize so eloquently and so dramatically the adventures of the American people down through the centuries. We commit a crime, not only against the child but also against the Country itself when we remove these grand reminders of yesterday from the curriculum of today.

"I wonder what you would say, Joe, if you knew over there where you are now about the current threat, the strangest thing I have ever been called upon to speak or write about in all my long career as an educator, and one which I never thought I would have to comment on in this Country—the current threat, of all things, to our national songs posed by interpretations of the recent Supreme Court ruling barring state-prescribed prayers in school classrooms."

As a public educator, I certainly hold no brief for any sort of sectarian religious practices in the public schools. In fact, I would be the very first to oppose such practices. We teachers have no business preaching or trying to interpret the Scriptures, that's not our job; but nobody can tell me that the legal separation of church and state, which the Founding Fathers wisely wrote into our Constitution, was ever intended to justify the attacks on our patriotic music which we are now witnessing on all hands.

For instance, in one of our greatest eastern states it has within the last few months or so become illegal to require the recitation in school of these lines:

"Oh, thus be it ever when free men shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation!
Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a Nation!

Then conquer we must when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust!'
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

In my own state, just a short time ago, a certain organization which specializes in this sort of thing demanded that one of our school districts eliminate several songs contained in the music programs in the local schools because they were written originally in the form of prayers and state-mandated prayers are now illegal. One of these songs contained in our California music textbooks and now apparently to be ruled out has been sung by millions of Americans for a hundred years without any ill effects until now:

"Mine eyes have seen the glory
Of the coming of the Lord,
He is trampling out the vintage
Where the grapes of wrath are stored."

This may be a prayer, I don't know; I don't care. It fought with Grant in the wilderness, that song. It rode with Sheridan on that breathless gallop to Winchester twenty miles away. It fell like welcome balm upon the anguished soul of Lincoln when he stood on that day of all days gazing up Pennsylvania Avenue, straining his eyes while the fresh young troops marched out of the West, flowers in their muskets, chanting that mighty tune and adding to it words of their own choosing: "We are coming, Father Abraham, three hundred thousand more."

Another of our little kindergarten songs out there begins with a quotation from Charles Dickens which has gladdened the hearts of mankind ever since Tiny Tim spoke it out of the fullness of his heart and in reverence of the Christmas Season. "God bless us everyone," it starts—and so presumably, it is illegal.

The move to outlaw Christmas carols in the schools is well known, I am sure, to all of us despite the fact that these innocent, joyous folk-songs are among our most precious musical treasures, sung alike by Christians and non-Christians during the Yuletide holidays. I well remember my own childhood in the Midwest where we sang these lovely little songs without any thought of sectarianism. Alongside me was a little girl, we were in the third grade, and I loved her madly. I remember her today. She was the daughter of our Jewish Rabbi and her name was Mina Slotsky. She was a beautiful little girl and she sang those Christmas carols in the most beautiful little soprano voice you ever heard, in the fullness of her heart, and I well remember one, because, of course, her heritage did come in and she insisted on singing it—"The world in Solomon stillness lay."

All these songs and many more are now under increasing attack across the land. What alarms me are the implications for the

future if education is to be prohibited from teaching music written in the form of prayers. What happens, I ask you, to such verses as these?

"Our father's God, to Thee,
Author of liberty, to Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright,
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God Our King;"

and

"America, America, God shed His Grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea;"

and even that song written by the best-loved of all of our modern Jewish composers:

"God bless America, land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her
Through the night with a light from above."

These are all prayers, ladies and gentlemen; that's all they are, that's all they ever were. They are our most precious musical heritage. Do you begin to see the cleft stick on which education is now caught? It seems to me that all these amputations of the great poems and the songs which every former generation of Americans would have defended literally to the death have somehow something in common. They represent a gnawing away at a once-mighty tradition, an erosion of everything out of our past which was at once wonderful and glamorous and soul-stirring; the substitution of the dull, the humdrum, the trite, for the thrilling, the mysterious, the breathtaking.

It is a trend which, unfortunately, seems to be accelerating. It is a trend which both school people and the lay public must resist with every legal means at our disposal if the Nation's schools are to continue to fulfill their ancient role as the transmitters of the cultural, the historical, the patriotic tradition which has always in the past been part and parcel of the inheritance of every American. The rights of minorities in this land must always be protected, no matter how microscopically small and vocal some of these minorities may be, but nothing in this concept confers upon any minority, no matter how tiny or tyrannical, the right to dictate to the vast majority, particularly when nothing less than the survival of the great Republic itself in the years ahead may well be the issue now at stake.

"And so it is, Joe. I have left the poor, bedraggled misfits you mentioned until last, those spindly, bearded, round-pegs-in-square-holes who parade in straggling, evil-smelling lines with misspelled placards to help your enemies, because they know down in their hearts they cannot hold a candle to you; and they envy you because you are something they can never be—a man.

"You wouldn't hate them, Joe, if you could be over here where we are and just see them with their lank-haired, burning-eyed female counterparts. Every country has its loose nuts, Joe. These are ours.

"But the professors who lead them and who justify them, and who egg them on to treason—these prostitutes of my profession, I cannot excuse. They cannot plead ignorance. They know how their actions give aid and comfort to the enemy. They cannot claim that life and success have passed them by, leaving them to chew on the cold bones of frustration and acquire vicarious status through showing off. Neither can they take refuge in youth and inexperience.

"We cannot silence them, Joe. To do so would be to sully the very cause you are fighting for. But your revenge on these seducers of the young is already complete, whether you know it or not, for around the neck of each one of them hangs like an albatross the terrible picture of our American wounded, hands trussed behind them, shot in the face in cold blood by the bloody butchers whom these cap-and-gown agitators have preferred to their own countrymen.

"It's not the kind of memory I should like to have accompany me through life, I can tell you; but never sell my profession short, Joe. For every professor who plays footsie with the Vietcong, there are hundreds, thousands more who are loyal, decent, patriotic Americans, as evidenced by the recent and vigorous protest enunciated by the University of California at Berkeley's faculty against the few, fortunately the few among them who have so coldly and cynically abused the privileges of academic freedom.

"And for every American school today which still clings stubbornly and blindly and stupidly to the outworn, exploded dogmas of progressive education, there are many, many more now swinging over daily to the basic educational philosophy which we in California call 'education in depth,' and which, please God, will help to spare your children what you have had to undergo.

"In countless high schools across the land new, different courses in economics, in world geography, are taking the place of the outworn pablum of social studies. Those who come after you, Joe, will understand more clearly the real nature of the world we live in, and they should be better armed and better guarded against its ancient pitfalls.

"But above all else, we educators are rising above the terrible temptation to go to the other extreme, to teach hatred to the children, and intolerance and narrow nationalism. We teachers are still teaching America's children to hope and to aspire and to love their fellow men, while advising them all the while against the perils implicit in a fool's paradise.

"We have faith, we educators, that sometime in the days beyond tomorrow, education in the other lands of this earth will cast off its shackles and join us in this great mission.

"That's about all I can tell you, Joe. Nearly all of us here are thinking of you and praying for you. God bless you."

This, then, is my letter to Viet Nam. It will take you and millions like you to change its promises to realities. As the grim struggle escalates, as more and more of our sons and brothers are cast into the scales, isn't it about time we did a little escalating of our own right here at home?

I can't think of a better or more rewarding place to start than our own schools, our own colleges; above all, our own universities. It is you, after all, who must answer at last to our boys who come home again. See you do it!

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I truly wish that every American citizen could read and digest the testimony given by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives each year. The information contained in his statement never fails to be diversified, instructive, and extremely important. This year, on February 10, the Director's testimony required 3 hours and touched upon many issues which have been in the news both this year and last. Several days ago this information was made public and reference to it appeared in the press. Unfortunately, comparatively few citizens ever see the text of this testimony as its circulation is limited.

To disseminate more widely the views of Mr. Hoover and the Bureau on the many areas which are within his jurisdiction, I include the following excerpts from his testimony in the RECORD at this point:

INVESTIGATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. HOOVER. I now turn to the investigative accomplishments of the Bureau. The Bureau had another banner year during 1965 with regard to investigative accomplishments, reaching new peaks in several categories.

Convictions in FBI cases totaled 13,011. Convictions were obtained against 96 percent of all persons brought to trial, over 90 percent being on pleas of guilty.

Sentences, including actual, suspended and probationary, imposed in FBI cases totaled 40,595 years, and 11 life sentences were imposed.

A total of 13,491 fugitives were located in FBI cases, the highest number in the past decade.

A new alltime high was reached with the recovery of 20,447 automobiles which had been moved across State lines. They were located in FBI-investigated cases through the cooperative efforts of the FBI and local authorities.

Fines, savings, and recoveries recorded in cases investigated by the Bureau reached an alltime high of $235,171,542, up $24,400,140 over the prior year. This averages out to $1.46 for each $1 of funds appropriated for the operation of the Bureau during the fiscal year 1965.

Confidential informants

The assistance and tremendous value of good confidential informants in combating crime are demonstrated by the accomplishments resulting from their services on our behalf during the fiscal year 1965.

These individuals supplied information which led to the location of 4,080 persons, including 2,094 fugitives. Their aid also resulted in the recovery of stolen merchandise and contraband valued at $9,243,336.

Other law enforcement agencies also benefited greatly from the activities of FBI informants. Information furnished by them concerning matters under the jurisdiction of other Federal, State, and local agencies was relayed promptly to these agencies. This led to the arrest by these other agencies of 4,982 persons and in the recovery of merchandise valued at $5,281,393.

There is constant criticism from the so-called leftwing element about the use of informants and great effort is made to discredit them. It will be seen from these figures and accomplishments that we have had great success through the use of informants in bringing about apprehensions, convictions and recoveries.

CRIMINAL REPEATERS

In January 1963, the FBI initiated a statistical program utilizing criminal identification records for the purpose of providing an analysis of the criminal and prosecutive history of known offenders. This followup on known offenders measures not only their criminal history, recidivism and mobility, but eventually the success or failure of specific court action or correctional treatment.

An examination of the records of nearly 93,000 criminals who were arrested in 1963 and 1964 shows that three out of every four had been arrested on at least one previous

occasion. Over one-half of them had received lenient treatment, such as parole, probation or suspended sentence at some point in their criminal careers—and after the first occasion on which they were beneficiaries of lenient treatment, these criminal repeaters averaged more than three additional arrests.

As a part of this study on criminal careers we recently conducted a special analysis of 7,992 District of Columbia offenders who were arrested between January, 1963, and July, 1965, for a crime in Washington, D.C., and on whom a fingerprint card was submitted to our Identification Division.

Based on prior criminal charges, 83 percent of these Washington, D.C., offenders were repeaters, and of these one-half began their criminal careers someplace other than the District of Columbia. Nearly two-thirds of these offenders had three or more arrests each.

When considering the types of crime, 29 percent of the robbers, 40 percent of the burglars, 41 percent of the auto theft offenders, 58 percent of the narcotics offenders, 5 percent of the murderers, 16 percent of the rape offenders, 31 percent of the assault offenders, 38 percent of the larceny offenders, 44 percent of the sex offenders, 46 percent of the gambling offenders and 48 percent of the bogus check offenders had repeated in committing these crimes.

Another special survey was conducted during October and November 1964, of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area during which cooperating law enforcement agencies reported to us detailed information concerning crimes, victims, and offenders.

The results documented the metropolitan character of crime, that is, the extent to which the offender crosses jurisdictional lines and commits crimes. It was found that 15 percent of all persons arrested in the metropolitan area were nonresidents of the community where arrested.

Specifically, for the serious crimes 29 percent of the offenders in suburbia were nonresidents of the place where the crime was committed. Over half of those arrested for committing robberies in the suburbs were nonresidents of the place where the crimes were committed. The mobility of the offender in the metropolitan areas places an increased burden on suburban police agencies which are generally below effective police strength.

This survey also documented some of the relationships concerning the victim of crime and the offender. For instance, in Washington, D.C., while 90 percent of those arrested for the crimes against the person were Negro, so, too, were 82 percent of the victims. This fact that the victim of some crime is generally from the same social and economic circumstances as the offender is frequently overlooked in the "one-sided appeal" for the rights of the offender.

CRIME HIGHLIGHTS

As a general rule, crime rates which relate the national population to the incidence of crime are highest in those areas experiencing the fastest growing population. At the present time, approximately 70 percent of the Nation's population is located in urban areas. The rapid growth of fringe areas has caused instability and a pronounced change in population density. The crime rate in 1964 was 1,361 offenses per 100,000 population. This rate was 11 percent higher than the rate in 1963.

Crimes of violence—murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault—comprised 13 percent of the Crime Index offenses during 1964 and these offenses, as a whole, rose 15 percent over 1963 and 40 percent over 1958. The property crimes of burglary, serious larceny, and auto theft made up 87 percent of the index offenses and, as a group, were up 13 percent in volume over 1963 and 61 percent over 1958.

Police officers killed

The felonious killing of police officers and assaults on police acting in the line of duty continue to be a serious problem. Detailed information collected on police deaths reveals 225 law enforcement officers were murdered by criminals during the 5-year period 1960–64. Fifty-seven of these killings were reported during 1964. Twenty-eight percent of these officers were slain while making arrests or transporting prisoners, 23 percent were killed investigating robberies in progress or pursuing robbery suspects, and 20 percent died responding to so-called disturbance calls, such as family disputes, and man with gun complaints. Interrupting burgalaries in progress or pursuing burglary suspects and investigating suspicious persons or circumstances each accounted for 12 percent of the deaths. The remaining 5 percent of the killings were committed by mentally deranged or disturbed individuals who gave no warning in making their unprovoked attacks on the officers.

Since 1960, 96 percent of all police murders have been committed with rifles, shotguns, or handguns. Handguns actually have predominated in that such weapons have been used in 79 percent of these murders. During this 5-year period 294 persons were involved in the 225 police murders. Of this number, 249 were arrested, 33 were killed justifiably by police at the time of or shortly after the incident, 10 committed suicide, 1 died a natural death, and 1 drowned before being taken into custody.

The criminal histories of these persons disclosed 78 percent had prior records of arrest and more than one-half of this group had previous arrests for assaultive-type crimes such as rape, robbery, assault with a deadly weapon, assault to kill, and assault on a police officer. There were, in fact, six officers murdered by men who had been convicted on earlier murder charges and later released on parole. Almost one-third of the police killers were on parole or probation when they murdered the police officer. Nationally, during 1964 police reported more than 18,000 assaults on police officers during the course of their duties, an assault rate of 10 per 100 officers. In contrast, the police were involved in only 240 justifiable killings of felons in making almost 6 million arrests for criminal acts.

Mr. ROONEY. You wouldn't have any information as to how many of these are in the halfway houses, would you?

Mr. HOOVER. I wouldn't have any information as to how many of these are in halfway houses because we know nothing about how the halfway houses operate. They are handled by the Federal Prison Bureau.

Police effectiveness

More than one-half of the over $970 million in cash and property stolen during robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts in 1964 was recovered as a result of effective law enforcement work.

The vast majority of crimes against the person are cleared by arrest. In 1964, 90 percent of all murders, 86 percent of the negligent manslaughters, 67 percent of the forcible rapes, and 74 percent of the aggravated assaults were cleared by arrest. Clearances of property crimes occurred in 37 percent of the robberies, 25 percent of the burglaries, 19 percent of the larcenies, and 26 percent of the auto thefts. The sheer volume of such crimes is a major factor in keeping down the solution rate. The success of law enforcement efforts in solving crimes often is directly dependent upon citizen alertness, cooperation, and general assistance.

Youthful criminality

There was a 17-percent increase in 1964 over 1963 in the number of arrests of persons under 18 years of age. For the country as a whole, persons under 18 years of age comprised 21 percent of all police arrests for criminal acts. This ranged from 19 percent in the rural areas to 30 percent in the suburban communities. For the serious offenses of criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft these young persons were represented in 48 percent of the arrests nationally. For rural counties the proportion was 38 percent and for the suburban areas 54 percent. While these statistics indicate our young people contribute a disproportionate share to the total crime picture, arrest rates show that a small percentage (4 percent) of the total young age group is represented.

The handling of juveniles varies widely throughout the Nation. Overall, about half of the young people arrested during 1964 were released by the police with a warning or handled directly by the police with the parents. On a national basis, an additional 47 percent of the young people taken into custody were referred to juvenile court. The remainder were either referred to welfare agencies, other police agencies, or were certified to criminal courts for trial.

Parole, probation and clemency abuses

Despite a rapidly rising crime rate in the United States that sees more and more law-abiding citizens the unhappy victims of criminal offenses, we appear to have the paradox of a new privileged class in America—the repeating offender.

Although his crimes increase in frequency and intensity, except for his relatively brief periods of incarceration between paroles and probations, he seems to gain ever greater concern from some quarters for less and less restraint upon his activities. Law enforcement has been so restricted in some instances that dedicated officers have resigned in disgust.

Convicted criminals are patronized as misunderstood or underprivileged victims of deprivation. Their misdeeds are excused as the effects of society's sins against them. Great amounts of time, money, and concern are devoted to their rehabilitation. They deserve another chance—and another—and another.

Unfortunately, little if any concern is directed toward the unfortunate victims of the repeating offender.

While enlightened and modern methods of rehabilitation are indeed worthy objectives, and fair play for wrongdoers has historically been the earmark of American justice, this fair play should also apply to those helpless citizens who too often are the victims of repeating offenders, prematurely released from confinement on parole or probation, termed "turnstile justice."

One need only follow his daily newspaper to note the too frequent tragedies resulting from misguided leniency. Encouragingly, there appears to be a growing concern among responsible sources over the perils surrounding our citizens. Many newspapers have courageously led in alerting the public to these dangers.

Yet, terror-stricken crime victims must often wonder, when they hear the ceaseless clamor for unlimited concern for the rights of criminals, whether they too have any civil rights. They must often wonder whether they have been excluded from the ranks of those with a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The law-abiding public, I feel certain, asks no more than equal justice and the same protection of their rights by police, prosecutors, and jurists as is afforded to those who have violated the law. I am sure they ask for no special privilege—just fairplay all around.

I will cite some illustrative cases in various parts of the country which emphasize the dangers facing the public today. The abuses that arise from improperly administering the worthy goals of parole and probation and from other leniency should be a real concern

to each member of the public for he is in jeopardy of being the ultimate victim.

Illustrative cases—Leniency to continuing offenders

In New York City, a 34-year-old man was arrested in July 1965, charged with the strangulation-murder of a 13-year-old boy. Despite a record of 11 arrests, including 6 convictions on morals charges involving minors since 1956, this individual was merely fined or given suspended sentences in all 11 arrests. Only once was he treated in a mental institution, despite a record of sordid sex assaults upon children in several different States.

A Baltimore, Md., man was arrested by FBI agents in March 1964, on charges of kidnaping, robbing, and criminally assaulting a young waitress. These offenses occurred while the man was free on bail on narcotics and larceny charges, plus charges of making 17 obscene telephone calls to various women. He had been indicted in November 1963, on robbery, larceny, and burglary charges and freed on $15,000 bail. About a month later, he was accused of making the indecent telephone calls and, in view of the nature of the charges, his bail was set at $2,000 on each charge or a total of $34,000. In February 1964, his bail was reduced to $10,000 and he was released after a court psychiatrist reported there was only a "rather remote" probability that he would become involved in other sex charges. Two weeks later, on March 4, 1964, he was charged with kidnaping, robbing, and raping the Baltimore waitress.

In another New York City case, which prompted a leading newspaper to ask the question editorially "This Is Justice?" a man had been arrested 21 times in 25 years and yet released time and time again to break into homes to rob and rape. He was reportedly characterized by New York parole authorities as a "pathological individual, antisocial," in 1957. In the next 2 years, he was arrested twice on rape charges, both of which were dismissed. In December 1964, he was caught after committing his second assault in a month on a New York actress. Both of these assaults occurred since his release on parole in mid-October 1964.

Typical of cases which permit the release of hardened criminals as a result of legal technicalities is that of a Florida man with a 47-year criminal record who was first convicted in 1917 for manslaughter and sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment. In 1933 he received a 20-year sentence for assault to murder and in 1952 received a similar sentence for the same type offense. In 1956, he pleaded guilty to murdering a man and wife and was sentenced to life imprisonment. In late 1963 his conviction was appealed because he had been tried without an attorney and, pursuant to a Supreme Court decision indicating such action violated a person's constitutional rights, he was granted a new trial. At this trial, he pleaded guilty to second degree murder and was placed on 5 years' probation. On September 14, 1964, following an argument over money, he shot and killed two women. Subsequently convicted of first degree murder, he was sentenced to death in the electric chair.

Today we are also facing the frustrating problem of some of our courts being infected with the sentimentalist's attitude in relation to individuals charged with crimes. Time and time again criminals are being released under unreasonable bail bonds to prey once more upon the public. One needs only to look here in the Nation's Capital where recently two or three individuals, charged with bank robbery at gunpoint, were release on $100 personal recognizance bonds. Reportedly the third one was not released because a detainer had been filed against him for being delinquent in alimony payments. During the commission of this bank robbery, one of the bandits reportedly pointed a gun at a woman teller who had turned on the bank's motion picture camera. According to the teller, the robber cursed her and she heard the gun click. It is ironic that a person can get out of jail here in the Nation's Capital so easily after allegedly robbing and attempting to kill, but cannot do so if he gets behind in his alimony.

Numerous other cases point out the need for a more realistic bond being required of individuals who definitely present a threat to today's society. One which comes quickly to mind involves an individual who was originally arrested in October 1956 on a charge of assaulting a police officer and assault with a deadly weapon—automobile. He received a 6 years' sentence under the Youth Corrections Act and was paroled in January 1959. In October 1960 he was arrested for possession of numbers slips and paid a $100 fine. In October 1961 he was arrested for making a false report, petty larceny, possession of numbers slips, and tampering with an automobile; however, these charges were subsequently dropped. In November 1961 he was arrested for taking property without the owner's permission and sentenced to serve 60 days. In January 1962 he was arrested on a parole violator's warrant and incarcerated until January 1963. In July 1964 he was again arrested on a charge of attempting to procure for prostitution and paid a $50 fine. In June 1965 he was arrested for armed robbery and homicide and in July was released on a $7,500 bond. Within a month, he was again arrested for grand larceny by trick and released the same day on a $1,000 bond. The following day he was arrested for the robbery of a bank in Washington, D.C., a few weeks before, and is presently incarcerated in lieu of bond on this bank robbery charge. Truly, turnstile justice.

One of the greatest frustrations to law enforcement today is the fact that an arrested criminal can thwart justice for months through postponement of trial and numerous appeals, all the while remaining free on bond.

Recently I heard of a case in Philadelphia where an individual was to be brought to trial for attacking two young girls, who received five postponements of his trial on the claim that he did not have an attorney.

Another man arrested for rape in October 1961 did not go to trial until April 1964. He used the delaying tactic of hiring and firing attorney after attorney until a disgusted judge finally called a halt.

Needless to say, enlightened and modern methods of rehabilitation are worthwhile. Recent legislation enacted, which will permit the commitment or transfer of adult prisoners to so-called "halfway" houses, the granting of leave to Federal prisoners by the day and for weekends and work releases for special educational programs may be well in intention and spirit, and in the desire for rehabilitation. However, such programs must of necessity be very closely controlled and carefully supervised to insure that convicted criminals are not released unscrupulously to expand their parasitic endeavors upon humanity. Likewise, we constantly hear statements concerning reduction in prison population. This, too, is most difficult for me to understand when crime has been on an alarming increase for the past several years.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Complete devotion to the Soviet Union has always been an integral part of the program of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The party certainly demonstrated this allegiance by its activities during 1965, particularly through its attacks on U.S. foreign policy. Not since the Korean crisis has the party, aided and abetted by its fronts, sympathizers and dupes, seized upon an issue with such vehemence as its attack on our Nation's foreign policy.

Such tactics, of course, are in keeping with its long-sought goal of achieving a communized America. To achieve this goal, the party does what it can to create confusion in this country, and to influence and manipulate groups of people to discredit our Nation in the eyes of the world.

Communist Party issues, finances and activities

Party Issues

During 1965, the party continued its relentless and vicious attacks on the U.S. foreign policy, particularly in regard to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Accusing the United States of engaging in "dirty aggression," the party has given full support to all activities designed to obscure the true facts in this situation. In addition, the party has attempted to tie in the peace demonstrations with the civil rights movement to obtain the maximum disruptive effect from both and to create the ultimate in dissatisfaction among the activists in both movements.

While the chief foreign policy objective of the Communist Party, U.S.A. continues to be the withdrawal of U.S. forces from southeast Asia, it continues to advocate expanded trade with "socialist" countries, admission of Communist China to the United Nations and normal diplomatic relations with Cuba as well as with Communist China. The repeal of the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities also remain high-priority objectives.

Although the party has given lipservice to actions designed to promote the false impression that it is an American political party, its actions clearly indicate complete hostility to the United States and allegiance to the Soviet Union. All of the party's actions in connection with the current peace movement have been directed toward branding the United States as an "outlaw aggressor nation" and portraying the Soviet Union as a "benevolent lover of peace."

Finances

Several sources of Communist Party, U.S.A. funds can be enumerated even though the party resorts to clandestine methods and subterfuge in the handling of financial matters. One source of party funds is the income from dues collected on a monthly basis from the membership. In addition, each club is assigned a quota for the party's sustaining fund. Other sources of income are the annual drives for funds for the Communist newspapers The Worker and People's World. Additional income is received from the foreign circulation of these newspapers, particularly in Soviet bloc countries.

For many years, the Communist Party, U.S.A. has encouraged the inclusion of bequests to the party in the wills of members and sympathizers. These bequests are usually left in the name of some trustworthy Communist, who, in turn, furnishes the proceeds to the party. Other sources of income include donations, public meetings, investments, and business enterprises.

The party's national office in early 1965 informed all of its districts that the party planned to spend, during 1965, $10,000 for wages, travel, and literature distribution in the South. This was said to represent a modest increase over 1964. Party activities in the South are financed through what is termed a "Southern solidarity assessment," which is an involuntary assessment of 1 month's dues payable each December.

Party organizations and publications always seem to be on the razor-edge of insolvency. This predicament—real or contrived—is used to generate never-ending party appeals for more funds and to lull the anti-Communist opposition into a false sense of security. Nevertheless, the party somehow always manages to secure sufficient funds with which to continue its enterprises and activities.

Recent Activities of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Propaganda

Communist Party, U.S.A., propaganda, designed to lessen popular support for U.S. foreign policy, has been directed at virtually every segment of our society. The party press has made broad appeals to all Americans to help win "the mind of the President for peace in Vietnam." One such appeal, for example, urged every American to participate in picket lines and demonstrations; to write or wire the President and Members of Congress; to organize delegations to visit Washington, D.C., and, above all, to involve members of churches, labor unions, civil rights organizations, neighborhood groups, and all other centers of people's activities in the struggle for the "President's mind."

Almost every issue pertaining to domestic matters has been related by the party to the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. The party continues to claim that it is a "necessary party that has influence on every segment of social activity in the country," and that "wherever you find struggles for progress, you will find Communists there."

Fully aware that Federal prosecution under the Internal Security Act of 1950 restricted many of their activities, party leaders continued to mount a massive propaganda assault to remove this obstacle to their aims and purposes. In an effort to gain support from the academic community, party spokesmen have utilized appearances on college campuses specifically to condemn this act. In addition, they have solicited and received support from Communist parties in other countries. The campaign against the Internal Security Act of 1950 is now worldwide in nature and directed to project the illusion that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is a legitimate party being suppressed because it opposes the imperialistic aims of the United States.

Through the dissemination of newspapers, books, pamphlets, leaflets, and other printed matters, the party indoctrinates its members and sympathizers and is able to reach and propagandize the non-Communist masses. It makes strenuous efforts to increase and expand the distribution and consumption of its literature.

Youth

The Communist Party, U.S.A. continues its efforts to exploit the abilities, idealism, and enthusiasm of youth in the United States for its own sinister purposes. Party policy closely follows Lenin's emphasis on youth—"youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth and still more the working class youth." A very practical consideration for party policy, of course, is the current age level of its membership. Party leaders are concerned about the increased age level and are devoting much thought and effort to drawing youth into the party as "young blood."

Party leader Gus Hall, well aware of the fact that the future of the party depends on youth, has called for an all-out effort to recruit additional youths into the party. One of the steps taken in response to this edict was the creation of a summer youth project to train additional cadre for leadership positions. This project was inaugurated with a 2-week national youth leadership school under maximum security conditions at Camp Midvale, N.J., in June 1965. Leading party officials were extremely pleased with this school which was attended by some 80 students from various parts of the United States. These students received instructions in Marxism-Leninism from top party officials. The students then spent the remainder of the summer working full time for the party in various party districts under the regular party leadership.

A primary task of the students who attended this school was the recruitment of minority youth for the party's year-old front group, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. During the summer of 1965, this organization launched an ambitious program aimed at bolstering its Midwest region which had been beset by factional disputes, lack of organization, and adverse publicity. Participants in this program spoke of this "summer project" in glowing terms at a conference of national coordinators of the DuBois Clubs held over the Labor Day weekend in Chicago.

Public appearances of party leaders

In line with instructions issued by Gus Hall for the party to take advantage of the upsurge in "radicalization" among American youth, leading party spokesmen made a record number of over 50 appearances on college campuses during the 1964–65 campus year, before audiences totaling over 36,000. Gus Hall has vowed that party leaders would "go anywhere to meet groups of students in this country, regardless of the size of the group." True to his word, party leaders crisscrossed the country, with Hall himself traveling as far west as the University of Hawaii in Honolulu. The most recent theme of the party leaders diatribe on the campuses has been the halting of "America's aggression in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam." James E. Jackson, editor of the Worker, in appearances at four colleges in the State of Washington called for a mass student enlistment in the "peace crusade" to force the United States to withdraw from the Vietnamese conflict.

The party has high hopes of utilizing the interests created by these campus appearances to get a nucleus of students interested in Marxism-Leninism and, subsequently, in a position to be recruited into the Community Party. While party leaders understand that they may not have overwhelming success of recruiting the students, they are encouraged over their opportunities to appear on campuses and gain an aura of legitimacy.

Political activities

Elated with the November 15, 1965, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, which declared the membership provision section of the Internal Security Act of 1950 unconstitutional, the Communist Party, U.S.A. began making bold plans for the future as soon as the decision was made public.

In a press conference on November 15, 1965, Gus Hall, the party's General Secretary, declared that the party would move immediately to get Communist candidates on election ballots and would run candidates for public office wherever possible. Hall stated that the party would take steps for greater participation in the 1966 election and, as part of their stepped-up activity in this regard, would issue a new program to the American people. Part of this program calls for the establishment of a new political party which would be based on Negro, labor and "peace" groups. The program declares that the new party is essential because the current problems facing the Nation cannot be solved under the two-party system as it is presently situated.

Communist influence in racial matters

Historically, the Communist Party, U.S.A., has never overlooked the potential inherent in any of our country's problems, be they domestic or foreign. Every crisis is grasped in an effort to exploit the situation for the advancement of Communist objectives. Similarly, the party has always aimed its biggest "guns" from its propaganda arsenal and used its major efforts and functionaries to exploit minority groups, especialy the Negro people.

The increasing frequency of meetings of party functionaries at the highest levels to mold its designs on the Negro question is illustrative of the escalation of Communist efforts to influence the civil rights movement. Whereas the party's national Negro commission was almost dormant 2 to 3 years ago, 1965 witnessed several key meetings by this highest body in the party devoted to racial matters.

At its meeting on March 20–21, 1965, labeled a "milestone" by party National Vice Chairman Henry Winston, the general consensus was that the party increase its efforts to lure support from all segments of society. Party General Secretary Gus Hall emphasized that the party must pursue its efforts to merge the struggles of the Negroes and the working class in order to reach its goal of gaining influence among the masses.

Just a month later, on April 23, 1965, the Negro commission again met and passed a number of proposals which were immediately adopted by the party's national committee. These dealt with the party's far-reaching and penetrative plans for exploiting the racial situation, as follows:

1. Each party district is to establish committees to work with the leadership and to organize the party's activities in the South.
2. Permanent assignments should be made in areas of concentration for the recruiting of party members with each party district working on plans to recruit young Negroes.
3. The party's role in relation to the labor movement should be one of stimulating the idea of organizing the unorganized workers in the South.
4. The party leadership should prepare an informational catalog on the South for the use of other groups.
5. The struggle for civil rights must be kept in motion.
6. The party must raise substantial amounts of money from September to December 1965, to be controlled by the Negro commission for work in the South.

Another key item stressed during the April 23, 1965, meeting was to have party contacts with the principal civil rights organizations working in the South, including the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and Southern Christian Leadership Conference, as well as with other groups which supply medical and legal aid in the South.

To effect a channel of communication between the party and civil rights workers, it was stressed that the party become better organized by meeting with individuals going to the South for temporary work in the civil rights field and having them report back to the party about their experiences.

At another meeting of the Negro commission held on June 23, 1965, a leading party functionary equated the struggle for Negroes for first-class citizenship as consistent with Marxist-Leninist doctrines. Another party leader suggested that the Communist Party, U.S.A. focus its attention on every educational system in the United States where discrimination is practiced and urged that Negro youth be drawn into the "socialist struggle" (Communist struggle).

These activities show the clear-cut designs of the party to exploit to its fullest the racial situation, including using it as a steppingstone for membership recruitment.

That Communists are not giving mere lipservice to the dictates of their masters is clearly evidenced in an examination of the many racial activities such as demonstrations, pickets, boycotts, and the like, which have taken place in the recent past. There is hardly an activity in this area that does not have a Communist element present. The degree of Communist participaiton and influence will, of course, vary from activity to activity but almost always there will be found the Communist at work. We also find party leaders arrogantly proclaiming the involvement of their "slaves" to Communist dicta. In May 1965, Party leader Gus Hall proclaimed that the Communist movement is making progress in the civil rights field. In June 1965, when it became public knowledge that Communists were active in lengthy demonstrations in Chicago, Ill., relating to

a school segregation protest, two party leaders, Claude Lightfoot and James West, issued public statements verifying the presence of Communists in these demonstrations.

The riots in Los Angeles, Calif., which took place during the period August 11–14, 1965, provided the Communist Party, U.S.A. and other subversives with the means to further blacken the reputation of the United States and to atempt to fan the flame of discontent among the American people.

That the Communists had an ulterior motive in this action was clearly demonstrated in the remarks of one party functionary who placed the entire blame for the uprising on the white people and proposed to his party underlings that they take advantage of such riots wherever they occur since riots will eventually lead the United States to socialism.

At a still higher level, the national headqaurters of the party, on August 15, 1965, instructed the southern California party district to prepare articles concerning the riots for early publication in the Worker, an east coast Communist newspaper. Special efforts were to be made to play up the police brutality angle. Major portions of subsequent issues of The Worker and People's World, a west coast Communist newspaper, were devoted to the uprising in Los Angeles and its aftermath. Each article faithfully followed the line set by party headquarters.

Despite the expressed good intentions of those legitimately concerned with the civil rights movement, their efforts to keep Communists out have been less than totally effective. This is amply illustrated by the Communist involvement in racial activities which are often sponsored by groups with well-meaning intentions. Then, too, we find the extreme militants, such as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, whose leadership has proclaimed that they will accept Communists within their ranks.

Security measures

The security measures used by the Communist Party, U.S.A. in recent months can best be described as inconsistent. On the one hand, approximately 70 party functionaries from various parts of the country gathered in New York City in January 1966, for a meeting of the party's national committee. On the other hand, some party clubs hold meetings on short notice, identities of members are closely guarded in some party districts and in other districts a variety of devices are used to hold meetings under secure conditions.

Numerical strength

Party leader Gus Hall, in the past, in placing the membership at 10,000, has declared that there are at least 100,000 "state-of-mind" members whom he defined as persons sympathetic to the party line and objectives. Bolstering this declaration of many persons being sympathetic to the party is the claim of party leaders that if they can defeat the Internal Security Act of 1950 they can recruit 50,000 new members within a year.

In keeping with this, on November 15, 1965, following the Supreme Court decision which held that the membership provision of the act was unenforceable if the fifth amendment was utilized as a defense, Hall promptly indicated the decision would result in renewed growth of the party. In substantiation of his prediction, Hall stated during a press conference in Chicago, Ill., on December 6, 1965, that the party was experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history, and that the party membership had jumped to 1,000 or 2,000 above its 10,000 total of a year ago.

Party's 18th national convention

The most important event facing the Communist Party, U.S.A. in the near future is its 18th national convention. Present plans call for the convention to be held in New York City for 4 days commencing June 23, 1966. Approximately 300 party delegates and 150 alternate delegates are scheduled to attend the convention. In addition, the party plans to invite 300 nonparty members to attend the convention as guests. The purpose of inviting the large number of guests is to create the impression that the convention is not essentially a Communist Party convention and also to create confusion as to who are the actual party members at the convention. To create publicity for the convention, the party plans to call a huge mass meeting of several thousands on opening night. The party also plans to open the convention to television and radio coverage.

This will be the first national convention for the party since 1959. The convention is the highest authority of the party and ostensibly is authorized to make political and organizational decisions bearing on its entire membership. Actually, the convention proceedings and decisions will be controlled by the dictatorial manipulations of Party General Secretary Gus Hall. A new national committee consisting of older comrades subservient to Hall and selected youth, Negro, and mass organization representation will be "elected."

To attract youth and obtain the sanction of the "new left," the party convention will endeavor to project the party as a legitimate political organization. Every effort will be made at the convention to depict the party as the vanguard of the "peace" and "civil rights" movements. As in the past, the convention will endeavor to identify the party with the working class and trade union movement.

Communist front and Communist-infiltrated organizations

In furthering the aims and objectives of the international Communist conspiracy, the Communist Party, U.S.A. creates and utilizes Communist front organizations. In this manner the party attempts to conceal and disguise its activities and to lend a semblance of respectability to its operations. Through these fronts, the party conducts pressure and propaganda campaigns, disseminates Communist literature and propaganda, raises funds, recruits new members and insidiously exploits the masses and public opinion to further its revolutionary aims and purposes.

The party, in supplementing its program of deceit carried on through its front groups and to further disguise its activities, continues to urge its members to join and infiltrate legitimate nonsubversive organizations. The objectives of the party members are to work into or work within the framework of these legitimate groups in an attempt to control or influence the policies of such groups, or the thinking of their members, without exposing the party's interest in the groups.

Some of the main spheres of activity in which the party is interested relate to peace, youth, Negro, political, trade union and disarmament matters, and attacking U.S. policy relative to Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Prosecutive action against party fronts

The Internal Security Act of 1950, effective September 23, 1950, requires that all Communist front organizations register as such with the Attorney General. As might be expected, none of the known fronts have complied with this requirements, thus placing the burden upon the Government to compel such compliance.

Since the passage of the act and the order of the Subversive Activities Control Board determining the Communist Party, U.S.A., a Communist-action organization, the Attorney General has filed petitions with the Board seeking to cause the registration of 22 organizations as Communist-front organizations within the provisions of the act. Petitions as to eight of these have been dismissed due to the dissolution of the organization. The Board completed hearings as to the other 14. Of these, four have been placed in indefinite abeyance since they are not presently in existence; orders became final regarding seven but the organizations subsequently dissolved; one order was set aside by the Court of Appeals; and two have been remanded to the Board by the Supreme Court to adduce additional evidence. None have registered.

Prospective action against the Communist Party-U.S.A.

The Government's prosecutive action against the Communist Party, U.S.A. stands much the same as outlined in my testimony when appearing before you last year.

Retrial of the party, which was reindicted on February 25, 1965, under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950, for failure to register with the Attorney General as a Communist-action organization began November 1, 1965. On November 19, 1965, the party was found guilty as charged in the 23-count indictment and was ordered to pay the maximum fine of $230,000. The conviction is being appealed.

The indictment returned in March 1962 against Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, charging him with failure to register for the party and with failure to return the registration statement, remains outstanding. As was the situation last year, the court has postponed the hearing on a motion to dismiss the indictment and setting of a trial date pending a final decision in the registration case against the Communist Party as an organization.

As to the provision of the act which requires individual members of the Communist Party to register, the Subversive Activities Control Board had issued registration orders against 43 national and district party functionaries. Two of these cases were consolidated for appeal purposes and on November 15, 1965, the Supreme Court reversed the ruling of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals which had upheld the Board's registration orders. The Supreme Court held that the orders violated the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

Need for vigilance

The Communist Party, U.S.A. constitutes a grave security threat to our Nation, not only because of its subversive historical background, its antidemocratic philosophy and its insidious tactics, but also because of the particular nature of the party itself—an organization controlled and directed by Moscow whose ultimate goal is to overthrow our form of government.

A widespread underestimation of the menace which the party presents to the internal security of the United States is just the impression the party desires to present. The ability of the party to seize upon items of discontent and to fan the sparks of civil disobedience into actual strife presents a clear and present danger.

Other organizations

There are numerous other organizations requiring much the same investigative coverage as that required for the Communist Party-U.S.A.

Trotskyite Organizations and Communist Splinter Groups

Some of these are revolutionary groups such as the Socialist Workers Party, the Proletarian Party of America, and the Progressive Labor Party. The manner in which their objectives are to be reached may vary, but the ultimate goal is the same—the destruction of our free, democratic, open form of government.

Splinter groups are those groups which have broken away from the mainstream of the Communist Party, U.S.A., usually over

interpretation or implementation of basic Communist ideology. While the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin form the base for the programs of these groups, they vary as to the interpretation of these teachings and in the manner in which their objectives are to be reached. Many of these groups have shown a tendency to favor the Chinese Communist Party line as opposed to that of the Soviet Union.

Socialist Workers Party

The Socialist Workers Party was the first major group to oppose the Communist Party, U.S.A. for the right to lead an American Communist revolution. It is the largest Trotskyite organization in the United States. Factionalism within the Socialist Workers Party itself has spawned other groups, who while following the teachings of Trotsky, differ with the Socialist Workers Party over the means to be utilized in the attainment of a workers' world and a classless society. Among such offshoots of the Socialist Workers Party are the Johnson-Forest Group, the Workers World Party, the American Committee for the Fourth International, and the Revolutionary Committee of the Fourth International

Proletarian Party of America

The Proletarian Party of America, while not a Trotskyite organization, is a revolutionary Marxist group which was formed in 1920. Its purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Progressive Labor Party

One of the more recently organized and one of the most militant organizations is the Progressive Labor Party. This group was created as the Progressive Labor Movement in early 1962 by individuals who had been expelled from the Communist Party, U.S.A. At the first national convention of the Progressive Labor Movement, held in New York City, April 15–18, 1965, the name of the organization was changed to the Progressive Labor Party.

Utilizing what it considers to be ills of a capitalist society, such as unemployment, poor housing, discrimination, police brutality, unequal educational opportunities, corruption, poverty, and the alleged indifference of trade union leaders and employers toward the workers, the Progressive Labor Party aggressively and militantly strives to enlarge its organization and develop followers for its goal, a socialist United States based on Marxist-Leninist principles.

Student Committee for Travel to Cuba

The use of Progressive Labor Party-sponsored front groups has been another favorite tactic of this organization. One of its best known fronts has been the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba which organized successful trips to Cuba in 1963 and 1964 in defiance of the State Department ban on such travel. Based upon information developed by the FBI, the Department of Justice presented facts relative to the 1963 trip to a Federal grand jury, Eastern District of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., and on September 27, 1963, indictments as to four individuals were returned. They were charged with conspiracy to violate section 1185(b), title 8, United States Code, for organizing this 1963 trip of 59 individuals. Trial of these individuals has been completed and is awaiting the court's decision.

Following the 1964 trip in which 84 persons traveled to Cuba, the Department of Justice obtained indictments against 9 persons on September 22, 1964, in the Eastern District of New York, for conspiracy to organize the 1964 trip in violation of section 1185(b), title 8, United States Code. These individuals are awaiting trial.

May 2 Movement

Another successful front organization of the Progressive Labor Party is the May 2 Movement which was organized in April 1964, by a group of young people who participated in the Yale Socialist Union conference on "Socialism in America." The original aim of this organization was to plan and execute a demonstration in New York City, on May 2, 1964, to demand withdrawal of United States troops from South Vietnam. Since that time, it has continued in existence and has held a number of demonstrations protesting United States action in Vietnam.

Harlem Defense Council

The Harlem Defense Council is basically the creation of Bill Epton, one of the vice presidents of the Progresive Labor Party. This organization was extremely active in the events following the outbreak of rioting in Harlem in July 1964.

As the result of his activity in connection with the Harlem rioting, Epton was arrested on August 5, 1964, on a charge of advocating criminal anarchy. This charge was dismissed on June 7, 1965, and on the same date Epton was rearrested and charged with inciting to riot, conspiracy to riot, advocacy of criminal anarchy, and conspiracy to advocate criminal anarchy. The charge of inciting to riot was subsequently dismissed but on December 20, 1965, Epton was found guilty of the other three charges and on January 27, 1966, he was sentenced to prison for 1 year on each count to be served concurrently.

The Progressive Labor Party and the Harlem Defense Council continue their policy of creating hate and distrust of the New York City Police Department and miss no opportunity to hurl charges of brutality and malfeasance against that department.

Klan- and hate-type organizations

I should like to turn to the Klan- and hate-type organizations which make up another category of organizations which require widespread coverage on our part.

Klan-type organizations

Numerous incidents have arisen in the racial field which have highlighted the participation of Klansmen. These incidents have involved beatings, killings and the general denial of civil rights to individuals.

There are 14 active Klan-type organizations operating in the United States. These operate out of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee. The estimated membership is 14,000 and increasing.

The largest of the Klan groups is the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, run by Robert Shelton and headquartered in Tuscaloosa, Ala. During the past year, this group has commenced organizational efforts in New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Texas. The chief means used by this and other Klan groups to attract adherents and gain publicity is the public rally at which Klan leaders openly advocate white supremacy and denounce any form of racial integration.

The Bureau continues its program of penetrating the Klan at all levels, and, I may say, has been quite successful in doing so.

The Bureau's role in penetrating the Klan has received public attention due to the solution of the brutal murders of Viola Liuzzo in Alabama, Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn in Georgia, and the three civil rights workers in Mississippi. We have achieved a number of other tangible accomplishments in this field, most of which are not publicly known but are most significant.

(Discussion off the record.)

Hate-type and other organizations

Mr. HOOVER. Generally speaking, hate-type and similar extremist organizations parade under the guise of patriotism, anticommunism and concern for the destiny of the country. Behind this veneer, however, is a deep hatred for such groups as the Negroes, members of the Catholic and Jewish faiths, and immigrants.

While pretending to formulate their own particular theories for improving our Government in solving complicated social, political and economic problems, the extremists merely offer emotionally charged solutions to the gullible and unthinking person who craves for the simple answer. They call for improved government, yet continually defame those in high office. They pretend to be Christians and God-fearing, yet preach hatred for those of differing religions or races. They preach a return to their own idea of "Constitutional Government," yet defy the laws of Congress and trample on the rights of their fellow citizens.

Presently under investigation by the FBI, in addition to the Klan, are 15 such groups with a total estimated membership of about 400. Included are such organizations as the American Nazi Party, the National States Rights Party, and the Deacons of Defense and Justice, Inc.

American Nazi Party

George Lincoln Rockwell, the self-styled leader of the American Nazi Party, has been peddling professional hate during the existence of his organization for the past 6 years. The national membership of this group is less than 100. Defeated in the 1965 Virginia gubernatorial election, Rockwell through his "political party" still cherishes political power at the national level. According to his plan, should his organization take command of the leadership of the U.S. Government, the Nazis will exterminate Jews by Hitlerian methods and banish all Negroes to Africa. Subsequent to his electoral setback, Rockwell experienced Internal Revenue seizure of the office equipment at party headquarters in Arlington, Va., to satisfy a tax lien, and a change of ownership of the premises housing party headquarters necessitates a relocation in the near future.

Behind the masks of patriotism, anticommunism and Aryan supremacy, Rockwell is dedicated to creating a climate of religious and racial hatred against his principal targets—the Jews and Negroes. Nazi propaganda is replete with insulting and savage humor depriving its victims of all semblance of dignity. Rockwell views his country as the helpless victim of an imaginary "Zionist conspiracy," whose only salvation is to follow the ideals of his hero and inspiration—Adolph Hiter.

Although Rockwell claims that he and his troopers never engage in violence except in self-defense, the garish and theatrical demonstrations staged by this group are intended deliberately to provoke breaches of the peace and riotous action.

National States Rights Party

The National States Rights Party, whose national director is Dr. Edward R. Fields, has an estimated membership of approximately 75. A principal spokesman who travels about the country spewing hate is vice chairman of the group, J. B. Stoner. This organization favors segregation of the races in schools, Armed Forces, and residential communities.

Deacons of Defense and Justice, Inc.

Another organization spawned from the racial unrest existing in the South during the past year is the Deacons of Defense and Justice, Inc. This militant Negro organization was organized in Jonesboro, La., in 1964 and incorporated under the laws of the State of Louisiana for the purpose of members defending themselves against Klan violence and to provide protection not given by local authorities. The Deacons were most prominent in the Bogalusa, La., area during much of the racial disturbance there during 1965 and worked closely with the Congress of Racial Equality and the Bogalusa Voters

League. Leaders of this organization have encouraged Negroes to arm themselves and form roving patrols equipped with walkie-talkies in an effort to discourage Klan-type violence.

Black Muslim and Black Nationalist extremist groups

Mr. HOOVER. At the same time, a number of violently antiwhite Negro organizations add to our responsibilities and work. These include such organization as the Nation of Islam, better known as the "Black Muslims." This is the largest such all-Negro organization, its membership being about 5,300.

As to the black nationalist extremist groups, one such group known as the Organization for Black Power came into existence during the summer of 1965 and is still in its infancy. Its aim is to gain political control of major U.S. cities through mobilization and control of the Negro residents.

Individuals connected with its founding represent various facets of the militant Negro extremist community. The chairman of the organization is Jesse Gray. He is a former Harlem organizer for the Communist Party, USA.

Black Muslim Groups

Nation of Islam

The Nation of Islam, an all-Negro, violently antiwhite organization, is frequently referred to as the "Black Muslins." The organization teaches complete separation of the races, economic independence for the so-called Negro, and that the black man in the United States will in the future own and occupy a separate black nation.

The national headquarters of this organization is located in Chicago, Ill., and its leader is a Georgia-born Negro who calls himselm Elijah Muhammad and claims to have been selected by Allah, the Supreme Being, to lead the so-called Negro out of slavery. Muhammad and some other members of the organization, declaring that members of the organization owe no allegiance to the United States, have refused to register under the provisions of the Selective Service Acts. Members of this group have continuously been involved in violent conflict with local police.

The expulsion from the group in 1964 of Malcolm X Little, former national functionary and leading spokesman for the organization, and his subsequent assassination in February 1965, have played a marked role in causing the membership to decline in the Nation of Islam.

Organization of Afro-American Unity

The formation of the Organization of Afro-American Unity was announced in June 1964 by its leader, the late Malcolm X Little. The purpose of the group is to bring before the United Nations the existing problems of the Negro in the United States.

Since the assassination of Little, this organization has been groping in the darkness in a search for leadership. The eventual destiny and direction of the Organization of Afro-American Unity will be determined by the eventual victor in the power struggle to succeed the late Malcolm X Little.

Black Nationalist Extremist Groups

Revolutionary action movement

The Revolutionary Action Movement has been in existence since early 1963. It is dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalist system in the United States, by violence if necessary, and to its replacement by a socialist system oriented toward the Chinese Communist interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. The Revolutionary Action Movement is entirely nonwhite in membership, clandestine in nature, and owes its primary allegiance to the "Bandung world," that is, the nonwhite races of the world, rather than to any national entity, as such. The group has organized units or membership in several of the larger cities and is attempting to recruit new members and expand its sphere of influence.

Organization for black power

The Organization for Black Power formally came into existence at a conference held in Chicago, Ill., over the July 4, 1965, weekend. According to its literature "Membership in the Organization for Black Power shall be of organizations and individuals who accept the perspective of Black Power and the discipline of the organization in the struggle for this power."

The organization states it "is part of the revolutionary struggle of people all over the world to liberate themselves from the determination of the United States to impose its way of life on the whole world and to build a new world free from exploitation."

Minutemen

The Minutemen organization is another group whose activities are closely followed. We have penetrated this organization and our sources keep us posted on developments. We disseminate the results of our investigations on a continuing basis to pertinent agencies of the Government, including the Secret Service.

The organization is headquartered at Norborne, Mo., and is headed by Robert DePugh.

Minutemen claims its primary purpose is to prepare its members to overthrow the Government of the United States in the event the Government is taken over by the Communists. In January 1966 DePugh advised special agents of the FBI that this country needs to get rid of those "parasites in Washington and draw up a new Constitution inasmuch as the old one is outmoded."

DePugh has also said that the Minutemen, as an organization does not buy or store arms, but individual members maintain whatever arms and ammunition they purchase with their own personal funds "which is their constitutional right."

He has stated that his organization will stress "infiltration" of opposing groups, and turn to armed revolt only as a last resort. He has said that "we feel that with the use of intelligence, security, propaganda, and infiltration we can turn our enemies' weapons against themselves." He has stated that the Minutemen advocate "armed resistance only when it has become very apparent to all the people that Communists or Fascists have overtaken the Government and all the people themselves are willing to support an armed revolution." An excellent example of this organization's effort to store munitions is shown by the fact that in June 1965 through information furnished by the FBI, local authorities located 36 sticks of dynamite and other blasting equipment in Prince William County, Va. The explosives were stored by a local Minutemen unit which had been using the area as a training site.

We have long been aware of the Minutemen organization and our investigation indicates the organization is a loose federation, with each unit acting independently and lacking any real central control. DePugh is the only known leader of the group and acts as its sole spokesman.

DePugh avoids the responsibility of trying to substantiate all of the things he says of the Minutemen. For example, while he has placed the membership of the organization at "more than 25,000," there is little real evidence that the Minutemen is anything more than essentially a paper organization with a membership estimated at 500.

Nationalist activities in Puerto Rico

Another continuing internal security problem is the activity of the violent revolutionary minority among the advocates of independence for Puerto Rico. The bulk of these individuals advocating independence by violence are affiliated with nine proindependence organizations all of which are under active investigation.

These groups are active principally in Puerto Rico and among the Puerto Rican population in New York and Chicago. The chief danger from them continues to lie in acts of violence on the part of small groups or individuals. In the past, these acts have ranged from arson and sabotage to an attempt to assassinate the President of the United States in November 1950 and the shooting of Members of Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1954.

Demonstrations protesting U.S. policy toward Vietnam

Demonstrations protesting U.S. policy toward Vietnam which have been held throughout the United States during 1965 have most certainly been a factor resulting in additional demands upon our manpower because of the interest in and support of some demonstrations by some of the subversive organizations I have discussed.

Since February 1965, scarcely a day has gone by without a demonstration in some city. Particularly active have been faculty members and students from colleges and universities in all sections of this country. Demonstrations have taken the form of sit-ins, teach-ins, picket lines, speak-outs and widespread distribution of material criticizing U.S. efforts in Vietnam.

The Communist Party and other subversive groups such as the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, a Communist-inspired, Marxist-oriented youth group; the Socialist Workers Party, which has been designated as subversive by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450; its youth affiliate, the Young Socialist Alliance; the Progressive Labor Party, a pro-Chinese Marxist group and its affiliate, the May 2 Movement; and the Workers World Party, a pro-Chinese Communist splinter group, have actively supported and participated in demonstrations along with the Students for a Democratic Society, a youth group with active Communist infiltration.

There follows the highlights on five national demonstrations we have had during the past year.

Student March on Washington

On April 17, 1965, a student march on Washington, sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society, attracted an estimated 15,000 participants. Included among the participants were Arnold Johnson, Communist Party, U.S.A. public relations director, and Michael Zagarell, national youth director of the party. George Meyers, a member of the national board of the party, distributed copies of The Worker an east coast Communist newspaper, during this demonstration. Numerous other Communist Party members were observed participating. Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, reported that the Communists participated in the march and described it as an 'unforgettable event." Zagarell said "we" played a decisive role and Johnson stated "our" people were there from all over the country.

National Teach-Ins

The Inter-university Committee for a Public Hearing on Vietnam, which is now known as the Interuniversity Committee for a Public Hearing on Foreign Policy, sponsored a national teach-in on May 15, 1965, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C. This committee, which is headquartered at Ann Arbor, Mich., is the brainchild of faculty members at the University of Michigan. Its secretary is Prof. Anatol Rapoport of the university who is a self-admitted former Communist Party member.

The teach-in, which was carried by telephonic hookups to campuses throughout the United States, drew nearly 4,500 individuals to Washington, D.C. While advance publicity described the teach-in as an airing of

both sides of the Vietnam issue, the actual teach-in proved to be one sided. Speakers were almost unanimous in condemning U.S. policy. Among the speakers were Prof. Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago who stated, "If we . . . succeed in our present policy, South Vietnam will become a colony of the United States." He contended that the United States did not have the courage to "retreat or advance too far."

Isaac Deutscher of London, England, was a featured speaker. He described himself as a Marxist who had been expelled from the Communist Party because of his opposition to Stalin. He denied that the United States was threatened by any major Communist power and said that U.S. policy had disillusioned the world.

Comments from the audience included such statements as the United States should withdraw from Vietnam; the United States needs a positive foreign policy; the United Nations should some day take precedence over national sovereignty; and Congress should have a hearing concerning American policy.

Washington summer action project

Students for a Democratic Society, joined by the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America; the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a civil rights group; and the Committee for Nonviolent Action, sponsored a demonstration in Washington, D.C., from August 6 through August 9, 1965, under the title "Washington Summer Action Project." This demonstration included picketing of the White House and a sit-in at the White House gate entrance, and workshops on Vietnam, the draft, Puerto Rico, and South Africa. On August 9, the demonstrators marched to the Capitol Grounds for the purpose of staging a "Congress of Unrepresented People" to declare peace in Vietnam. The sponsors of the demonstration had previously announced their intention of actually occupying congressional seats; however, they were stopped at the boundary of the Capitol Grounds. Numerous demonstrators were arrested when they attempted to enter the grounds. As with other demonstrations, the Communist Party and other subversive organizations supported and participated in the Washington summer action project. Among the Communist Party members noted were James Jackson, a member of the party's national committee, and Michael Zagarell, the national youth leader of the party. Demonstrations were held throughout the United States during this period in support of the Washington Summer Action Project.

International Days of Protest

The Vietnam Day Committee, Berkeley, Calif., designated October 15 and 16, 1965, as international days of protest and issued a call for groups throughout the world to join it in demonstrating on those days. Massive civil disobedience was urged on October 16.

As a result of this call to action, demonstrations were held in cities throughout the United States and in some foreign countries. These demonstrations took the form of picketing, sit-ins, teach-ins, burning of draft cards, and parades.

The Communist Party and other subversive groups once again vigorously supported and participated in these demonstrations.

In Berkeley, the demonstration started with a teach-in at the University of California. Speakers were unanimous in condemning the United States and one speaker called for the impeachment of President Johnson. On the evening of October 15, approximately 8,000 demonstrators began a march from the University of California to Oakland Army Terminal, Oakland, Calif., where they hoped to carry their message to U.S. troops. The committee had previously called for civil disobedience at the terminal. They were frustrated when Oakland authorities refused to allow them to march through Oakland.

In New York City, the Whitehall Speak-Out Committee, an ad hoc group of the War Resisters League, sponsored a parade and a rally to protest the draft and U.S. action in Vietnam. During the rally, it was announced that Robert Thompson, a high official of the Communist Party, U.S.A., had died and that he was a sponsor of International Days of Protest in New York City. Approximately 50 Communist Party members, including such well-known Communist Party officials as Gilbert Green, Arnold Johnson, and Mike Stein were observed participating in this demonstration. Over 20 members of the Workers World Party participated. Jack Barnes, a member of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, was active during the demonstration.

Demonstrations throughout the country attracted large numbers of counterdemonstrators who were in favor of U.S. policy. In some instances, the counterdemonstrators outnumbered the demonstrators.

March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam

The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy sponsored a march on Washington for peace in Vietnam on November 27, 1965. Approximately 12,000 marchers picketed the White House carrying slogans calling for a negotiated peace in Vietnam, an end to the war in Vietnam, and the withdrawal of troops from that country. After the picketing was concluded, approximately 20,000 demonstrators gathered at the Sylvan Theater on the Washington Monument grounds to hear various speakers who were critical of U.S. action in Vietnam.

As in the past, Communist Party members, including several national functionaries, actively participated in this march. Literature was distributed by the Communist Party and other subversive organizations and Vietcong flags were displayed by some participants.

Students for a Democratic Society

One of the most militant organizations now engaged in activities protesting U.S. foreign policy is a student youth group called Students for a Democratic Society. Communists are actively promoting and participating in the activities of this organization, which is self-described as a group of liberals and radicals. This organization currently claims a membership in excess of 3,000 in over 100 chapters throughout the United States, and its members are most vocal in condemning the American way of life and our established form of government.

This organization sponsored a march on Washington to protest U.S. action in Vietnam which took place on April 17, 1965. Communists from throughout the Nation participated in this march and over 70 past or present Communist Party members from New York City alone, including several national leaders, were observed among the participants.

A national convention of this organization was held at a camp near Kewadin, Mich., in June 1965. Practically every subversive organization in the United States was represented by delegates to this convention. There were delegates from the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth and training section of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, which has been designated as subversive pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Also represented were the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the Spartacist group, a Trotskyite splinter organization. Other delegates represented the Progressive Labor Party, a Marxist-Leninist organization following the line of Communist China, and the May 2 Movement, a front group of the Progressive Labor Party.

At this convention, a number of proposals were made to further oppose the U.S. action in Vietnam. One Students for a Democratic Society leader called for deliberate violation of the sedition statutes by Students for a Democratic Society members which it was hoped would result in mass arrests and a "political trial" of the organization. Members were urged to attempt to enter military bases to persuade soldiers that they should refuse to fight in Vietnam.

At a meeting of the national council, the governing body of the Students for a Democratic Society which was held over the 1965 Labor Day weekend, 20 of the approximately 100 participants had past or present affiliations with the Communist Party or other subversive groups. A vigorous antidraft program was proposed at this meeting, which included plans to counsel draft-age youth on how to avoid the draft. This proposal was later submitted to the Students for a Democratic Society membership by referendum for approval but was defeated by a narrow majority.

In spite of this, Students for a Democratic Society leaders recently announced that each local chapter would make its own decisions as to whether an antidraft program would be undertaken by that particular chapter.

During the last week of December 1965, the antidraft program and the Vietnam protest movement again were subjects which dominated discussions at a national membership conference of this group held at Urbana, Ill. Heated exchanges took place between various factions, some of which wanted to continue with a "hard line" and others wanting to retreat entirely from all protest activity in connection with the Vietnam issue. Although no foreign policy decisions resulted from this conference, the Students for a Democratic Society has continued to sponsor and participate in demonstrations throughout the United States protesting U.S. action in Vietnam.

The party and Vietnam

The Communist Party, U.S.A., held a 3-day meeting of its national committee and invited guests from January 15 through January 17, 1966, in New York City. Gus Hall, general secretary of the party, in discussing the Vietnam situation, cited the growing peace movement in this country as evidence that the people are becoming more discontented with U.S. policy toward Vietnam. He stressed the need for the Communist Party to become more active in the protest movement against U.S. policy.

Herbert Aptheker, a member of the Communist Party national committee, spoke concerning his recent visit to Hanoi with Asst. Prof. Staughton Lynd of Yale University and Thomas Hayden, a founder and an official Students for a Democratic Society, a youth group with heavy Communist infiltration. Lynd is a former member of American Youth for Democracy, which has been designated as subversive by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

Aptheker announced that he had met with the Central Committee of the Communist Party of North Vietnam. At this meeting, which was not attended by Lynd or Hayden, officials of the central committee were, according to Aptheker, "deliriously happy" that the Communist Party, U.S.A., had established contact with the Communist Party of North Vietnam.

Coverage of Communist Party, U.S.A., and other groups

There has been no letup in our programs to penetrate the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other groups and organizations operating against this country and against the rights of its citizens.

(Discussion off the record.)

TELEPHONE TAPS

Mr. HOOVER. Every year I have reported to this committee the activities of the Bureau in regard to wiretapping and I want to advise that this morning we have 32 telephone taps in operation. Their use is highly re-

stricted with a tight central control. Each must be authorized in advance and in writing by the Attorney General. All those in operation are in connection with matters in which the internal security of the country is involved.

ESPIONAGE AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

We are being confronted with additional problems in combating the espionage attacks mounted against this country.

Soviet-bloc official personnel

For one thing, the great bulk of the representatives of the Soviet bloc who are stationed in this country have some type of intelligence assignment and the number of these official representatives has increased substantially over the years. The number here on February 1, 1966, totaled 848.

I hand to the committee a chart showing the total Soviet-bloc official personnel and their dependents in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall insert this exhibit at this point in the record.

(The exhibit follows:)

Total Soviet-bloc official personnel in the United States

[Includes officials and dependents of Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Outer Mongolia,* Poland and Rumania. Does not include couriers, members of special delegations and other officials temporarily in the United States and not assigned to official establishments]

July 1, 1960:	
Official personnel	557
Unofficial personnel	801
Total	1,358
July 1, 1961:	
Official personnel	609
Unofficial personnel	883
Total	1,492
July 1, 1962:	
Official personnel	645
Unofficial personnel	887
Total	1,532
July 1, 1963:	
Official personnel	663
Unofficial personnel	973
Total	1,636
July 1, 1964:	
Official personnel	654
Unofficial personnel	944
Total	1,598
July 1, 1965:	
Official personnel	713
Unofficial personnel	1,004
Total	1,717
July 1, 1966:	
Official personnel	848
Unofficial personnel	1,215
Total	2,063

* Since Oct. 22, 1961.

"Illegal" (deep cover) operations

Mr. HOOVER. The work of the official representatives of the Soviet-bloc countries who are assigned to the United States is being supplemented to an increasing degree by the "illegal", deep cover intelligence agents who are being dispatched into this country.

This, for example, may be an individual who enters the country among a group of refugees. It might be an individual who enters as an immigrant. On the other hand, it might be someone already in this country who was recruited here by the foreign intelligence services. For the individual just arriving in this country, he may take no overt action on behalf of his foreign master for many years, becoming well assimilated into our way of life in the meantime.

These individuals usually bear assumed identities; are supplied with documents, usually false but always expertly fabricated, which a person in this country would normally have in his possession so as to bolster the assumed identity; and make no open contact with known representatives of the foreign governments which they serve.

The detection of these undercover spies constitutes a time-consuming, tedious investigative problem.

Targets are unlimited

In their intelligence-gathering operations, the Communist-bloc countries have a seemingly inexhaustible supply of funds. In carrying out their relentless quest, there is virtually no phase of our national life which goes unexplored. A list of material which they seek would constitute a voluminous catalog of life in the United States. The emphasis, of course, is on scientific, technological, military, and industrial data which will strengthen the Soviet bloc. At the same time, however, they are alert for any and all information—classified or unclassified—which will enable them to weaken the United States through propaganda or subversion.

As a result of several decades of development, the coordinated espionage attack against this country by the intelligence services of the Communist bloc has now reached an intensity which makes it the most massive offensive of its kind ever mounted.

Red China

At the same time, the security problem presented by Red China has assumed larger proportions. Our workload has more than doubled during the past several months. Red China has made concerted efforts to acquire unclassified technical data shipped from this country for their libraries and government agencies. Because of their lack of basic research, it is only logical to assume that they will resort to other means, such as espionage, to obtain information they cannot get publicly.

Cuba

Castro has been making a concerted effort to carry out his promise to export his revolution throughout the Western Hemisphere. The Cuban Government has given its full support to groups advocating independence for Puerto Rico.

The increasing effort of Cuba to expand its intelligence apparatus has now reached into the lives of Cuban refugees in the United States. Since March 1965 over 25 Cuban refugees here have received unsolicited letters aimed at recruiting the addressee to gather and report intelligence data to Cuba. The Cuban spy apparatus boldly calls on these refugees to report intelligence data to a specified address in Cuba and gives instructions concerning secret ink preparations to be used in forwarding the data.

To supplement his intelligence coverage by personnel at the Cuban mission to the United Nations at New York City, over the past months Castro has augmented his diplomatic staffs in Canada and Mexico. It is obvious that the open U.S. borders with those countries are inviting targets for the known Cuban intelligence agents assigned as diplomats in Canada and Mexico.

The current influx of Cuban refugees, which is the result of the recent U.S. offer to permit their entry into this country, could result in more than 100,000 Cubans coming to the United States. If this occurs, it will undoubtedly increase our workload, primarily in the Miami area but also throughout the United States wherever the refugees settle. In addition to checking our files concerning the new influx of refugees it will be necessary for the FBI to resolve any allegations of a security matter with regard to the refugees. From past experience it can be anticipated that the Castro regime will seek to take advantage of the influx of refugees in order to infiltrate intelligence agents.

The Tricontinental Conference—Havana, Cuba, 1966

The Tricontinental Conference, also referred to as the Tricontinent Conference, was held in Havana, Cuba, from January 3 to 14, 1966, with 83 African, Asian and Latin American countries represented. Approximately 450 delegates attended, with Communist China having the largest representation next to Cuba. Western observers believe the convening of the conference was an attempt by the Soviets to gain the dominating role in the existing two-continent group known as Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization (AAPSO), which has been under the control of Communist China. It was believed that the Soviets felt the holding of the Conference in the Western Hemisphere and the inclusion of 20 to 30 Latin American delegations, who historically follow the Soviet line rather than the Communist China line, would swing the balance of power to the Soviet Union. Fidel Castro, of course, considered the holding of this major Conference in Havana to be recognition of him as a world revolutionary leader.

Nothing was released at the conference concerning ideological differences arising there between the Soviets and the Communist Chinese. Various resolutions were adopted concerning anti-imperialism and anticolonialism in the Western Hemisphere, chiefly aimed at the United States. It was agreed that a committee would be formed with headquarters in Havana to coordinate "national liberation" movements on the three continents. The Soviet announcements concerning this new committee indicated a permanent-type headquarters was being established in Havana until the next Tricontinental Conference meeting in Cairo, Egypt, during 1968, while the Communist Chinese announcements showed the Havana headquarters was set up on a provisional basis only and the consensus is that the Communist Chinese will try to have a meeting of the AAPSO in 1967 in Peiping, China, at which the Communist Chinese line would be expected to prevail.

From Cuba's standpoint, the Conference was quite successful in that there were unanimous resolutions against presence of foreign military bases and troops in "oppressed" countries and Castro was able to make a big show of offering aid to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Castro castigated the U.S. "military occupation" of the Dominican Republic and projected that Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, and Venezuela were ripe for revolutionary overthrows of their Governments. The most overt action taken occurred after the Tricontinental Conference officially adjourned on January 14, 1966, when representatives from 27 of the Latin American delegations attending the conference formed the Latin American Solidarity Organization with headquarters in Havana. Present were Fidel Castro, Cuban President Dorticos, and other high Cuban officials with a Venezuelan delegate acting as chairman. The announced aims of the Organization were to prepare for a Latin American solidarity conference in 1967, to support "liberation" movements by all means available and to firmly back "liberated" countries which may be attacked by imperialism. This group also resolved to "develop a constant campaign against the increasing policy of Yankee imperialism and its false, cynical and hypocritical propaganda used to hide its vandalistic actions in the Western Hemisphere."

While the various delegations attending the Conference were referred to as "country"

delegations, thus implying that they were official delegations, only radical groups attended from Western Hemisphere countries and most of them have little or no significance in their own countries. Nevertheless, we can expect a marked increase in Cuban, Soviet, and Communist Chinese propaganda and subversion within the Western Hemisphere if a working committee is formed in Havana on a permanent basis. U.S. installations throughout Central and South America can expect to have their hands full if this group does become effective.

Latin America

Latin America remains one of the most explosive and vulnerable areas in the world for Communist subversive operations. Because of the increased efforts of the Soviet bloc, Communist China and the Castro regime to promote unrest and subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere, practically every Latin American country represents a potential crisis area. The FBI's responsibilities and intelligence collection efforts from sources available to us in this country have increased significantly. The Dominican Republic is a case in point.

Following instructions of the President, FBI personnel arrived in the Dominican Republic on May 21, 1965, on a special assignment in connection with the Dominican crisis. As a result of our past experience and contacts in the Dominican field, our agents were able to become operational on a crash basis immediately upon arrival at Santo Domingo.

Our present staff in Santo Domingo consists of 11 agents and 10 clerical employees.

The role played by the FBI during the Dominican crisis has been most significant. We developed and disseminated to top officials of the Government voluminous intelligence data of the highest quality, concerning activities of key Dominican personalities who had the potential to influence the outcome of the crisis which began April 24, 1965.

Intelligence developed, which at the peak of the crisis was described by a key U.S. official as the "lifeblood" of U.S. negotiations, has enabled us to keep the intelligence community well informed concerning a number of crucial points, thereby enhancing this country's efforts in the establishment of law and order in the Dominican Republic.

Counterintelligence operations

Aggressive programs are underway in all areas to uncover and combat the many and varied espionage thrusts being carried on against this Nation and its officials.

(Discussion off the record.)

Propaganda attacks against U.S. agencies by Soviet KGB

Mr. HOOVER. The KGB—the Soviet Committee of State Security—is waging an attack against U.S. agencies. The nefarious schemes of the Soviets, through their "Disinformation Department," were exposed in a report prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency in 1965. Details of the Agency's study were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28, 1965. The study revealed that the FBI as an organization and I as its Director are priority targets for attacks.

The study disclosed that the overall objective of the Soviet attacks is to discredit U.S. agencies here and abroad and the study emphasized that a preferred instrument used by the Soviets in their attacks is the forged document.

Typical of the smear tactics used in such efforts was the circulation of letters in South America in the summer of 1964. My name was forged on letters which were designed to make it appear that the FBI and the CIA had something to do with the Brazilian revolution of April 1964. The intricacies of that Soviet scheme became further apparent when we determined that my signature had been forged from a letter stolen by the Cubans in Havana in 1960.

More recently, beginning in January 1966, scurrilous anonymous mailings prepared in Moscow by the KGB and sent to its branch in New York City have been mailed to various Members of Congress and other prominent Government officials and citizens. A letter supposedly signed by me is a crude forgery. Comparison of all these letters disclosed they had all been prepared by the same person. Further comparison with other letters circulated in the past in this and other countries by the Soviet "Disinformation Department," a part of the Soviet KGB, prove without a doubt that this is a Soviet scheme, amounting to character assassination both scurrilous and putrid.

The head of the New York residency of the KGB is a member of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations and as such he is immune to arrest and prosecution.

This is but one of many instances in which attachés to the United Nations from the Soviet bloc have doubled as intelligence and espionage agents.

I might say over 100 personnel engaged in espionage activities are attached to the KGB in New York City.

Deserter investigations

Along the same line, we have had a substantial increase in the number of requests from the military authorities to locate individuals declared by the military to be deserters.

We have cooperated with the various branches of the Armed Forces since 1945 in this program. By the close of the fiscal year 1965 some 204,000 deserter cases had been referred to us. Of this number, 201,714 had been closed by the apprehension of the deserter, his voluntary return to the service and the like.

During the fiscal year 1965 a total of 4,479 deserter fugitives were located, marking the sixth consecutive year during which the FBI located and returned to military control more deserter fugitives than during the prior year. This is a reflection of the growing volume of work in this area.

Communist participation in protests

Mr. SIKES. In the case of a group such as that in Washington on yesterday protesting the war in Vietnam, would the FBI of its own volition seek to determine whether there had been Communist-inspired connection with that particular march?

Mr. HOOVER. We may have informants and agents observing the group to see whether they recognize any Communists in it.

In the demonstrations that have taken place in the last several years, Communists are known to have participated in many of them because we follow closely on the activities of the Communists.

Communist activity in Cuba

Cuban Refugees

Mr. SIKES. Many Cuban refugees are now permitted to come into this country. To what extent have you determined that they are infiltrated with Communist agents?

Mr. HOOVER. I think we would be very naive if we didn't assume that among them would be some Castro agents. The great bulk of the Cuban refugees that come to this country are basically refugees trying to escape the terror and the maltreatment that they have suffered in Cuba.

They are screened by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We have men at the screening centers also in case any suspect that the Immigration Service develops may be referred to us for further processing.

As you know, in Miami proper there are about 100,000 Cuban refugees. They present an economic problem.

Mr. SIKES. A serious problem indeed.

Mr. HOOVER. I noticed when I was in Miami recently much of the help in the hotels are now Cubans and there is agitation and opposition from American-born workers as to why they cannot get the jobs instead of the Cubans.

There is another aspect to the problem of Cuban refugees. A great many scientific and professional men have come from Cuba and find it difficult to practice their profession. I believe that the University of Miami is making arrangements whereby courses can be given to doctors who come from Cuba that will enable them ultimately to pass the examination in Florida. Florida has a very strict rule against admitting anyone, either doctor or lawyer, to its practice unless they are U.S. citizens, residents of the State and unless they can pass the examination.

"Ché" Guevara

Mr. SIKES. Do you know of "Ché" Guevara's whereabouts, where he is, and what he is doing?

Mr. HOOVER. No, I do not know his whereabouts. There are rumors he has been killed by Castro. There are other rumors to the effect he has been in Venezuela, trying to stir up a revolution in that country. He also has been reported to be in Honduras, Guatemala, and most recently Vietnam.

I have my doubts that he has been killed. I think he is being kept in "deep freeze" for leading revolutions which may result from the Tri-Continental Conference which was held first part of January 1966 in Havana, Cuba.

The Tri-Continental Conference

Mr. SIKES. Does that conference and what came out of it indicate increasing strength in the Communist movement in the hemisphere?

Mr. HOOVER. It does. Russia participated. The convening of the conference shows very definitely that there has been an increase in the Communists strength in many of the South American and Central American countries. Of course, in the Caribbean countries, and in Santo Domingo, in the Dominican Republic, there are large elements of Communists. Castro has made a point of getting people into those countries to stir up more trouble. Yesterday, there was a very serious situation in the capital of the Dominican Republic, Santo Domingo, where several people were killed when fired upon by the police and palace guards at the palace.

Mr. SIKES. Does it also indicate that Havana is in fact the center of hemisphere Communist activities and that Castro is its leader?

Mr. HOOVER. That is true—the center of Castro communism.

Mr. SIKES. Have there not been some restrictions placed on free and easy travel between Mexico City and Havana?

Mr. HOOVER. There have been a few restrictions but it is still going on.

Mr. SIKES. No significant restrictions?

Mr. HOOVER. Nothing significant so far as security is concerned from our point of view.

MILITARY DESERTIONS

Mr. SIKES. One other question on the number of military desertions. This could be obtainable from the military but do you have for the last 5 years the number of desertions which have been reported to you?

Mr. HOOVER. I will get that and have it inserted in the record.

Mr. SIKES. Have you studied the reasons for the increase to which you referred in your statement?

Mr. HOOVER. I think the reason for it is the increase in the size of the military forces.

Mr. SIKES. It is numberswise?

Mr. HOOVER. It is numberswise, yes.

Mr. SIKES. Thank you. That is all.

(The information requested follows:)

Fiscal year:	Deserter referrals to FBI
1961	7,144
1962	7,384
1963	8,736
1964	10,646
1965	16,282

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. SLACK?

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Director, as always you have given this committee a very clear, concise, and most comprehensive statement.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to ask you if you are training your associate director, and your assistant directors, in this fine art which you have mastered, to develop the sense of communication with Members of Congress, members of this committee, and with the public generally in such a way as to naturally instill the confidence that you seem to?

Mr. HOOVER. We do carry on a very intensive program of getting over to our personnel, not only officials but the rank and file of our agents, the necessity for good public relations, by getting out and appearing before public groups, civic clubs and the like, talking on various matters about the Bureau.

As regards the officials of the Bureau, I would say there are a number who could today do what I do.

Mr. FLYNT. I hope that is correct. I think it is an indication of your modesty in making that statement. I must say that I hope that you are correct.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR AGENTS

Do you still require the same high standards of character and competence that have so long characterized the recruitment program of the FBI?

Mr. HOOVER. I have insisted that the same high qualifications that we have always had be adhered to strictly. I will not appoint any man merely because of the color of his skin. We have some employees who are full-blooded Indians. We have some who are full-blooded Chinese. We have white and Negro employees.

I will not lower the qualifications. I insist appointees be above average in intelligence and reputation, of good character, and be above average in personal appearance. I would rather have vacancies than employees who do not measure up to those qualifications.

Our turnover is one of the smallest among Government agencies and a great deal smaller than in manufacturing industries.

I am a strong believer in carefully screening men for appointment, as special agents as to character, education, and appearance. We bring them to Washington for 14 weeks' training, before we send them to the field where they are further trained and indoctrinated.

Mr. FLYNT. Let me express the hope that you will not lower those standards.

Mr. HOOVER. I will not lower them as long as I am Director.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. JOELSON?

Mr. JOELSON. Thank you.

Mr. Director, I also want to wish you continued success.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR AGENTS

I notice you stressed appearance with regard to the qualifications of employees.

Mr. HOOVER. I do.

Mr. JOELSON. I can understand physical requirements but why is appearance so important?

Mr. HOOVER. As regards appearance, Mr. Congressman, I certainly would not want to have any of the beatniks with long sideburns and beards as employees in the Bureau.

Mr. ROONEY. How about members of the Mattachine Society?

Mr. HOOVER. No member of the Mattachine Society or anyone who is a sex deviate will ever be appointed to the FBI. If I find one in the FBI he will be dismissed.

As to appearance our special agents, in a broad sense are really salesmen. They interview the presidents of large banks, the chairmen of the boards of large corporations, longshoremen, and laborers. They have to sell themselves to them to get their confidence to obtain the information that they need.

In addition they go on the witness stand and appear before juries. They must convince a jury of 12 people that they are testifying objectively, impartially and without emotion. Their personal appearance plays a great part in this.

I am not looking for the "collar ad" type, but I am looking for men who are clean cut, mature, and who will measure up to the image which I think the American people feel an FBI man should be.

In this regard, we cooperate with a weekly TV show. It is called "The FBI." I have received hundreds of letters from people saying that the inspector portrays what they thought an FBI inspector would portray. Efrem Zimbalist, Jr. is the inspector in the show. In other words, there is an image that people have of the FBI. I want our special agents to live up to that image.

CAMP MIDVALE

Mr. JOELSON. You mentioned this Camp Midvale up in New Jersey which, after redistricting, may be in my district. This camp for Communist youth that was held there, I noticed in your statement it was a 2-week camp.

Mr. HOOVER. That is correct.

Mr. JOELSON. Is this camp itself a permanent establishment?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes. It is utilized by the Communist Party.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. Director, the FBI is a member of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference and the U.S. Intelligence Board and does make recommendations and offer plans concerned with strengthening internal security of our Nation.

Do you feel that our present setup in regard to internal security is up to topnotch efficiency at the present time?

Mr. HOOVER. First, as to the Interdepartmental Intelligence Conference, I am the Chairman, and the other members are the heads of Army Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and Air Force, Office of Special Investigations. A representative from the National Security Council attends meetings as an observer.

I think this Committee has been most effective in ironing out problems and difficulties between the member agencies. I have been Chairman of this Committee for many years and I know of no instance in which the heads of the other agencies participating have not cooperated with us as to the need for certain security measures to be taken.

The most that we can do is to recommend certain steps to be taken to the Attorney General. As to whether the recommended steps are adopted or not adopted lies within his province.

We are a member of the U.S. Intelligence Board.

I think the internal security today is as strong as it ever has been and has improved over the years.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. It is also a Communist objective, is it not, to downgrade, criticize, and try to split up our intelligence process?

Mr. HOOVER. That has been the case, as I cited in my testimony. The KGB, which has a very substantial number of men in New York attached to its residency office there, the head of which is a member of the United Nations Soviet mission, is engaged at all times in trying to discredit by use of forged documents or any other method they can use to discredit U.S. intelligence agencies, principally the CIA and the FBI. Every now and then they go after somebody else, but we are the two main targets as we have caused them the most trouble as far as their activities are concerned. We have been able to keep abreast of their activities.

The unfortunate thing is that some people in this country, perhaps well-meaning, not necessarily dupes, are willing to accept the idea that we can live in peaceful coexistence. I don't believe you can live in peaceful coexistence with a country that every year has intensified its intelligence and espionage operations against this country.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The media—newspaper, radio and TV—should be very aware that deep research should be made into the material that they start picking up.

Mr. HOOVER. I think that is true. Many of the newspapers have done an excellent job. Some of the newspaper chains such as the Hearst, Scripps-Howard, Newhouse and the Copley Press and various other chains of that type, have done an excellent job. Some columnists have done a very effective job.

I do not believe that everybody who is opposed to the foreign policy in Vietnam is necessary a Communist. That, of course, would be ridiculous as a charge, but there are many gullible people who are against the policy in Vietnam as a result of the propaganda put out by some college professors who are naive and some students lacking in maturity and objectivity are constantly agitating and carrying on demonstrations in some of our largest universities.

BAYARD RUSTIN

At the University of Maryland last year, at a law enforcement institute held for police officers of Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., the university invited Bayard Rustin to be one of the speakers. Bayard Rustin was convicted for sodomy, a violation of the Selective Service Act and was an admitted member of the Young Communist League. Such a selection was not to the credit of the university.

Mr. ROONEY. I intended to ask you about him. Was he convicted on his own plea of guilty to the crime of sodomy?

Mr. HOOVER. He was. He admitted sodomy. He was apprehended in Pasadena, Calif.

If they wanted a man to speak on civil rights they could have invited Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, who is a reputable man, or some other responsible racial leader. But to pick out a man who has such a bad background was wrong.

(Discussion off the record).

SOVIET TRADE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Director, there seems to be an increase in the contact that American businessmen are having with Soviet trade missions. You, upon other occasions, have warned and alerted American business that they should be careful in dealing with trading organizations such as Amtorg and other Communist trade organizations.

Are these trade organizations working now, do they still conduct and fit into the espionage picture?

Mr. HOOVER. Amtorg fits into it 100 percent. It is the main trade organization of the Soviet Government in this country.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. American business, in their interest to expand trade with the Communist countries, should still be very careful?

Mr. HOOVER. I think they should be particularly alert and keep their guard up.

I wrote an article for the Harvard Business Review some time ago on that very subject on the businessman and the spy. It concerned efforts to obtain information through businessmen and their concerns, that would be of value to the Soviet bloc in their activities in opposition to this country.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I think it is important they keep alert.

Mr. HOOVER. I think it is highly important they keep alert, that they know what is going on.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. This is like so many other things. They fail to realize that the Soviets are still out to "bury us" and that is economically and militarily.

Mr. HOOVER. Some forget that and think we can live in peaceful coexistence, which I think is a complete fallacy.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Again, Mr. Director, my thanks to you and to your associates for the dedicated job you are doing.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you, Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I share the opinion of my colleagues on the committee for the excellent presentation you have made and the progress you are making on this troublesome problem of crime in the country.

INCREASING CRIME RATE

Have you ever made any comparison between the rate of crime increase in the United States and that of other countries?

Mr. HOOVER. We have made limited comparisons but the data available is not comparable in most instances. Great Britain has had a great surge of crime. Russia has a serious crime problem. Practically all countries have had increases in crime. It seems to be a disease that is with us, and it is evident among the youth.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is one of the things that disturbs me, because every year we see an increase in all types of crime.

Mr. HOOVER. That is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. And we recognize as our population grows we are going to have a certain increase. As you state, in many areas of the world this is going on and that is taking place to a large extent by our young people who are going to have to assume more responsibilities of citizenship in future years.

If you look down the road with this fantastic increase in crime, it makes you a little concerned.

I see young people today having almost too much freedom of expression, and yet we want freedom of expression, but it doesn't seem to be channeled in the right way.

Do you have any ideas as to how we can handle this?

Mr. HOOVER. The first step is with the family. This is where discipline should start, but unfortunately it does not start there. That leaves the problem to the schools and to the churches. They do as much as they possibly can, but they cannot take the place of the father and the mother.

It is difficult in many instances to tell whether a young person is a boy or a girl from the clothes they wear, the way they fix their hair and so forth.

On the other hand I see groups which come through the Bureau on tours and I meet many of them. I have been very pleased to find many of the youths in these groups are cleancut, good looking—so much so I generally talk to them to see whether they want to come into the Bureau when they graduate.

I think there is a substantial number of youth in this country who are very sound, but the ones who make the most noise and the ones who carry on the demonstrations, as at the University of California, at Berkeley, are in the minority. They are usually aided and assisted by a few "screwball" professors. Take the assistant professor at Yale, Staughton Lynd, who went to Hanoi. He went with Herbert Aptheker who is one of the top men of the Communist Party-U.S.A. and with Thomas Hayden, who is an official of the Students for a Democratic Society. Yet, Lynd came back to this country, made speeches and even went to London and made a public appearance there. The State Department did cancel his passport. I would have liked to have seen it canceled as soon as he got back from Hanoi.

Mr. CEDERBERG. This is one of the things that concerns me. We seem to condone some of these activities that are taking place within our country, without even using some of the remedies that we do have.

Mr. HOOVER. We have remedies such as in the burning of draft cards. There is a law against it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. What do we get by failing to take these actions against people like Professor Lynd?

Mr. HOOVER. The only way that I know to counteract them is for newspapers throughout the country to campaign and campaign strongly. Some newspapers are doing this which may generate public opinion resulting in a reaction in Congress and in the executive branch of the Government where the action has to come from.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Have you been requested to make any investigations on any of these so-called draft card burnings?

Mr. HOOVER. Yes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Have they actually burned their draft cards?

Mr. HOOVER. They have.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Have you reported this to the Department of Justice?

Mr. HOOVER. I have and steps have been taken in several instances to initiate prosecution.

Mr. ROONEY. There is information in this regard in the record.

Mr. HOOVER. Yes, there is.

STUDENT ROLE IN UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

Mr. CEDERBERG. I don't wish to prolong this discussion but I have a concern for the tendency of some of our young students to try to take the management of the university over as they do in many other countries, and I think that will be the downfall of education——

Mr. HOOVER. That is the trend, that the student body must have a greater say in the management of the schools.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I don't think they should have any more say, as far as the actual management of the university is concerned, beyond paying their tuition, attend classes, and the right of some expression, but not to take over the management in any way.

Mr. HOOVER. Your view has merit.

Another point is the fact that in some State universities political expediency enters the appointment of regents and so forth which can cause problems.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. In the February 1966 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, there is a message from the Director on this very subject: "The American College Student." It is an excellent message and I think with your permission we might enter it in the record at this point.

Mr. ROONEY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document referred to follows:)

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "New Left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense.

Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hardcore fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the anarchistic and seditious ring of these of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flareups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the New Left are part of the 100,000 "state of mind" members Gus Hall, the Party's General Secretary, refers to when he talks of party strength. He recently stated the Party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "one to two thousand" increase in membership in the last year.

For the first time since 1959, the Party plans a national convention this spring. We can be sure that high on the agenda will be strategy and plans to win the New Left and other new members. A communist student, writing in an official Party organ, recently stated, "There is no question but that the New Left will be won."

Thus, the communists' intentions are abundantly clear. We have already seen the effects of some of their stepped-up activities, and I firmly believe a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies. One recourse is to support and encourage the millions of youth who refuse to swallow the communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogues make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Mr. CEDERBERG. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Director, on behalf of the committee, I wish to thank you for a highly interesting and informative 3-hour session. It was well worthwhile and I express, on behalf of all members of the committee, our thanks to you for your fine and efficient administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. HOOVER. Thank you.

TRADE WITH COMMUNISTS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda campaign by the administration to promote trade with the Communists is continuing. The administration is conducting a systematic and widespread campaign to sell the American people on such trade under the theme of "building bridges."

How ironic that this theme is used, for while the American public at home is being seduced with the refrain "building bridges," their sons in Vietnam are being killed and maimed in combat efforts to destroy real Communist bridges.

A recent example of the "bridge-building" propaganda is contained in a Department of State booklet entitled, "Private Boycotts versus the National Interest." With attendant newspaper publicity thousands of copies of the booklet were made available to the American public on September 7.

Not only does the Department in the booklet attempt to sell the idea generally of expanding trade with Communist nations, it attempts to convince the American public and Members of this House and the other body of the merits in a piece of legislation which was sent to the Congress last May 11 to provide the executive branch with authority to negotiate commercial agreements with the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European Communist nations.

The Department of State booklet is remarkable for what it says and it is remarkable for what it fails to say.

Throughout the booklet one encounters self-serving terms such as "peaceful trade" or "trade in peaceful goods." It mentions trade in terms of Christmas tree ornaments, hams, vases, ashtrays, baskets, and tobacco. But the Department of State booklet does not discuss the kind of items the Communist countries want to and are obtaining from us which help build up their economic and military potential. Many export licenses have been granted which permit shipments to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries of advanced equipment and machines.

The Department of State does not comment on exporting American technology. And yet with increasing frequency the Federal Government grants licenses to export to the Communists technical data and prototypes.

In all Communist states military and economic factors are closely interrelated. There is every reason to believe that past exports of American technology could be used against us in our current war against communism in southeast Asia. And continued exports of American technology could be used against us in this and future wars. There is no reason to believe otherwise.

According to the administration's "bridge builders," there is no harm done if we trade with the "good" Communists. Those who control the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia are placed in that category. The administration "bridge builders" whenever possible avoid mention of the fact that these Communists are each day assisting North Vietnam.

Recently, at the very time that the State Department was distributing its latest propaganda booklet on buidling bridges, Radio Moscow was boasting that the Soviet Union has pledged to give North Vietnam all the aid it needs to strengthen its defenses and keep itself going economically. Radio Moscow boasted of the modern weapons, transportation equipment, drugs, food, and clothing it has given North Vietnam. Radio Moscow also boasted of how it has trained North Vietnamese pilots. And, according to Radio Moscow "All this help will continue." Significant amounts of supplies are also being sent to North Vietnam from other Eastern European Communist nations.

I call upon the administration to halt its efforts to propagandize the American people in this way. The American people will not be fooled or coerced into believing that the trade the Communists have in mind is in our national interest.

THE FIGHT AGAINST AIR POLLUTION

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the fight against air pollution, to which this Congress made a significant contribution last year, will be long and costly. But the lives and health—not to speak of the comfort, safety, and convenience—of most of our people are directly involved in this struggle.

Among the many obstacles to an effective effort to eliminate the sources of air pollution has been popular apathy—apathy bred by unawareness of the seriousness of the threat, by the myth that pollution is concentrated only in a few major industrial centers, and by a general lack of information about the causes and consequences of polluted air.

On the other hand, one of the most encouraging developments in recent months has been the increased attention which newspapers, magazines and book publishers, as well as radio and television, have devoted to this immensely important subject.

As one who represents a congressional district in which air pollution represents an immediate and ever-present danger, I have been actively concerned with this major domestic problem. Late last year, the New Jersey Education Association invited me to write a special article on the subject for their monthly magazine, an article which early this year I included in the RECORD. I have special reason, therefore, to welcome the effort now being made to awaken the American people to the grave threat they face in unclean air, and to hope that with new information will come the kind of universal demand for action that can speed our victory over this especially obnoxious form of environmental poison.

This week, Mr. Speaker, two of the Nation's most respected publications, the New York Times and the Saturday Evening Post, added their great weight to this fight. The findings which both publications report should leave no doubt in anyone's mind about the nature and the gravity of air pollution. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Saturday Evening Post article and the first two of a series of four being published this week by the times.

The articles follow:

[From the Saturday Evening Post magazine]

DEATH IN OUR AIR—ONCE A PROBLEM, NOW A CRISIS, AIR POLLUTION IS SICKENING AND KILLING THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS AND POISONING BOTH CITY AND SUBURB: UNLESS WE ACT, THINGS WILL GET WORSE

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

At one o'clock in the morning about a month ago, Peter Briola, a tough and spirited lawyer, sat up in bed with a familiar agony. He was alone in his white clapboard house in Lincoln, a town of 3,600 people in the middle of Maine. The typical New England homestead, among rolling and forested hills near the banks of the Penobscot River, looks like a romantic painting of an idyllic scene of peace and purity, of an unspoiled America.

"It was like all the other times, as though someone had you by the throat, trying to choke you. There was that terrible smell, like rotting dead stuff. You begin to cough and gasp. Your eyes run. You shut the windows, but it doesn't do any good. Nothing does any good."

Here among the ancient spruce of the deep woods a paper mill is pouring filth upon Peter Briola and his fellow townsmen. They suffer from a contamination that has now infested every city in the United States and not a few small towns. Today, polluted air threatens the health of most Americans, corrodes their property, obscures or obliterates their scenery and insults their peace of mind. Unclean air is no longer rare in American cities. It is the rule.

City and country, voices are rising to protest. Norman Cousins, editor of *Saturday Review* and chairman of a New York City task force on air pollution, recently concluded: "More poisons are pumped into the air in New York than anywhere else in the United States." Yet, Ed Christopherson, a writer who left Manhattan for Missoula, Mont., "Garden Spot of the West," found there was no place to hide. "When I lived in New York," he says, "I used to watch the clinkers come down the airshaft and remember how great the pine-scented evening downdrafts smelled in Missoula, and this was an important factor in my moving out here. Today Missoula is the country's second worst smog area. As a counter to the state's 'Big Sky Country' booster slogan, some Missoulans are posting signs out on the highways saying, 'Missoula, Montana—Dirty Sky Country.' "

Mrs. Peter Rose, a housewife on a major thoroughfare in Denver, "The Mile-High City," says: "Twenty years ago when we moved into this bungalow it was a delight. The yard had nice green grass and beautiful roses. The whole neighborhood was clean. The house needed only one good cleaning a week, and the curtains and drapes I used to clean twice a year. From the neighborhood you could see the mountains clearly most of the time, with snowcaps visible through that wonderful purple. But in the last few years, since they made the road one-way and started the traffic growing the way it has—well, about six years ago my husband began having eye trouble, irritation and watering. A short time later my eyes did the same

thing. We both began getting frequent inflammations like sinus trouble. The doctor has us use eyewashes every day now. The roses all shriveled and died. The lawn began to go. Half the time you can't see the mountains anymore. I have to clean the house every day, and it's still gritty and greasy. Curtains and drapes can stand cleaning every week. I've got forty-five windows in the house, and they need a cleaning every week instead of twice a year. It's the same house and the neighborhood is still a nice residential one, but the air has become dirty, uncomfortable and expensive."

Dr. La Rele Stephens, a physician in Moscow, Idaho, says he can almost tell by the barometer and the direction of the wind when he will begin getting calls from patients in Lewiston, a town of 13,000 that is 29 miles away: "When the wind blows the mill fumes over the town or there is a dead calm, the patients begin to come in with respiratory troubles, nasal congestion, allergies, difficulty in breathing, lot of sneezing. I'm convinced we get some deaths, too, because when the fumes make the natural fogs thicker, which you can tell by the smell, we get more automobile accidents."

Donald McLean, of Polk County, Fla., told a Senate committee that since phosphate plants began putting seven tons of fluorides a day into the air he has had to sell his cattle and his citrus groves because the cattle sickened and died, crops that used to mature in 80 days now take 200, barbed wire that used to last 20 years rots in 4, and he doesn't dare grow vegetables for his family for fear they will pick up the same chemicals that fall onto his pastures and groves. "It eats up the paint and etches glass, it kills trees, it kills cattle. It is an irritant to mucous membrane, and we have sore throats, tears run out of our eyes, we sneeze, we have nosebleeds. Gentlemen, am I a fool to assume that that stuff [is] injurious to humans?"

There is evidence that Mr. McLean is no fool.

Damage to health and property from unclean air is increasing. Some places, like Lincoln, Maine, and Polk County, Fla., have special and dramatic problems. But every American city of more than 50,000 population has air pollution serious enough to worry about, whether or not its citizens see or smell it. Smoky industry and dark motor exhausts provide extra doses, but masses of atmospheric poisons come from smokeless chimneys and from perfectly tuned engines. Four-fifths of all pollution is invisible, most of it odorless.

Three years ago, when open fires, incinerators, chimneys, smokestacks and tail pipes were putting 125 million tons of chemical junk into the American air, the threat was already serious. But the burden has risen relentlessly until this year it is 145 million tons and headed still higher.

There is a vast ocean of clean air around the earth, enough for 2.5 million tons for each human being. Yet people become uncomfortable and sick for lack of each man's requirement of 30 pounds of clean air a day. The 2.5 million tons elsewhere does a man no good if what is under his nose is dirty and dangerous, if he cannot get his 30 daily pounds where he lives and works.

It was not until after World War II, when city air became loaded with the wastes of the new prosperity, that Americans began to notice that they don't always have access to air they can see above them. For there is a lid, usually invisible from the ground, that regularly cuts off whole communities from the upper air and traps the accumulated poisons of smokestack and tail pipe at the lower levels, where men breathe. Now that men recognize the container that periodically locks in communities with their aerial wastes, they also realize, with justified uneasiness, that clean air is man's most urgent demand upon his environment. He can do without water for days and without food for weeks. But he cannot hold his breath for more than a minute or two. Then he must breathe, even if it kills him. As it sometimes does.

"There is no doubt," John Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, said recently, "that air pollution is a contributing factor to the rising incidence of chronic respiratory diseases—lung cancer, emphysema, bronchitis and asthma."

In four days of 1948 polluted air sickened 43 percent of the population of Donora, Pa., and killed 20; in four days of 1952 it killed 4,000 people in London; in 15 days of 1963 it killed 400 people in New York City. Polluted air undoubtedly kills many people in many other places, but they are not counted because the death certificates never read "air pollution," and few cities ever analyze how many "extra" deaths they get during a seige of severe pollution.

Yet few Americans are aware of the alarming growth of respiratory disease—doubling every five years in the United States. Few suspect that foul air is most probably a factor in the rise in allergic-like reactions, or that it may contribute to the common cold. Emphysema, a fast-growing disease of the lung and almost surely the result of air pollution, has no public reputation. Emphysema creeps up in the form of increasing colds, chest congestion, breathlessness; and then, usually after age 50, there is a definite diagnosis and ultimately death. California has recorded an astounding 300 percent increase in cases since 1955. About seven percent of all Social Security disability payments, $80 million a year, is paid for emphysema victims, who are second in number only to those with arteriosclerotic heart disease.

There is argument over the cause of lung cancers. The American Cancer Society, for example, blames tobacco and says the effect of air pollution is insignificant. Most opinion is that tobacco is the primary cause and air pollution an aggravation. When age differentials and smokers are eliminated from the statistics, there are 39 lung-cancer deaths per 100,000 in rural areas and 52 in cities. These cancer-death rates are proportional to the size of the city, and so is air pollution. In the laboratory, compounds found in air pollution can create animal cancers.

Every city has its own mixture of poisons. The various blends are depicted by a special machine that can draw air through a clean white filter and in 24 hours trap as many solid particles as human lungs would trap in 3 months. A filter from downtown in a pleasant Virginia city is a deep mauve, from an Oklahoma suburb a pale gray, from industrial Georgia dark brown, from a big city in Ohio copper-black, from a mill town in West Virginia pitch black. Yet, as appalling as they are, the soiled filters do not show the more poisonous component of air pollution, the gases, which weigh nine times more than the visible particles.

Even when unclean air does not kill people or hurt their health, it often makes their lives miserable. It stings their eyes, dries out their throat tissues. It envelops their cities in a thick smog that blanks out the scenery. It sends offensive smells into their homes and produces an estimate $11 billion damage a year to property, such as paint and metal and masonry.

In every urban area of the country it has reduced vegetation of all kinds, from petunias to mighty oaks, by 10 to 20 percent. It kills some plants, blights new shoots, damages leaves to cut off nourishment and produces premature old age. Perennials are now harder to grow because of the peculiar atmospheric soup that comes out of automobile tail pipes. Dr. C. Stafford Brandt, chief of the agricultural section of the U.S. Public Health Service's Air Pollution Division says, "From Washington to Boston and inland for a hundred miles there is not a square mile that is free from air-pollution injury. I don't see how anyone can look at our evidence and not become gravely concerned with the effect on our vegetation." Sometimes the evidence is obvious: One night of heavy industrial output killed $10,000 worth of commercially grown flowers on Staten Island, N.Y. Most of it is more subtle: Fruit trees grown in normal city air are 10 percent smaller and produce 10 percent less fruit than trees in clean air.

Air pollution is mainly the result of things burning—gasoline in cars, coal and oil in factories and homes, trash and garbage in incinerators and dumps. The curve of dirty air follows fairly closely the curve of national wealth—more cars to put out exhaust, more power plants to make electricity, more factories to turn out goods, more trash to burn. This is why air pollution has reached serious levels in the 1960s. The biggest single source of air contamination, gasoline consumption in motor vehicles, doubled in the 20 years before 1945 but almost quadrupled in the 20 years since then. Starting in 1968, the auto industry will install antipollution devices in all new cars. Still, in the next decade the air is going to get even thicker—urban population, motor vehicles, electricity production and trash will greatly increase.

Another factor aggravating the situation is that the nature of aerial wastes is changing. For example, when the plastics now common in households are burned, some of them yield phosgene, a poison gas used in World War I. A report of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council says: "Chemical poisons are being produced in new forms so fast that the toxicologists cannot keep up with them."

Bad air once was a problem of the poor. "The wrong side of the tracks" as an expression for the lower-class section of town came from the days of coal-burning locomotives. Neighborhoods downwind of the cinders and smoke were so unpleasant that those who could afford it brought homes upwind. But the postwar population explosion in people and the even greater one in tail pipes and smokestacks have begun to end the delicate class distinction in breathing. It is still generally true that the farther from industrial centers one can get, the cleaner his air; but expensive suburbia is no guarantee of pure air. For one thing, the high-speed highway carries a growing burden of exhaust to the suburbs. For another, the atmospheric lids that keep pollution near the ground frequently cover large areas, often thousands of square miles, and the quantities of aerial poisons that the modern metropolis puts into the air quickly raise the level of pollution over the entire area, not just in the neighborhoods around the smokestacks. It is more and more common that everyone, rich and poor, breathes polluted air. Fewer and fewer of us are immune to the problem.

Peter Briola, the attorney in Lincoln, Me., lives at 43 West Broadway. When he put new bronze street numbers on his house not long ago, they quickly turned black. When he pried loose the "4" and the "3", the backs, protected from the air, were still shiny. But the air in Lincoln has caused Briola deeper concern than the loss of brilliance of the numbers on his door.

"My wife, Helen, was born and brought up in this town," he says. "It's had a paper mill for a long time. In fact, her grandfather sold them the land for their mill. I came to Maine in 1932 and later met Helen. We liked it here in Lincoln. Helen always lived here, and I liked it, too. There's beautiful scenery with the forests and lots of nice, clear lakes and clean air. Then in 1957–1958 another company bought the paper mill and put in what they called an 'improved' process. I can remember when we first knew they had started it.

"It was one night in the fall of Fifty-eight. We had both gone to bed and were asleep by maybe ten-thirty. About eleven o'clock we both woke up. We can't breathe. It seems as though someone is trying to gag you, and there's a terrible smell like rotten eggs. I remember saying, 'What's happening? What's going on?'

"I looked out the window, and there was a tremendous dense fog that was not like anything I'd seen here before. It was like thick, thick smoke, and it stuck to the ground. I can't tell you how terrible the smell was.

"We closed the windows, but it permeated everything. We couldn't sleep all night. The next morning I went out and I was dumbfounded. Just dumfounded. I had just had the house painted that summer. And now it was coffee color. Overnight. We had galvanized hooks holding up the clothesline. They were all shot as though they were a hundred years old. I had a Ford then, and you should have seen it. The paint was all pebbled, the chrome all tarnished. The wires on the TV antenna were shot. Then the wind shifted and the sun came out. House after house on streets all over town, the same thing happened. We were a coffee-colored town. After a couple of weeks of sunshine, the coffee color bleached out and then the paint was gray and peeling.

"So that's what would happen every time there was a dead calm or the wind came from the northeast—the house would turn coffee color, and inside we'd choke, eyes would weep, nose and throat would burn, you'd get nosebleeds. The worst thing was that you just couldn't get enough air.

"We called the sheriff and he took pictures, and we complained to the state Department of Health, and I complained to the mill. But they wouldn't do a damn thing. They'd say that they were doing everything they could, but then it would happen again. They said, 'Well, it's a new process, and whatever happens to the houses is OK after the sun comes out.' I said, 'What about the people?' and they said, 'We don't know what we can do about it.'

"The town council didn't want to be too tough because the mill had hired four hundred people in town, and they'd hint they'd move.

"Well, I know Sen. EDMUND MUSKIE, and when he started holding hearings on air pollution, I wrote to him, and he invited me to testify. I went down to Boston a year ago February, and I told the whole story.

"After that, the company changed the top management at the mill, they recovered some of the sulfuric acid they used to let out, and they put pine scent into the gases. But the stench still chokes you and wakes you up at night."

Last July Helen Briola died of cancer of the lymph glands.

"We suffered and suffered with these inflammations. Who can say how she got the cancer? Her death certificate says 'asphyxiation, edema, vocal cords.' Who can say? I can't. But it's something that you think of."

Mrs. Carter Henderson is a tall and handsome blonde from England who lives in circumstances quite different from those of Peter Briola. She and her husband—an executive in an electronics firm—and their five-year-old daughter have a $500-a-month apartment in midtown Manhattan. It is the kind of apartment most city-dwellers dream of: six rooms, two rooftop terraces on the 22nd floor with views of both sides of the great city, and inside the living room, two-story windows looking out at skyscrapers and New Jersey.

But the rooftop location is no longer such a blessing in New York, for it is next to the apartment chimney, one of 13,000 in the city; the chimney carries out the particles, gases and odors produced by burning all the apartment's trash and garbage. Nearby are four red-white-and-blue stacks of the Consolidated Edison powerhouse, one of the company's 11 around the city, most with pollution controls inferior to those in cities serious about clean air. The Hendersons also get more than their share—since they are affluent enough to afford a rooftop apartment—of the fallout from the 47 city-run incinerators, all of them operating in violation of the city's own air-pollution laws.

"My husband and I are early risers," Mrs. Henderson says, "and on some Sunday mornings at six o'clock you can see a lovely view—the George Washington Bridge and the Palisades in New Jersey ten miles away. About seven o'clock the chimneys and cars start up, and sometimes in winter by nine o'clock you can't see the Chrysler Building four blocks away."

When Mrs. Henderson first came to New York in 1956, she was shocked by the dirty air, though at that time it seemed a minor nuisance to natives. She was a founder of Citizens for Clean Air, Inc., a group of 1,000 business and professional leaders agitating for pollution control. They seem to have succeeded in launching the reform of New York's primitive anti-pollution laws.

Like Mrs. Henderson in New York, Peter Briola in Lincoln and Mrs. Rose in Denver, there are men and women all over the country organizing to fight for cleaner air. But theirs is a difficult battle. For the enemy known collectively as air pollution is really a complex of hostile ingredients, each of them extremely hard to vanquish. And each of these ingredients is more potent when combined with its fellow poisons than when found alone.

Of the total of 145 million tons of junk Americans put into their air every year, it is estimated that 52 percent is the colorless and invisible gas called carbon monoxide. That remarkable equipment of natural man—the dime-sized tissue at the top of the nasal passage that can detect some odors better than any device made by man—is useless when it comes to this deadly gas.

It is recognized that at 1,000 parts of monoxide per million parts of air, the gas kills quickly. At 100 parts it produces bad headaches and dizziness. At present, 50 parts is considered the danger point. But as we learn more, we are less sure. California found that 30 parts per million for eight hours seriously affects people who already have poor blood circulation. Since monoxide sickens and kills by capturing the oxygen carriers in the blood, people with heart disease, arteriosclerosis, asthma or emphysema, as well as heavy smokers, are unusually vulnerable.

The U.S. Public Health Service sampled air in six cities—Cincinnati, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Denver, Chicago and Washington, D.C.—during periods of heavy traffic. It found carbon monoxide at 30 parts per million in 10 percent of the tests; the average levels inside passenger cars during rush-hour range from 21 to 29 parts per million, and there were concentrations higher than 100 parts inside tunnels and garages.

The effects of monoxide at these "low," everyday levels may be profound, even on healthy people. In the Public Health Service's Taft Center in Cincinnati, Dr. Charles Xintaras studied the brain waves of rats. When his rats breathed monoxide in rush-hour concentrations, almost at once the "intellectually alert" pattern of the brain waves disappeared and was replaced by one typical of a dream state: The brain kept receiving impressions from the outside but did nothing about them.

In an even more startling experiment, Dr. John H. Schulte, formerly at the University of Cincinnati and now with the U.S. Navy, gave 49 healthy Cincinnati firemen-volunteers mild doses of monoxide, all well below the level of organic damage. Each man had several sessions before a panel which flashed a letter or a color, in response to which the man was supposed to push the button appropriate to that letter or color. Sometimes a man breathed ordinary air and sometimes varying mixtures of monoxide, but he never knew which.

Dr. Schulte's experiment produced nothing new for medical literature, with one exception. No matter what the level of mild monoxide, the men showed no physiological changes; their pulse, respiration and blood pressure remained the same. And their reaction time in pushing the bottons was the same, whether they breathed pure air or monoxide. The exception was that men getting monoxide made more errors in pushing the buttons, and the more monoxide they got, the more errors they made. At one percent monoxide in the blood they made 10 percent errors, at 20 percent monoxide they made 80 percent errors. Yet they seemed perfectly normal.

Many researchers believe that "turnpike fatigue," the lassitude that comes with long drives in cars without air conditioning, may be mild monoxide poisoning and may produce more accidents than supposed. One speculation is that, except for the results of new antipollution controls, increasing monoxide from increasing traffic could reduce alertness not just among motorists but in whole sections of the population.

The next heaviest portion of poison in the American air, 18 percent, is the sulfur oxides, which come mostly from the burning coal and oil in power plants, factories and homes. They have been the chief villain of every recent pollution disaster, like Donora, New York and London. They paralyze the tiny hairlike tissues that ordinarily protect sensitive lung tissues from dangerous invaders. They irritate the throat and damage the lungs. Their presence makes lung and heart work harder. In Nashville a study of 9,313 people showed that cardiovascular disease in people over 55 was twice as common in areas of the city with high sulfur readings.

The most recent studies show that quite ordinary sulfur-dioxide levels in the air do human and property damage. With an annual average of 0.01 to 0.02 parts per million in the air, there is increased cardiovascular illness, noticeable impairment of breathing among otherwise healthy people, and significant mental corrosion. At 0.02 to 0.03 levels for a year the death rate from respiratory disease begins to go up, and perennial flowers become chronically damaged. It is therefore alarming to note that the 1964 sulfur-dioxide mean in the following cities was: Chicago, 0.18; Cincinnati, 0.04; Los Angeles, 0.01; Philadelphia, 0.08; San Francisco, 0.02; St. Louis, 0.06; and Washington, 0.05. Vernon MacKenzie, chief of the Division of Air Pollution of the Public Health Service, says, "The sulfur-pollution problem in some sections of the country in our opinion has reached virtually a critical stage."

The next most common contaminators in urban air are the hydrocarbons, a large group of compounds coming mainly from escaped, unburned fuel, mostly invisible and mostly from cars.

They are known to cause cancer, though it takes higher concentrations than usually found in the air. Worse yet, sunlight causes hydrocarbons to combine insidiously with still another pollutant—the oxides of nitrogen—to produce photochemical smog (also called oxidant), the bourbon-colored haze that regularly blurs most modern cities. In photochemical smog, people breathe harder but get less oxygen. Very high concentrations for a few hours can produce impaired breathing and general malaise for days afterward.

All the ingredients of air pollution—monoxide, sulfur and the rest—might be less of a threat to human life if the air always moved freely. But some places are hemmed in by mountains so that air cannot move sideways. Big cities usually have tall buildings that

fend off outside winds. Most places are enveloped periodically in extremely calm and unmoving air masses with almost no lateral movement.

Air trapped at the sides may move vertically, as in a chimney, carrying upward its load of floating dirt and making room for new air. This upward movement of air occurs because hot air rises and ordinarily the warmest air is next to the earth. From time to time, however, a layer of warm air slips in at an upper level—it slides over a mountain or top of an air mass. When the dirt-laden air rising from the ground hits this intruding warm layer, it stops. This plug in the chimney, called an inversion because it inverts the usual change in temperature as air gets higher, is a lid that seals in a city like a plastic bag, keeping out the clear upper air and letting the aerial wastes accumulate down where the people are.

From the street the stable air mass under an inversion may look fairly clear, at least until the pollution has begun to collect and the nitrogen oxides and smog give it the characteristic yellow-brown haze. But from an airplane one often can see a sharp separation between the murky air below the inversion and the clear air above.

Inversions are not rare phenomena that occur only at a few strange places. On any given fall or winter day, half the United States has inversions lower than 1,500 feet; fall and winter are also the times of maximum burning of coal and oil. C. R. Hosler of the Weather Bureau calculates that air is trapped below 500 feet over all parts of the United States more than one fourth of the time in all seasons. Sometimes the situation becomes highly dangerous.

At about eight o'clock on November 27, 1962, Doyle Urban, a dark-haired meterologist with a perpetual cigar in his mouth, came into the weather center of the U.S. Public Health Service complex in Cincinnati. He took off his jacket, read over teletyped weather reports from all over the nation and began looking for inversions that might cause an air-pollution disaster like Donora, New York or London—inversions as large as Nebraska or larger, and due to last 36 hours or longer, with low winds and no rain.

By noon on that November day Urban was sure he had found just such an inversion and he sent out a transmission to every American weather station: "Air Pollution Potential Alert. Begin High Pollution Alert . . . and then described an area that covered 22 states with 87 million people from New England to Arkansas. The lid was on over 23 major American cities.

Urban's forecast turned out to be accurate. Hartford's level of particles in the air soon rose to 5½ times normal; Albany, 4½ times; Charleston, W. Va., 3 times; Detroit, 3 times. By the fourth day, particles in the Boston-New York area had reached 7½ times normal. In Washington, D.C., at the end of the first day carbon monoxide was 5 times normal. Philadelphia had 8 times its usual oxides of nitrogen, New York 7 times its usual sulfur.

No one knows the effect of this episode on life, health and property. All New York City's homes for the aged reported increased respiratory troubles. Allergists in Washington noted more patients. Massive tragedy may have been avoided by luck. In the middle of the episode a wandering low-pressure mass from Cape Hatteras moved in for two days, bringing fresh air, and then moved out, removing some of the bad air. Then the graphs of pollution began to rise again, but from a lower level.

It was important for local officials to have Doyle Urban's warning, yet most cities had no air-pollution agencies. Of those that did, only 65 percent got the alarm, and of those, only a third took any action, such as warning institutions with respiratory and heart patients and alerting industries that put waste into the air to stand by to cut back operations.

In most cities the inversion and rising pollution were not understood. But they were felt. Visibility was reduced, eyes watered, people had sore throats and coughed, those with respiratory ailments felt terrible and undoubtedly more of them died sooner than they otherwise would have. Yet there was no great complaint because, like Londoners before 1952, most Americans regard air pollution as the natural condition of man. They assume that city air was always like this.

Which is why the world owes a debt to kooky old *El Pueblo de Nuestra Señora la Reina de Los Angeles de Porciúncula*. For it was Los Angeles, Calif., that woke the nation to the perils of air pollution.

Most of the people of Los Angeles came from someplace else in search of clean air, a forgiving climate, rich foliage and expansive views. But after the war, industry mushroomed, and automobiles filled the land. Suddenly Los Angelenos couldn't see their hills most of the time. And their beautiful air hurt them. It still does. Over half the days of the year, those with sensitive tissues suffer stinging eyes, 30 days a year half the people do, and about six days a year everyone has painful, watery eyes. About the same is true with ease of breathing.

Tradition has it that the revolt against stinging eyes and foul air began with the little old ladies from Pasadena. They saw and smelled nearby refineries and, blaming them, began mailing in their gasoline credit cards in protest. According to another tale it all started when Mrs. Norman Chandler, the most influential woman in the county, came out of her front door one morning, noticed that the city was no longer visible, and said to her husband, then publisher of the Los Angeles *Times*, "Norman, you simply must do something about this smog."

All this is a little bit true. The garden-club types in Pasadena did give the refineries a remarkably hard time. And the Los Angeles *Times*, along with the rest of the press, did push for pollution control. But the basic cause of the revolution was that the ordinary voter valued his voluptuous air almost as much as he did his car and freeway, a comparison not without irony.

Clean air became such a hot political issue no politician could avoid it. Mass meetings insisted on action. In 1947 the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control Board was formed and given power to control everything released into the air in the 4,000 square miles of the Los Angeles basin. The basin, then with 45 separate cities (now with 76), is hemmed in on three sides by mountains and sealed on the fourth side by incoming sea winds, so that everyone breathes about the same air, and no one municipality can protect its own atmosphere. Once it had its law, Los Angeles attacked air pollution with more vigor and sophistication than any community had ever done before, or has since.

Its first discovery was that clean air begins and ends with politics. Unless there is solid support for pollution control and no political finagling with enforcement, the system quickly breaks down. In Los Angeles, as in most places, the initial response of polluters told to clean up was as predictable as religious ritual:

1. It is technically impossible;
2. It is economically ruinous;
3. If you bother me, I'll move my factory; and
4. Take me to your leader.

In most cities such objections win the day. Most political leaders are loathe to force added expense and headaches on big taxpayers and employers.

S. Smith Griswold, for years Los Angeles Air Pollution Control Officer and now a leading federal anti-pollution official, describes a typical experience:

"Some industry would show us their plans, and we'd tell them they wouldn't be permitted to release all that stuff into the Los Anglese air. They'd say they do it every place else, no one knows how to prevent it, it is uneconomical to do it any other way. We'd say we were sorry, but no one has a right to poison the air in this county. Then they'd smile and ask who my superior was. I had a list in my top drawer: the names of the five members of the County Board of Supervisors, the elected ruling body. Next day the industry would be back saying, 'OK. What do we do?' In all the years of our operations, the top political leadership never failed to back us up one hundred percent. And we were tough.

"And not one industry ever moved out, except the makers of crude incinerators banned by law and people who burned junked cars, also banned. And not one industry that had decided to settle changed its mind because we put air-pollution permits into the picture. But a lot of them threatened to."

The second discovery Los Angeles made arose from a misconception. Everyone thought the watering eyes, gasps and stenches were caused mostly by the refineries. Refineries do emit an impressive collection of smells and gases. This used to be considered "inevitable." Los Angeles proved it is not, and today has the cleanest refineries in the world.

Despite a massive reduction in refinery, industrial and open-burning emissions, however, the smog did not go away. It got worse. Hydrocarbon pollution dropped with the refinery program but then in 1960 began to creep upward again, though refineries were putting out less than ever. Carbon monoxide kept right on climbing during the industrial cleanup, until today it is four times worse than it was in 1940. Why did the pollution turn upward?

Los Angeles originally had the same ratio of pollution as the national average for the country: 40 percent from stationary sources (chimneys, smokestacks and open fires) and 60 percent from cars, trucks and buses. Today Los Angeles is closer to 10 percent from stationary sources, though industry and population have more than doubled during this reduction, and 90 percent from motor vehicles.

To the public the most obvious vehicular offenders are the trucks and buses whose Diesel exhausts are clearly visible and unpleasant to smell. Los Angeles cracks down hard on them.

But despite appearances, Diesels are not the real problem. A large fleet of pollution control officers in cruiser cars checks on truck exhausts, but an even larger one checks on automobile exhausts, for it is the automobile that emits the great volumes of pollutants. Each car without anti-pollution devices produces an average of seven pounds of wastes a day, enough collectively to put down a lethal layer of poisons two feet thick over the entire basin. This discovery was enough to alarm Los Angeles, an area where winds are typically mild and inversions frequent and low.

A car pollutes the air in four ways: from its gas tank, from its carburetor (both give off evaporated gasoline), from its crankcase vent and from its tail pipe. Of the hydrocarbons, mostly evaporated or unburned fuel, 10 percent come from gas tank and carburetor, 30 percent from the crankcase vent and 60 percent from tail pipe, out of which also come all of the carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen.

Elimination of the 30 percent of hydrocarbons from the crankcase is relatively simple. A pipe can refeed the raw gas back to the intake manifold. Redesign of engines can reduce carbon monoxide by 50 percent

and hydrocarbons by 65 percent. California required the automobile industry to produce such cars in that state beginning with 1966 models, and the result has been a marked improvement. The Federal Government followed suit for all cars, and the auto industry has applied its skills and money to achieving a solution.

Thus, as with so many modern air-pollution practices, Los Angeles became the model for the country. Today almost half of all professional antipollution workers for local government are in Los Angeles, 25 percent of all local spending in the country for clean air is spent in Los Angeles County (40 percent in California). And no place in the nation approaches the problem with more care. Every industry in Los Angeles County needs a pollution permit before it can build or operate, and this requires a showing of every pound of material going into the process and an accounting of every pound coming out, with the assumption that anything unaccounted for has gone into the air.

Los Angeles, and the country at large, still must cope with 95 tons of polluting gases and particles put into the air every year by motor vehicles. Transportation contributes 60 percent of all national contamination of air. Even when all new cars have some exhaust controls, the problem will be far from solved. There are 5 percent more cars in the country every year. In the 1980's automotive monoxide and hydrocarbons will be back where they are today. By 2000 they will be double the 1966 levels. The ultimate answer, in the opinion of most pollution authorities, is a basic redesign of the way Americans power their private cars.

Redesign is no longer considered too much to hope for, in the light of the Los Angeles experience. Faced with the strict law and strict enforcement, Los Angeles industries were forced to design their machinery with pollution in mind and to put high-caliber engineering talent on the job. From 1948 to 1965 Los Angeles industries produced 64 major air-pollution control techniques never known before. In most cases the initial insistence was that it couldn't be done.

One refinery used to make life miserable for surrounding communities with huge quantities of hydrogen sulfide that caused vomiting and turned house paint black. Now it captures it all, pipes it to a plant that sells the resulting sulfur and sulfuric acid. The profit from these sales has paid for the $1,250,000 cost of capturing the gas. The same refinery used to release tons of carbon monoxide. Forced to convert it to harmless carbon dioxide, it discovered this generated enough heat to make steam for the whole refinery, which more than paid for the $1 million cost of the control.

There is a steel mill which used to dump 15 tons of iron oxides and other dust onto its neighborhood every day and now drops negligible amounts. Because of this there is a low-income working woman who has everyday advantages of life that Mrs. Henderson, the penthouse dweller in Manhattan, does not have and couldn't buy for a million dollars. The Los Angeles woman, her face framed in pink plastic hair curlers, said, "I work the night shift in the glass factory, and sometimes I used to forget to bring my sheets in from the clothesline in the evening. By the time I got back from work in the morning, those sheets would be black, and I'd have to wash them all over again. Now if I can't take my wash in overnight, it's still clean in the morning."

There are steps any community can take now. It can sample its air to find what is in it. It can make a careful inventory of everything that goes into its atmosphere or drifts in from the outside. It can analyze its weather history to see how often and how severe its inversions are. And there is action that most cities need to take but have not:

Open trash and garbage burning can be outlawed. About a quarter of all communities in the country are plagued by dump fires. Crude incinerators can be forbidden.

Black smoke is still a menace, though there is no need for it. Eliminating it costs money, but so does fire prevention.

Sulfur dioxide from burning coal and oil also is manageable, but it requires a basic change in the use of fuels. No feasible way has been found to remove sulfur from coal, but not all coal contains dangerous quantities of it. Natural gas has very little sulfur. Oil can be desulfurized, including the heavy residual oil used by many power stations. Desulfurizing fuel would accomplish a giant step in improving urban air.

Most burning and discharges into the air can be drastically sanitized, as Los Angeles proved, by meticulous care in designing the industrial process and by a variety of devices for screening, washing or filtering wastes before their release to the outside.

Slowly the Federal Government has taken measures to try to reverse the upward curve of dirty air. It started in 1955 with an appropriation of $186,000. Thanks largely to Sen. EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, there is now a growing national program, begun in earnest with the Clean Air Act of 1963.

In accord with this program, the automobile industry is installing antipollution controls on all new 1968 cars sold in this country. Communities polluted by sources across a state line now can call for federal aid, as can any local government that says its own problem is beyond its capacity to handle. And the national government is developing techniques for controlling pollution and programs for training technicians so desperately needed in cities and states. It will double any money that localities put up to cleanse their own air.

Nevertheless, the national atmosphere continues to get worse. The country has more gasoline, more fuel oil, more trash to burn every year, more people to do it, more of them congregated in cities already polluted, but no more air than before. A third of the states have no one concerned with their air, and most of the remainder have only a token employee. It is estimated that a good local air-pollution program costs 40 to 50 cents per capita a year, but most places spend nothing.

A total program that with present knowledge could *reduce* the pollution levels would cost three billion dollars a year. Such a program might even stem the appalling growth of respiratory disease among urban Americans.

When President Johnson signed the Clean Air Act Amendment last October, he quoted author Rachel Carson: "In biological history, no organism has survived long if its environment became in some way unfit for it, but no organism before man has deliberately polluted its own environment."

This summer I was driving down a Los Angeles freeway with John Sheehan, a businesslike, 38-year-old graduate engineer who inspects refineries for the county air-pollution district. He pointed through the windshield and informed me that the Hollywood Hills were 10 miles in front of us and that years ago you could see them quite clearly most of the time. That day there was nothing but a light-brown blankness. The air-pollution index printed in the paper that morning had not been particularly high, but the surrounding haze obliterated the land, irritated the eyes and caused a dryness like the onset of a sore throat.

"Now look out your window, straight up," he said.

Directly overhead was a brilliant, blue, clear sky.

"The inversion today is at maybe one thousand feet," Sheehan said. "So straight up you're looking through only one thousand feet of smog. Down here you're looking straight through ten miles of it. And breathing ten miles of it. Just one thousand feet over us the air is clean and clear and full of that good old oxygen."

Sheehan shrugged. "But, of course, you and I are down here."

We're all down here.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 26, 1966]

NATION IS FACING ALL-OUT BATTLE FOR CLEANER AIR—7,300 COMMUNITIES AFFLICTED BY SMOG AS URBANIZATION SENDS THE TOLL HIGHER

(NOTE.—Following is the first of four articles on air pollution, its effect on national life and the fight under way for clean air.)

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, Sept. 25.—Just about a year from now, it will be brought home forcefully to the people of the United States that they are engaged in a domestic struggle comparable to a national military effort.

It is the battle against air pollution.

When people buy 1968 model cars next fall, they will find they must pay about $50 extra for mandatory equipment to reduce a car's normal emission of fumes. That is the new Federal law.

It will be the first time on record that an air pollution control measure has been imposed on an entire nation, and it will represent, for the first year alone, an extra national outlay of around $500-million.

Nonetheless, it will be just a down payment. The total effort will cost countless billions, and it will continue as far into the future as anyone can foresee and involve virtually every person in the country.

FIGHT MUST GO ON

Recurrently murky skies over big cities and even small communities attest that there is no physical possibility of withdrawal from this contest, no chance of negotiating with the nebulous gray enemy. Even as in war, the conflict will involve human casualties; there have been scores already, possibly thousands.

The resolution of the conflict can come only through a systematic re-ordering of national life so that people do not slowly suffocate in their own gaseous wastes.

Smog is not just a ludicrous appurtenance of Los Angeles and a few other big cities; the United States Public Health Service reports that no fewer than 7,300 communties are afflicted with air pollution in varying degrees.

In some of the communities, the mildness or infrequency of smog has lulled people into thinking it will go away. They are mistaken.

"Smog is a social disease—the product of people and their activities," says Thomas Williams, information director of the Public Health Service's Air Pollution Division. "And like other social diseases, if not dealt with, it only gets worse."

Air pollution has overtaken the nation suddenly, just as water pollution did. People think of air, as they once did of water, as an unlimited resource. But it is stringently limited. The air enveloping the earth extends up only about 12 miles before it becomes thin and useless. The air that daily serves living things extends upward only a few thousand feet.

Into the air above America is now going, every day, more than 360,000 tons of gaseous wastes. By some yardsticks, the atmosphere is the principal repository of all human wastes.

Dr. Jack McKee of the California Institute of Technology has calculated that in Los Angeles County, which has more than 6 million

inhabitants, gaseous wastes average 9,580 metric tons a day.

"This amounts," he says, "to 1,470 grams [about three pounds] per person per day on a dry-weight basis—twice as much as solid refuse disposal, and six times as much as the contaminants in waste water."

Evenly distributed, this load of waste would be an inocuously minuscule fraction of the atmosphere. But it isn't evenly distributed. Half the nation's population is concentrated on only 1 per cent of its land area, and weather conditions more or less regularly trap concentrations of pollutants there.

A historic example is Donora, Pa., where a spell of smog killed 20 people and sickened thousands in 1948.

The smog was held in place by atmospheric "lids." Once it was thought that these lids—a layer of cool air trapped under a warmer layer during a windless period—were distinctive to only a few localities.

But in recent years, meteorologists have established that the condition is common. It occurs from 10 per cent of the time at points on the Atlantic coast to as much as 50 per cent of the time in some Rocky Mountain areas.

ELEVEN-BILLION-DOLLAR LOSS

Where once the gasiest wastes were small enough to be imperceptible even in these atmospheric "inversions," excessive concentrations are now ubiquitous. Places such as Denver, Phoenix, and Albuquerque, as well as cities in Montana, Oregon and Washington, all traditionally associated with crystalline air, now have recurrent smog.

Furthermore, this atmospheric burden is growing by the day with the steady increase in people, urbanization, automobiles, industry, heating and rubbish burning.

Vernon McKenzie, a recent head of the Air Pollution Division, reports that many cities now are experiencing toxic concentrations of sulphur dioxide, the leading contaminant from industry. In heavy traffic, carbon monoxide is often reaching levels high enough to impair drivers' reactions.

The more obvious smog damage, such as damage to materials and crops, has been estimated nationally at $65 per person a year—$11-billion in all, or nearly 10 percent of the national budget.

Still, most experts consider this figure illusory in its understatement.

The real estate industry, for instance, hasn't dared to tote up, at least for public scrutiny, the great reduction in property values in smog-ridden suburbs, as compared to the ones that are smog-free.

And how does one put a price tag on the 23 atmospheric "blackouts" on the New Jersey Turnpike last year? Or on the aviation operations that increasingly are hampered and endangered by man-made murk?

The biggest suspected toll is in human health. Despite the efforts of thousands of researchers, this is still immeasurable. But the circumstantial case is more conclusive in some respects than that of the link between cigarettes and lung cancer.

City dwellers have higher rates of respiratory ailments—lung cancer, emphysema, chronic bronchitis—than rural residents. Severe spells of smog have caused thousands of statistically "excess" deaths in New York, London and other places.

A bout of smog in Denver last December was accompanied by respiratory infections that doubled the normal absentee rates in schools, factories and the city government.

"But the determination of just how bad air has to be before it impairs health is academic, from a practical standpoints" Thomas Williams observes. "Because whatever that level of impurity is, we're going to have it, unless we take concerted action to avert it."

What is being done?

Months of investigation from coast to coast have yielded a clear answer: Not very much.

The Federal Government spent about $30-million in the year ending in June on a remarkably comprehensive program. It included research, expert technical assistance to states, communities and industry, grants to local agencies that control pollution, the policing of interstate air pollution, and a nationwide monitoring of pollution levels.

LAXITY OF STATES

But with the exception of a few interstate abatement actions, none of this has directly prevented any pollution from entering the atmosphere. The immediate work of pollution control has rested by law with states and communities. And, with a small number of exceptions, their record has not amounted to much.

Vernon MacKenzie tactfully says with massive understatement: "The national response up to now has been wholly inadequate."

Another expert says bluntly: "Most air pollution enforcement activities are farcical."

Only 24 states have laws even acknowledging state-level responsibility for air pollution. Many states and cities are still geared to archaic nineteenth-century "smoke laws" that are in the same category as injunctions against spitting on the sidewalk.

Despite the official finding that 7,300 communities have air pollution problems, the latest survey of the Public Health Service showed only 130 city, county and regional air pollution programs in the country. A dozen of them had budgets last year under $10,000, indicating that they were no more than one-man operations.

The small scope is indicated by the 130 agencies' total outlay in 1965, some 25 per cent of which was in Federal grant money. The agencies spent only $14,254,000, and a quarter of that was in Los Angeles alone.

Moreover, the programs covered less than a third of the national population. The expenditure on each person was less than 23 cents—compared to the nominal smog damage cost of $65 per person.

LOS ANGELES IN FRONT

Los Angles County headed the list with its outlay of $3,663,000—60.8 cents per person.

New York City, with one of the nation's more severe pollution situations and about one million more people than Los Angeles County ranked about 65th in per capita expenditures, with a rate of only 15.7 cents.

A top engineer in the Air Pollution Division, who has dealt with dozens of municipalities, says:

"It's hopeless to try to clean up a big city's air without an expenditure rate of at least 35 or 40 cents per capita."

There is nothing like an absolute yardstick for measuring the severity of a city's air pollution because the variety of contaminants interact in different ways under different weather conditions. But the sheer volume of effluvia, gauged by fuel consumption and refuse burning, offers some indication.

On the basis of its much smaller area, New York City's daily volume of air contaminant, tentatively calculated at 9,000 tons, is nearly 10 times as much of an atmospheric load as Los Angeles's daily 14,000 tons.

But New York, although its past expenditures have been skimpy, is considered to have made a good start by passing some laws this year to reduce coal fumes and incinerator emissions and by engaging Austin Heller, a top Federal pollution expert, to direct its program.

San Francisco and Chicago generally are rated near Los Angeles in the scope of their programs. Detroit, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Boston and a few other cities have achieved some results. But after that, the list peters out.

In sheer weight of emitted gases, automobiles account for nearly two-thirds of the national atmospheric waste load. But most of the autos' contribution is carbon monoxide, which is colorless, ordorless and innocuous if not too concentrated. Of the more noxious effluents, industry (including power generation) produced nearly three times as much as automobiles.

The National Association of Manufacturers says that industry is spending $500-million a year on pollution control. But nobody contends that that is enough.

MUSKIE IS ALARMED

"In terms of reducing the threat," says Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the Maine Democrat who is one of Congress' pollution specialists, "I don't think we've even scratched the surface."

It has taken Los Angeles, the nation's first smog-stricken city, 20 years of strenuous efforts to make a major dent in its burden of gaseous waste. Therefore, Federal experts feel time is running out for the rest of the country.

"We cannot push our problems a few decades away with the resolve to face them 'when the time comes,'" says Vernon MacKenzie. "The time is now."

Moved by such warnings, Congress passed the Clean Air Act in 1963, which covers the current Federal activities. Last year, moving against the one smog source that is uniform throughout the nation, Congress authorized the Public Health Service to impose limits for automobile emissions.

The first such regulation, based on a California law in force for the last year, in effect requires manufacturers to put special equipment on car engines that will reduce the emission of hydrocarbon gases to 275 parts per million and of carbon monoxide to 1.5 per cent by volume. This is the equipment for which new-car buyers will have to pay extra next fall, wherever they live.

However, the regulation is denounced in auto-industry circles as "a billion-dollar hoax." The industry says it discriminates against smog-free localities, and will produce little immediate improvement, since it will take 10 years to retire the 90 million unequipped cars already in circulation.

The Federal rebuttal is that most cars are based in smog-affected areas, that the rest of them will probably visit such areas, and that you have to start somewhere in reducing auto pollution.

Despite the nationwide impact of this measure, it is only an opening skirmish in the coming struggle against air pollution.

The Federal Government has no way to police proper maintenance and operation of the equipment on new engines. It can only urge the states to enact enforcement and inspection legislation, so their own citizens' expenditures won't go for naught.

The states thus will have reason to examine their overall smog problem. And the question inevitably will arise:

"What's the use of our regulating automobiles and then doing nothing about the other sources of smog?"

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1966]

PUBLIC INDIFFERENCE HOLDING UP DRIVE FOR CLEANER AIR

(NOTE.—Following is the second of four articles on air pollution, its effect on national life and what is being done for clean air.)

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES.—In a large city in the Middle West a few weeks back, a nationally respected air pollution official concluded a disquisition on the nation's mounting smog problem by abruptly sweeping aside his slide-rule, charts and tabulations and exclaiming:

"That's the official story. Now do you want to hear the truth?

"The truth is that the critical ingredient in smog simply is politics. By that I mean people and their instruments of government,

and their attitudes about a community problem.

"We know how to cure smog. It's not unduly difficult or expensive. The problem is getting the people in the community to support a cleanup program.

"The most important part of a program is not technical expertise. It's having a wheeler-dealer who can put it across with the political establishment in a community. We've been long on engineering and short of wheeler-dealers. That's why our air is a mess."

The "mess" consists of a daily load of some 360,000 tons of gaseous wastes that pour into the nation's atmosphere and collect in palls of murk over some 7,300 communities. As population, urbanization, power generation and industry inexorably increase, so will the mess.

The official's observations are set forth here because they are authoritative in themselves, and because they reflect the virtually unanimous sentiments of the scores of Federal, state and local pollution officials who were interviewed in several months' research.

"Politically," the candid official continued, "air pollution is a far tougher can of worms than water pollution. With water pollution, the blame goes mainly to collective sources—municipalities and industries—and cleanup costs fall on them.

"A lot of air pollution goes back to individuals—their cars, their furnaces, their incinerators. When a cleanup program threatens to hit them directly, and change the way they're doing things, and cost a little bit, they back off.

"And if the pressure isn't there, the politician isn't going to do anything. He can think of 26 other ways of spending public money that will be more popular."

Consequently, of the 7,300 communities with air pollution, only 130 have control programs, and the Air Pollution Division of the United States Public Health Service appraises only about 90 of these as substantial.

Futhermore, in 1965 fewer than 20 came close to the per capita expenditure rate of 35 cents that Federal officials consider a minimum for an adequate community program. This reckoning is based on the fact that about 70 percent of a budget goes for personnel, and the larger the population involved, the bigger the supervisory, engineering, inspection and enforcement staff that is needed.

The highest expenditure rate in the country in 1965 was the 83.3 cents that Cook County, Ill., spent on its 180,000 persons living outside Chicago. New York City's per capita rate was 15.7 cents.

"In cities under 200,000," the official continued, "it's very difficult to promote the money you need for an adequate staff.

"In cities under 100,000, you get into an industrial-power situation: one or two companies dominate the community and nobody is going to pass any laws to cause trouble for industry—unless you happen to run into an especially enlightened company."

The Public Health Service estimates that 133 million tons of contaminants pour into the atmosphere every year. Industry, including power generation, is the major source of the gross contaminants. (Automobiles produce more gases, but a lot of that is carbon monoxide, which is innocuous unless it becomes too concentrated).

There are some 300,000 manufacturing plants in the country. If only two-thirds of them emit fumes, it still amounts to one plant for every 1,000 people. More than 500 communities have chemical plants. There are 300 oil refineries.

For generations, industry escaped regulation because its effluvia were considered an unavoidable concomitant of productivity and prosperity. Recent experience has proved this technically incorrect and ethically shaky.

The President's Science Advisory Committee, in its big report last November on "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," set forth as a prime principle:

"The responsibility of each polluter for all forms of damage caused by his pollution should be effectively recognized and generally accepted. There should be no 'right' to pollute."

Such major segments of industry—and major sources of pollution—as the oil, chemical, power and steel industries are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on pollution controls.

The electric power industry says it has spent $750-million, and the oil industry says it has spent $250-million just in the last 10 years. The chemical industry reports it is spending $43 million a year to operate smog control equipment that has cost $250-million.

The steel companies in Chicago have joined in a program that will cost upward of $30-million in the next five years to reduce their discharge of soot. Every week industry buys more than $1-million of equipment to remove obnoxious chemicals from industrial waste gases.

But, pollution officials point out, such sums are not inordinately large in the economics of industry—the nation's newest oil refinery, for instance, will cost $100-million.

Neither, officials say, do the sums necessarily bear a relationship to the size of the evergrowing problem. Fifteen years hence, twice as much electricity will have to be generated as now; the burning of oil is expected to triple, and the burning of coal and natural gas to double.

Fume-belching plants can still be found in most cities, and fume abatement has tended to vary directly with the strictness of local enforcement. Contentions are sometimes made that pollution controls are technically or economically impossible—although Federal experts say that proper control equipment averages less than 5 per cent of the cost of an industrial facility.

Some industrial circles are expounding the "classification" system that they pushed for water pollution—the concept that different degrees of cleanliness, or dirtiness, are acceptable.

The latest idea along this line is that the skies can be used for industrial waste on a "push button" system. Under this, industries would discharge fumes when winds seemed likely to blow them away, but would stop on signal when weather conditions threatened to change.

Air pollution officials are skeptical about this. They say that, if an industry has proper pollution control equipment for periods of adverse weather, it might as well operate the equipment all the time.

They also say the plan would put control agencies in an impossible position, where they would be constantly accused of pushing the "stop" button unnecessarily.

There is a familiar pattern when a community mounts a program to control air pollution, of industry representatives moving into a dominant role and slowing reforms.

"There are two main ways of doing this," the Middle West official said. "One is to go all out for an impressive technical program but give it no authority. The other is to give it impressive authority but no budget."

This kind of thing happens on the state level, too, the official said.

Industry is understandably touchy about air pollution control because it has, in one sense, been a whipping boy. Citizens like to think that their air pollution can be stopped by lambasting the factory on the other side of town.

But in most cases smog is a combination of industrial fumes, the effluvia of home heaters and incinerators, municipal refuse burning and automobiles. The public shares responsibility but is slow to face it.

"There are some remarkable fallacies that circulate as rationalizations for doing nothing about air pollution," says one Federal official. "I call them 'the six sophistries of smog.' They run like this:

"The air in any given area belongs to whoever got there first.

"Fumes strong enough to nauseate people and make their eyes water do not in any way adversely affect health.

"Until we can prove to everyone's satisfaction precisely how much of what pollutant is injuring which people to what degree, it is intelligent to do nothing at all about controlling air pollution.

"Air pollution is good because cigarette smoking is bad.

"Pollution control programs like Los Angeles' have been futile because smog has not completely disappeared.

"It's better for two million citizens to spend $10-million cleaning up the effects of air pollution than for 10 industries to spend $2-million to clean up the sources of pollution."

For years, clean-air campaigners have tried to overcome public inertia through the "scare" approach, stressing the presumable health hazards of atmospheric contaminants. It hasn't worked.

Despite strong statistical evidence that sieges of smog have hastened, if not caused, the deaths of thousands of persons in New York, London and elsewhere, the hazards seem as remote to the general public as those of cigarette smoking.

In a nationwide opinion survey commissioned last year by the chemical industry, more than eight out of 10 persons indicated they did not consider air pollution a community problem.

At this year's annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association, a joint industry-science-Government organization, there was pronounced sentiment that propaganda should emphasize smog's esthetic blight and economic drain, of at least $11-billion a year just in damage to crops and materials.

Unlike water pollution, in which a sample dipped from a river and analyzed in a laboratory may tell a good deal of the story, dealing with air pollution is a protracted and far-flung operation.

It may take thousands of air samplings over many months to determine the dimensions of a community problem. Then comes a door-to-door inventory of pollution sources, followed by corrective recommendations.

Then there is the design, procurement and installation of equipment, and finally the enforcement of regulations through periodic inspections.

A classic joke in the pollution control profession is this aphorism from a seasoned engineer:

"A cleanup job takes 50 years—40 years to get the politicians out of the way and 10 years to do the work."

In the absence of extensive initiative by states and municipalities, the Federal Government has spearheaded anti-pollution activities.

The "Pentagon" of this effort is several floors of a plain box-like Public Health Service building on Washington's C Street. Here some 300 persons in the Air Pollution Division pore over matters ranging from chemistry to statistics. They are supplemented by 200 scientists and technicians at the health service's Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

The Federal activities include public education, research, technical assistance to localities, subsidies to local control programs ($3.6-million in grants last year), and abatement actions for interstate pollution.

The division's annual budgets up to now have been under $30-million.

The law authorizes Federal abatement intervention when one state's smog bothers another. The procedure is like that in water

pollution cases: hearings, agreement on corrective programs, and supervised execution of the programs, with the possibility of Federal court action if there is no compliance.

Eight such interstate actions have been started so far, including one dealing with the "aerial garbage" that wafts back and forth between New York and New Jersey.

But most pollution is intrastate. And because each locality's smog problem is a unique combination of factors, responsibility for dealing with nonautomotive pollution is considered to rest, both legally and practically, with state and local governments.

If they will come to grips with air pollution, Federal officials think prospects are excellent for solving the problem. Los Angeles, which had the worst smog situation in the country, has virtually eliminated smog from stationary sources.

THE 14-YEAR RECORD OF PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as this 2d session of the 89th Congress nears an end, it is appropriate that all of us take a look back at what has been accomplished. We can all agree that much has been done, yet few would disagree that even more could have been done.

A review of this session is of particular interest to me, in part because of the amount and nature of the legislation which has been considered by the committee on which I have had the honor to serve, the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The adjournment of the 89th Congress, furthermore, will mark the 14th year of my service in Congress. I had the privilege of coming here at a time when President Eisenhower first assumed responsibility for leading this Nation. To my mind he was a truly great leader, uniting all of us during a most trying period.

As part of this look back at the past 14 years, one of the members of my staff has prepared a recapitulation of my activities here. I should like to submit it for the RECORD at this point:

THE 14-YEAR RECORD OF PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, REPUBLICAN, FIFTH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, IN THE 83D, 84TH, 85TH, 86TH, 87TH, 88TH, AND 89TH CONGRESSES

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

Representative PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey, was born January 17, 1916. He married Beatrice S. Procter on September 7, 1940. They have five children.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN graduated from Princeton University in 1938, magna cum laude in history. He obtained an LL.B. from Yale Law School in 1941, and later (1946 and 1947) did graduate work in history at Columbia University.

During the war the Congressman served in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations (Naval Intelligence) from September 1942 to December 1945. He was released to inactive duty with the rank of lieutenant.

In 1941 and 1942 Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was with the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, of New York City. He is a director of the Trust Co. of Morris County.

In 1948 he served as a staff member of the Hoover Commission, with the Foreign Affairs Task Force. He was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in November 1952 and has served in that body since January 3, 1953.

Active in community work, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN is presently a trustee of Princeton University and the Morristown Memorial Hospital. The Congressman is a Vice President of the American Bible Society and a former vestryman of St. Peter's Episcopal Church in Morristown, New Jersey. He serves as chairman of the Jersey Jetport Site Association.

ACTIVITIES AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Committees

For 6 years (87th, 88th, 89th Congresses), Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He serves as the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittees on Europe, on the Near East, and on the International Organizations and Movements.

For 12 years (83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, and 88th Congresses), Congressman FRELINGHUSEN was a member of the Education and Labor Committee. During the 83d Congress Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Legislative Activities

Representative FRELINGHUYSEN has been a leader in the fields of both education and labor. Long prior to the Soviet's launching of their sputniks, FRELINGHUYSEN was emphasizing the relationship between education and national defense. In the labor field he was one of the first to push hard for a congressional investigation of racketeering in the labor-management area. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was a floor leader during the passage of the labor reform bill (Landrum-Griffin), designed to protect the rights of laboring men and women.

Since his appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has become a Republican spokesman on foreign policy. He has sought a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs while at the same time adding his voice in constructive criticism in areas where he believes the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations have erred.

As the elected Representative of the Fifth District in Congress, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has constantly sought to keep the district informed regarding developments in Washington and to discover sentiment at home on issues before Congress.

Washington Newsletter—issued weekly to the press: This letter has become one of the most widely read letters of any Member of Congress. It is used as a vehicle for transmitting Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN's views to his constituents and as a commentary on the Washington scene. Some issues of the newsletter have been published in newspapers from Maine to California, and many wire service stories have originated as the result of it. The Congressman also sends a newsletter and final report to thousands of constituents directly.

District office hours: The district office, staffed by Mrs. Wilma Herbert, is open from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. daily except Saturday and Sunday. In addition, the office often is open Saturday mornings; location, 3 Schuyler Place, Morristown, New Jersey, Jefferson 8-7267.

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN holds frequent Saturday morning office hours in his Morristown office and schedules additional visits to other cities and towns. From time to time Congressman FRELINHUYSEN makes inspection trips to various parts of his district. He regularly visits such facilities as the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Lyons, Picatinny Arsenal and veterans' housing projects.

These frequent office hours and visits have given residents of the Fifth District an excellent opportunity to meet their Congressman, to question him on public issues, and to present their own views and problems.

Washington office: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN maintains a highly trained congressional staff in Washington ready to assist the Congressman in handling the problems of constituents. Every mail brings many requests for assistance with such Federal departments as the Social Security Administration, Small Business Administration, the Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Armed Services, and the Post Office Department, to name only a few. The Congressman handles every request as expeditiously as possible and a great majority are brought to successful conclusions.

Constituents also write requesting free Government publications such as the famous one entitled "Infant Care" which has aided thousands of new mothers in the Fifth Congressional District.

His office handles an average of 10,000 letters a year.

During the 14 years since Representative FRELINGHUYSEN has been a Member of Congress he has appointed many young men of the Fifth District to the service academies.

Constituents visiting Washington are urged to visit the office to obtain gallery passes for the House Chamber. Much useful information on sightseeing, hotels, restaurants, and transportation is available at the Washington and Morristown offices.

The Congressman encourages groups such as Scouts, senior classes, Sunday schools, etc., to inform him of their visits to Washington so that group pictures can be taken at the Capitol.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN is always available for appointments with constituents in Washington during congressional sessions.

Questionnaire: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN regularly conducts an informal public opinion survey of the Fifth District by means of questionnaires. At such times, fuller expression of constituent views is actively solicited.

National activities: In addition to his frequent local appearances, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has made speeches as far afield as California, has published articles in magazines of nationwide circulation, and has appeared on a number of radio and television programs.

In 1956 Redbook magazine picked FRELINGHUYSEN as 1 of 10 outstanding men in the House and Senate.

In 1958 he was elected to the Young Republican Hall of Fame.

In 1960 a Newsweek magazine poll of 50 Washington correspondents picked FRELINGHUYSEN as one of the 17 "most able" men in Congress.

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN was twice chosen as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, representing the House. In 1956, he was one of two Congressmen appointed by President Johnson as delegates to the United Nations 20th General Assembly. He served in the post for three months, working on the important budgetary problems of the U.N.

The port authority jetport proposal

In late 1959 when Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN learned of the Port of New York Authority's proposal to turn a vast section of southern Morris County into the world's largest jetport, he dispatched telegrams to 50 government officials in a 5-county area, inviting them to attend a meeting to discuss the proposal. As a result of this gathering, officials and citizens joined together in the Jersey Jetport Site Association, with the Congressman as chairman.

This organization enlisted volunteers, raised money and hired technical aviation experts. The group is given wide credit for convincing the New Jersey Legislature and the present Governor that Morris County is wholly unsuitable for such a project.

The Congressman also called a meeting of New Jersey's 14 Representatives and persuaded that group to go on record unanimously opposing the Morris proposal and urging a study.

VOTING PARTICIPATION

In 14 years Representative FRELINGHUYSEN has voted "yea" or "nay" on over 1300 recorded votes on the House floor. His 14-years voting participation average up to September 1966 stands at slightly over 90 percent. His yearly averages are listed below:

Congress (years)	Number rollcall votes	Frelinghuysen average	Average, all Members
83d (1953–54)	147	97	86
84th (1955–56)	149	91	88
85th (1957–58)	193	83	87
86th (1959–60)	180	89	89
87th (1961–62)	240	91	86
88th (1963–64)	232	82	86
89th (1965, 1st sess)	201	[1] 66	87

[1] During the 1st sess. of the 89th Cong., Mr. Frelinghuysen was granted a leave of absence (Sept. 21–Dec. 21, 1965) as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

(NOTE.—During the 85th Cong., Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was granted a short leave of absence because of a death in the family.)

The percentages reflect only votes cast and do not take in account "on the record" votes such as pairings for or against measures which are arranged in a Congressman's absence. If these are taken into account, the averages are close to 100 percent.

During the years that President Eisenhower occupied the White House, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was rated his firm supporter. For instance, during 1959–60 in the 86th Congress, the Congressman supported Mr. Eisenhower's legislative proposals 80 percent of the time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN supported Kennedy's legislative proposals in the 87th Congress 54 percent and the Johnson-Kennedy proposals in the 88th Congress 53 percent. In the first session of the 89th Congress he supported President Johnson 41 percent of the time. Note.—This low score is, in part, the result of his leave at the U.N., September-December, 1965.

VOTING RECORD

With respect to domestic legislation Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN in general maintained a moderate, middle-of-the-road record. In foreign affairs he has regularly supported this country's commitments abroad, and he has voted in favor of liberalizing our foreign trade laws. Foremost among these were the Eisenhower resolutions on Formosa and the Middle East and the Kennedy Alliance for Progress to aid Latin America.

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has voted for carefully-defined emergency legislation to aid the Nation's secondary schools and colleges. He supported and cosponsored the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted areas.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN has constantly voted against increased price supports for agriculture. He has supported civil rights legislation and labor measures aimed at curtailing abuse of power and protecting pension and welfare systems.

All of the bills cannot be listed here. However, the following should present a good picture of the general position Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN has taken on major national issues.

Foreign affairs and national defense: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on the following:

1. Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Acts of 1953, 1954, 1955, and 1958 (for a 5-year extension). In 1962 the title of this Act was changed to the Trade Expansion Act.

2. Mutual Security Act extension and appropriations of 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1960. In 1961 the title of this Act was changed to the Foreign Assistance Act. Foreign Assistance Act extensions and appropriations 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966.

3. Transfer of 1 million tons of price-support wheat to Pakistan (1953).

4. Issuance of 240,000 special immigration visas to refugees (1953).

5. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of March 1954, and should take all necessary steps to support the Organization of American States to prevent Communist interference in Western Hemisphere affairs (1954).

6. Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be seated in the United Nations (1953).

7. Formosa policy: Authorize the President to employ the U.S. Armed Forces for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area (1955).

8. Atomic energy: Revise the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 to permit exchange of atomic information with U.S. allies and to develop peacetime uses of atomic energy with the aid of private industry (1954).

9. Middle East policy: Resolution authorizing the President to undertake economic and military programs in cooperation with certain countries in the Middle East to oppose Communist aggression and infiltration (1957).

10. Draft bill extension: Extension of the draft for 4 years (1959 and 1963).

11. Sugar Act extension: A bill extending for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948 allocating quotas to various states and foreign nations and reducing the Cuban quota (1960).

12. Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act: preference given to families of those already in this country and to those with necessary skills.

In addition, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN was in favor of the following:

1. Foreign information services reorganization and creation of the U.S. Information Agency. Voted "nay" on the motion to disapprove (1953).

2. Emergency famine relief authority: Making $100 million worth of agricultural surplus commodities available to the President for famine and other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States. Voted "nay" on the motion to recommit (1953).

3. Latin American aid program (1961).

4. U.S. Arms Control Agency (1961).

5. Peace Corps (1961); expansion (1962); extension (1963).

6. The New Trade Expansion Act (1962).

7. Authorization to buy United Nations bonds (1962).

8. Reserve callup in national emergencies (1961 and 1962).

9. Cuba resolution (1962).

10. Cold War GI Bill: To enhance the benefits of service in the Armed Forces and further extend the benefits of higher education for veterans of service after January, 1955.

11. Asian Development Bank: To provide for United States participation in the Asian Development Bank.

Financial: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on the following:

1. Excess profits tax extension (1953).

2. Excise tax reduction of 1954.

3. Internal Revenue Code of 1954, making general revisions in the internal revenue laws so as to correct inequities and to close loopholes in the Federal tax laws, and extending the 52-percent corporate tax for another year.

4. Revenue Act of 1955: extending the 52-percent corporate tax to April 1, 1956, and extending excise tax rates of certain items.

5. Tax rate extension extending for 1 year existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates (1956–57).

6. Public debt limit increase providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit (1958 and 1962).

7. Savings bond interest rates increasing the interest rates on E and H savings bonds (1959).

Highway financing: Passage of a bill increasing the Federal tax on gasoline by 1 cent (1959).

9. Voted "nay" tax revision bill: A provision of this bill would have subjected taxes on interest and dividends to withholding. Voted in favor of tax bill conference report, with withholding provision deleted (1962).

10. Voted "yea" for tax bill (1964); 11.5 billion dollar reduction.

11. Voted "yea" for reduction of Excise Taxes (1964).

12. Voted "nay" to an increase of the Public Debt (1964 and 1966).

13. Voted "yea" for 1965 Federal Reserve Bill: repealed requirement for certain reserves against deposit for Federal Reserve Banks.

Education: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on the following:

1. Creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1953).

2. Increase of appropriation for federally affected school areas by $6 million (amendment to the Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations for 1954).

3. Authorization of up to $400,000 a year on cooperative arrangements with colleges and universities for joint studies on educational problems (1954).

4. Authorization of the White House Conference on Education (1954).

5. Establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on educational problems. This was Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN's own bill (1954).

6. Federal assistance to the States for the construction of schools (1956–57).

7. National Defense Education Act (1958); extension of act (1961), (1964).

8. Federal aid to education for school construction of elementary or secondary public school facilities (1960).

9. Extension of Federal aid to schools in federally impacted areas (1961), (1964).

10. College aid authorizing matching grants and long-term loans for construction of academic facilities (1962).

11. College Aid Bill (1963).

12. Aid to vocational education (1963).

13. 1965 Higher Education Act.

14. Library Services and Construction Act (1966).

15. Higher Education Amendments (1966).

Health and welfare:

1. Social security amendments (1954) extending coverage under old-age and survivors rights to approximately 10 million persons, and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. Voted "yea." Social security amendments (1955) providing disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals of 50 or over, reducing to 62 the age on basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, providing for continuation for insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining the age of 18, and extending coverage. Voted "yea." Social security amendments (1961), "yea."

2. Medical Care Plan (1960): Approving a modified plan of Federal assistance to the States for medical care for the aged.

3. Health Service Prepayment Plan Reinsurance Act: President Eisenhower's health program. Voted "nay" on the motion to kill the bill by returning it to committee (1954).

4. Vocational rehabilitation to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational-rehabilitation services. Voted "yea" (1954).

5. Antirecession:

(a) Temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation laws, and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment. Voted "yea" (1958).

(b) Military construction, favoring the acceleration of military construction programs for which appropriations have been made. Voted "yea" (1958).

(c) Civilian construction, favoring acceleration of civilian construction programs for which appropriations have been made. Voted "yea" (1958).

(d) Temporary unemployment benefits (1961) "yea."

(e) Aid to dependent children (1961) "yea."

6. Welfare revision (1962) "nay."

7. Water pollution bill (1961, 1965) "yea."

8. Poverty legislation. Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN has been chairman (1965 to date) of the Republican Task Force on Economic Opportunity to investigate the "War on Poverty." Voted "nay" to Area Redevelopment bill (1961), "yea" to Republican substitute. Voted "nay" to Area Redevelopment Act (1963). Act failed to pass. Voted "nay" to administration's Anti-poverty Bill, "yea" to Republican substitute.

9. Mental Health Bill (1963).

10. Extension of Social Security Benefits (1964).

11. Older Americans Act of 1965.

12. Medicare and Social Security Act of 1965.

13. Drug Abuse Control Amendments (1965).

Civil rights:

1. Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on bill to establish a Civil Rights Commission. He opposed moves to weaken the Commission's powers (1957).

2. Civil rights bill of 1960 to provide Federal Government with machinery to handle violations of American constitutional rights, guaranteeing voting rights of all citizens. Voted "yea."

3. Extension of Civil Rights Commission (1961) "yea."

4. Antipoll tax amendment (1962) "yea."

5. 1964 Civil Rights Act: the most far-reaching civil rights legislation since Reconstruction "yea."

6. Voting Rights Act of 1965 "yea."

7. Civil Rights Act of 1966 "yea."

Small business: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on bill to give permanent status to the Small Business Administration and increase its lending authority.

Labor: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" on the following:

1. Legislation aimed at preventing misuse of labor welfare funds (1958).

2. Legislation aimed at preventing abuse of power by some union officials—Kennedy-Ives bill (1958).

3. Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill to curtail corruption or abuse of power in the labor-management field and protect the rights of laboring men and women (1959).

4. Manpower Retraining Act (1962). A 2-year training program for unemployed workers displaced by automation or plant removal. Amended in 1963 and 1965.

5. Welfare and Disclosure Act (1962): Amendments designed to safeguard welfare and pension plans.

6. Voted "nay" to repeal of Section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act (1965).

Other legislation of general interest:

1. Statehood for Hawaii. Voted "yea" (1953).

2. Statehood for Alaska. Voted "yea" (1958).

3. Tidelands: To establish the titles of the States to lands and natural resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, as well as resources of the outer Continental Shelf. Voted "yea" (1953).

4. Air Force Academy. Voted "yea" (1954).

5. St. Lawrence Seaway. Voted "yea" (1954).

6. Highway program 1955 "pay-as-you-go" bill calling for new gasoline and other taxes to finance a long-range national highway program. Voted "yea."

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN also voted "yea" on the Withrow motion to recommit the bill with instructions to substitute he Eisenhower-endorsed proposal to finance the program by 30-year bonds (1955).

Legislation authorizing appropriations for the continued construction of highways: Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "nay" on motion to recommit the bill (1958).

Highway financing program (1961) "yea."

7. Housing redevelopment: 1954 act to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination of slums, and the development of urban communities. Voted "yea."

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN also voted "yea" on the Bolling motion to recommit with instructions to authorize 35,000 units of public housing annually for 4 years (the Bolling amendment incorporated the Eisenhower recommendations) (1954).

Housing amendments of 1955. Permitting 45,000 public housing starts to be made before July 31, 1956. Voted "yea." Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "nay" on the Wolcott amendment which removed all public housing provisions from the bill (1955).

Opposed omnibus housing bill of 1961.

Voted "yea" for 1964 Senate bill which authorized 1.1 billion dollars for housing and urban renewal programs. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN opposed 1965 Omnibus Housing Bill which included rent supplements for low income households. He opposed the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and instead supported the Republican alternative, an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in Executive Office of the President.

7. Wiretapping: To authorize the admission as evidence in court of information obtained by wiretapping in national security investigations in prosecuting alleged traitors, saboteurs, and spies. Voted "yea" (1954).

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN also voted "yea" on the Willis amendment, the "court order provision," requiring prior authorization of such wiretapping by Federal court order as well as by the Attorney General (1954).

8. Farm price supports: On the Harrison amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1954 providing flexible price supports from 82.5 percent to 90 percent of parity for five of the six basic commodities. Voted "yea." (The bill itself was passed by a voice vote.)

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN voted "nay" on the 1955 bill to restore rigid (or fixed) supports at 90 percent of parity. Voted "nay" on 1961 feed grains bill, omnibus farm bill (1962) "nay."

Voted "nay" on 1963 feed grain bill, and "nay" on the 1965 Food and Agricultural Act of 1965.

9. Natural Gas Act: A bill to amend the natural gas act to exempt producers and gatherers of natural gas from Federal regulation (pipeline and distributors to continue to be regulated). Voted "nay" (1955).

10. Minimum wage of $1 per hour. Voted "yea" (1955).

Minimum wage of $1.15 per hour and increased coverage. Voted "yea" (1960).

Minimum wage bill (1961). Voted "yea" on substitute motion to increase minimum to $1.15 immediately. Voted "nay" on final passage which granted a two-step increase.

Minimum wage bill (1965). Voted "yea" on final passage.

11. Fair Labor Standards Act: to extend protection to additional employees and to raise the minimum wage to $1.40 a hour during the first 2 years from effective date of act (1966).

12. Upper Colorado River project. Voted "nay" (1956).

13. Defense reorganization. Promoting the national defense by providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense. Supported amendments incorporating President's suggestions, supported bill (1958).

14. Government organization, Providing for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. Voted "yea" (1958).

15. Wheat programs of 1959 and 1960. Voted "nay" on both.

16. To cite Port of New York Authority officials for contempt of Congress. Voted "yea" (1960).

17. Area redevelopment bill (1961) "nay". Voted "yea" on Republican substitute.

18. Postal rate increase (1962) "yea."

19. Public works bill (1962) "nay."

20. Creation of Department of Urban Affairs (1962) "nay."

21. Communications satellite program (1962) "yea."

22. Establish cabinet-level Department of Transportation (1966), "yea."

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, an active legislator, has introduced various bills and resolutions in areas reflecting his committee work and interests.

Many of the Congressman's bills have sought to implement the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN has been particularly concerned with the problem of Presidential inability and succession. He has also introduced legislation calling for a study of the electoral college.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN voted "yea" to the Constitutional amendment providing for possible incapacity of a President.

Because of his 12-year membership on the Education and Labor Committee, the greatest number of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's bills are concerned with these subjects. Chief among these were his bills on the National Defense Education act and aid to federally impacted areas, both of which are now signed into law. He was also a sponsor of the Library Services Act, and of legislation which would grant tax credits to parents and other who pay college tuition.

In his 6 years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN has been a conscientious member who has been active in the writing of committee reports.

The detailed list of Representative FRELINGHUYSEN's proposals are listed below.

Government organization:

1. To establish a Commission on the Office of the President. (H.R. 7900, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; H.R. 1135, 85th Cong., 1st sess.)

2. To propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. (H.J. Res. 442, 84th Cong., 2d sess; H.J. Res. 38, 85th Cong., 1st sess.)

3. To provide for the establishment of the Office of Administrative Vice President. (H.R. 7901, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) (This bill would implement the suggestion of former President Herbert Hoover.)

4. To provide for a Joint Committee of the Organization of the Congress, etc. (H. Con. Res. 51, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; H. Con. Res. 185, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; H. Con. Res 14, 85th Cong., 1st sess.)

5. To establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security having exclusive jurisdiction in Congress to investigate all subversive and un-American activities. (The bill prescribes rules for the committee guaranteeing the witness protections comparable to those of a court of law.) (H.J. Res. 328, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; H.J. Res. 167, 84th Cong., 1st sess.)

6. To establish a Commission on Internal Security. (H.R. 2590, 84th Cong., 1st sess.)

7. To create a Presidential Commission to study U.S. foreign intelligence activities and the security of intelligence agencies from penetration by subversives. The Commission would have members both from Congress and from the Executive, and would report both to Congress and to the President. (H.R. 9660, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; H.R. 7780, 84th Cong., 1st sess.)

This suggestion was followed by the President's appointment of a special Hoover Commission "task force" to make such a study.

8. To establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence (H.R. 7730, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 12533, 85th Cong., 2d sess.; H.J. Res. 352, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

9. To provide for a Federal Advisory Council of Health, in the Executive Office of the President in accordance with the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H.R. 7532, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 2435, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

10. To amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States (H.R. 2395, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

11. To provide for improving accounting methods in the executive branch of the Government and for other purposes (H.R. 7209, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

12. To establish a Commission on Presidential Inability (H.R. 6836, 85th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 8544, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

13. To provide for research into problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, for development, testing and operation for research purposes of space vehicles, for creation of civilian agency to control such research (H.R. 4961, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

14. To increase the scope of the activities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, to establish a Joint Committee on Astronautics (H.R. 11188, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

15. Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriations bill (H.J. Res. 669, 87th Cong., 2d sess.).

16. To establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (H.R. 8613, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

17. To establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Community Development (H.R. 6209, 89th Congress, 1st session).

18. To establish a National Commission on Public Management (H.R. 17328, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

19. To establish a U.S. Commission on Human Rights for participation in the International Human Rights Year. (H.R. 17084, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

20. To establish a commission on the organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. (H.R. 12305, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

Health, Education, and Welfare:

1. To provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs, and for other purposes (H.R. 10149, H.R. 9841, 83d Cong., 2d sess.).

2. To authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction (H.R. 3770, 84th Cong., 1st sess.). (This bill incorporated proposals of the Eisenhower administration.) (H.R. 11530, 85th Cong., 2d sess.)

3. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education (H.R. 4568, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 7002, 85th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 86, 87th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 10617, 88th Cong., 2d sess.; H.R. 4632, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

4. To establish a program of financial assistance to students in higher education, and for other purposes (H.R. 8779, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; H.R. 2802, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

5. To promote the further development of public library service in rural areas (H.R. 3310, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

6. To strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency (H.R. 3771, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 5339, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

7. To establish a National Library of Medicine (H.R. 7528, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

8. Federal Advisory Council of Health in Executive Office of the President (see Government organization).

9. To authorize a 4-year program of Federal assistance to States for school aid (H.R. 1130, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

10. To provide for registration and reporting of welfare and benefit plans (H.R. 7802, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

11. To provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Relations Academy (H.R. 5306, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

12. For educational development—for the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance, services, provision of scholarships, strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in public schools, expansion of modern foreign language teaching; and improving State educational records and statistics, and other purposes (H.R. 10279, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

13. To amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by repealing section 1001 (f) thereof (H.R. 2332, 86th Cong., 1st sess.).

14. To assist institutions of higher education to market and retire bonds issued by them to finance the construction of college facilities (H.R. 4267, 86th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 951, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

15. To authorize a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities, and for other purposes (H.R. 4268, 86th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 11122, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

16. Designating the 7-day period beginning on the third Monday in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week (H.J. Res. 343, 86th Cong., 1st. sess.; H.J. Res. 458, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

17. To provide for Federal grants and contracts to cary out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency (H.R. 7403, 86th Cong., 1st sess.).

18. To amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations (H.R. 11569, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

19. To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutions in financing the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities. (H.R. 3134, 88th Cong., 2d session).

20. To authorize a 3-year program to assist States and communities to mobilize and coordinate human and financial resources to combat the causes of poverty in the U.S., and to assure coordination of Federal, State, and local programs designed to eliminate or alleviate the effects of poverty. (H.R. 11050, 88th Cong., 2d session).

Labor:

1. To provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss, and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower. (Industrial Safety Act) (H.R. 5740, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

2. To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents (H.R. 5739, 84th Cong., 1st sess.). This bill incorporated proposals of the Eisenhower administration. (H.R. 8413, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

3. To establish a Commission on Labor Racketeering (H.J. Res. 138, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

4. To require labor organization reports, to insure disclosure of certain labor organization information, to define certain duties and responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and to provide further safeguards for workers against improper activities in the conduct of labor organizations (H.R. 10272, 85th Cong., 2d sess.)

5. Providing further safeguards against improper practices in labor organizations and in labor-management relations. (Bill incorporates President Eisenhower's recommendations.) (H.R. 3543, 86th Cong., 1st sess.).

6. To amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes. (H.R. 7489, 86th Cong., 1st sess.)

7. To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. (H.R. 7490, 86th Cong., 1st sess.)

8. To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide more effective procedures for enforcing the provisions of the Act (H.R. 8059, 86th Cong., 1st sess.).

9. To amend the Federal Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates (H.R. 11493 and H.R. 12386, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

10. To amend the Railway Labor Act so as to authorize the President to establish boards to resolve jurisdictional disputes in the air transportation industry (H.R. 12894, 87th Cong., 2d sess.).

11. To repeal section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, (HR 5693, 89th Cong., 1st session).

12. To amend the Interstate Commerce Act. HR 17297, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

Civil Rights:

1. To establish a Commission on Civil Rights (HR 8350, 84th, Cong., 2nd session; HR 1134, 85th Cong., 1st session).

2. To amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957. (HR 3482, 88th Cong., 1st session).

3. To provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal Registrars, and for other purposes. (HR 6027, 89th Cong., 1st session).

4. The Federal Civil Rights Crimes Act of 1966. (HR 15568, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

5. The Civil Rights Law Enforcement Act of 1966. (HR 13329, 89th Congress, 2nd session).

Immigration: To make certain changes in Immigration and Nationality Act (to liberalize the McCarran-Walter Act) (H.R. 8805, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; H.R. 3311, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

Equal rights: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women (H.J. Res. 142, 86th Cong., 1st sess.; H.J. Res. 352, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

District of Columbia:

1. To provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and Secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, (HR 4634 86th Cong., 1st session; HJRes 445, 88th Cong., 2nd session; HR 5806 89th Cong., 1st session).

2. To amend the Old Georgetown Act (H.R. 9510, 87th Cong., 2d sess.).

3. To establish a park on the Georgetown waterfront (H.R. 10015, 87th Cong., 2d sess.).

National flood insurance: To provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes (H.R. 8795, 84th Cong., 2d sess.).

Foreign trade:

1. To increase the amount of articles which may be brought into the United States without payment of duties (H.R. 1132, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

2. To extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, for 5 years (H.R. 10370, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

Post office: To provide additional opportunity for certain postal field service employees to obtain career appointments under the act of July 30, 1956, who lost opportunity for such appointments because of administrative error (H.R. 12492, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

Electoral college reform: To create and prescribe the duties of a Commission to Investigate Electoral College Reform (H.R. 3653, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

Military closings: To direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment (H.R. 7158; 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

New Jersey problems:

1. To grant the consent of Congress to the Waterfront Commission Compact between the State of New Jersey, and the State of New York (H.R. 6456, 83d Cong., 2d sess.—Public Law 252).

2. To provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes (H.R. 2129, 84th Cong., 1st sess.).

3. Granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, Aug. 27, 1935 (air pollution) (H.J. Res. 470, 84th Cong., 2d sess.).

4. Granting consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey for the creation of the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency (H.J. Res. 381, 86th Cong., 2d sess.).

5. To authorize the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey (H.R. 3396, 88th Cong., 2d sess.).

Other: To establish a Presidential Civilian Achievement Medal (H.R. 8365, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

To authorize the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson (H.J. Res. 574, 86th Cong., 2d sess.; H.J. Res. 236, 87th Cong., 1st sess.).

To establish a Commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission (H.R. 9454, 88th Cong., 1st sess).

To establish the National Water Resources Trust Fund (H.R. 10580, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965 (H.R. 6424, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

Human Investment Act of 1965 (H.R. 10953, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

SOME NEW LIGHT ON STATISTICS FOR IDENTIFYING THE POVERTY STRICKEN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article in the September 3 London Economist, page 914, which describes the findings of two publications: one by the Census Bureau titled "Americans at Mid-decade," and another, "This USA, an Unexpected Family Portrait of 194,067,296 Americans," by Messrs. Ben Wattenberg and Richard Scammon. Mr. Scammon was head of the Census Bureau from 1961 to 1965.

Among the findings of the book by Wattenberg and Scammon, which relate to such diverse subjects as marriage and automobile deaths, those concerning poverty are of particular interest.

For example, the 1960 census showed that there were 14 million families with incomes of less than $4,000. But the authors point out that of these, 6.3 million were 2-person families, that 3 million were over 65, and that 2 million "were very young—many of them students—while nearly 5 million were not in the labor force, probably retired." Six million of these families lived in the country.

The Economist concludes that these are not alarming statistics:

> Low incomes can be borne more easily by the young and the old than by people at the peak of their earning power and family responsibilities.

Furthermore, the study showed that almost three-quarters of the families living in poverty had washing machines; 60 percent owned a motor car; almost all had television sets.

The article points out also that it is not possible to be so optimistic about the Negro, but that there are reasons for expecting early economic improvement for Negroes:

> One is that a large proportion of Negroes are young and have not yet reached their peak earning period. Another is that the new generation in the North has had so much more education than its parents, many of whom grew up in the South, with its inferior schools for Negroes.

While allowing ourselves to be reassured somewhat about Negro advancement, we must also remember that unemployment rates among young Negroes are also high, and that if this large group is to make its full contribution to society, programs of education and job training to fit their needs must be strengthened.

With unanimous consent the article referred to follows:

AMERICA: FACT AND MYTH

There are a few things that everybody knows about the United States: that in the richest country in the world nearly 40 percent of the people live in poverty or on the edge of it; that the whites are getting richer and the Negroes poorer; that the number of elderly people will soon become a crippling burden; that deaths on the roads are getting out of hand. Fortunately none of these things is true. But the Census figures (79 questions asked about each of 180 million Americans in 1960 and more detailed questionnaires sent to one family out of four) cannot speak for themselves though they are reproduced in countless reference books, often without acknowledgement; the lady who wondered why all this money was wasted when the figures could be obtained for nothing from the "World Almanac" is surely not unique.

The Bureau of the Census itself does a useful job in highlighting the most significant facts and trends. In January an illustrated leaflet[1] appeared bringing together statistics about the population in 1965 gathered from the smaller surveys and studies which it conducts between the decennial censuses. Here one can discover, for example, that just over half of all white Americans aged 25 or more, and only 29 percent of all Negroes, had completed high school. But though Negroes usually have from two to four years less education than the average white, for the new generation—Americans under 35—there is only a difference of a year or less.

However, the men who know just where the gold lies in this treasure-house of the Census are Mr. Wattenberg and Mr. Richard Scammon, who was head of the Bureau from 1961 to 1965. In their book[2] the figures almost sing—and mostly it is a cheerful tune. For example, the percentage of old people in the population in the year 2000 is not likely to have risen; it may well fall. The present rapid growth in the proportion of elderly is due in part to the heavy immigration of young adults to the United States at the turn of the century. Motor car deaths, when related to miles driven, fell substantially between 1950 and 1962—from 7.6 to 5.3 for each 100 million miles. In "immoral" America, there are more marriages, lasting longer, and the divorce rate has dropped.

But it is the handling of the figures about poverty and the status of Negroes which is most striking. The 1960 Census reported that 14 million families had incomes of under $4,000 a year. But the authors point out that 6.3 of these were two-person families; the heads of 2 million were very young (many of them students) and of 3 million were over 65, while nearly 5 million were "not in the labour force," probably retired. Six million lived in the country. Obviously some of these categories overlap. The argument is that, while some of these families are desperately poor (and so are some with higher incomes), many of them are actually living in reasonable comfort. Moreover, low incomes can be borne more easily by the young and the old than by people at the peak of their earning power and family responsibilities.

Two elderly people who own their own home (and most of whose medical bills are now paid for them) are plainly better off than a family with a number of children which has to pay rent. A married hospital houseman or graduate student may be having a thin time, but this will not last long. And there are eye-opening statistics: almost three-quarters of the families living in "poverty" had washingmachines; 60 per cent owned a motor car; almost all had television sets. The authors hazard a guess than one reason why the poor are so

[1] Americans at Mid-decade. Bureau of the Census. *Government Printing Office*, Washington, D.C. 40 cents.

[2] This USA. An Unexpected Family Portrait of 194,067,296 Americans. By Ben Wattenberg in collaboration with Richard Scammon. Doubleday & Company, New York. $7.50.

"invisible" in America is that there are fewer of them than has been suggested.

Optimism of this order is not possible about the plight of the Negro, though the striking fall in Negro death rates during this century is surely significant; today these are little higher than those for whites. On average, Negroes now earn about 60 per cent as much as whites, up from 41 per cent before the war. But the "catching up" was done by 1950; the consolation is merely that there has been no back-sliding, in spite of the heavy unemployment in the nineteen-fifties. In fact, both races are advancing at about the same rate. But the Negro is still twice as likely to be out of a job.

There are reasons, however, for expecting early economic improvement for Negroes, quite apart from the battle against racial discrimination. One is that a large proportion of Negroes are young and have not yet reached their peak earning period. Another is that the new generation in the North has had so much more education than its parents, many of whom grew up in the South, with its inferior schools for Negroes. Mr. Wattenberg and Mr. Scammon conclude that the Negro is winning his fight, though more slowly than he would like—as is evident from the headlines every day. Anything less would be intolerable in a country where most statistics register "more," with a certain monotony, every time a census is taken.

Poverty in retreat

Year	Percent of families in income brackets (table derived approximately from chart)				
	$10,000 and over	$7,000 to $9,999	$5,000 to $6,999	$3,000 to $4,999	Under $3,000
1947	8.5	11.5	20	30	30
1950	10.0	10.0	20	30	30
1955	11.0	19.0	23	23	24
1960	18.0	20.0	22	20	20
1965	21.0	23.0	20	18	18

THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION AND THE WARREN REPORT

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, September 28, I am introducing a concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to determine the necessity of a congressional investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy in order to attempt to set at rest the uncertainty still remaining notwithstanding the publication of the Warren report just 2 years ago.

I have a special order for the close of legislative business tomorrow to present my statement in connection with the resolution. I will also at that time list the Library of Congress compilation of literature on the subject.

The latest article by Tom Wicker of the New York Times, appeared on Sunday, September 25, and in well-considered fashion points up the public concern on the subject.

The Wicker article follows:

THE RIGHT OF APPEAL FOR LEE OSWALD

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 24.—A public discussion group in New York recently sought to hold a roundtable session about the Warren Report and its conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald was the lone assassin of John F. Kennedy. The major difficulty for the group was in finding anyone of stature who was willing to defend the Warren Report and its findings.

That is only an example of how the atmosphere has changed in the two years since the massive report and its 26 volumes of supporting testimony and evidence were published. In this country, the Warren Commission theory then was accepted widely, almost without question, although doubt continued to prevail in Europe with its history of political assassinations and conspiracies.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS RAISED

Now a number of impressive books—and even more that are not so impressive—have been published, all raising questions of the most serious nature. The Warren Commission's procedures, its objectivity and its members' diligence have been opened to doubt. Its major findings have been called everything from conjecture to prejudgment to error. The damaging suspicion has been planted, here as well as abroad, that the commission—even if unconsciously—was more concerned to quiet public fears of conspiracy and treachery than it was to establish the unvarnished truth, and thus made the facts fit a convenient thesis.

From the day of publication, for instance, Gov. John Connally of Texas has publicly denied the commission's contention that the same bullet passed through President Kennedy's body, then through Mr. Connally's chest *and* wrist to lodge in his thigh. The published analyses of the ballistics and autopsy evidence that have followed the Warren Report have tended to support the Governor, not the commission.

Again, reporters who were present in Dallas that dreadful Friday afternoon clearly remember that the doctor who attended the dying President, in his first public statement, tentatively described a bullet hole in the front of the throat as having had the appearance of an *entry* wound. That this opinion was changed in testimony before the commission, which rested its findings partially on the idea that the hole was an *exit* wound, cannot erase the memory of what was said at first hand on Nov. 22, 1963.

The point is not that the doctor necessarily was wrong the first time, or the second; perhaps there was sufficient reason for the changed opinion. Nor is it really possible to accept Governor Connally's judgment or vice versa, or to decide certainly any number of other points that have now been placed in dispute.

PUBLIC STILL CONCERNED

The point is that the Warren Commission has not, after all, even quieted public concern about who killed John Kennedy, or why, and even less has it presented an ironclad and unarguable case that Lee Oswald, alone and without rational motive, was the assassin.

This is not an easy conclusion to come to, or state. The horror of the event, the probity of the commission's members, the awful implications of any finding that the assassination was the work of something more hateful than a pathetic, warped mentality—for all these reasons few Americans could wish for anything but vindication of the Warren Commission's conclusion.

It may be of course, that the question will plague history—just as there are those who do not believe that Bruno Hauptmann kidnapped the Lindbergh baby, or that Warren G. Harding died a natural death, or that Richard III killed the Princess in the tower. Like life itself, some riddles remain always unsolved.

But has every means of establishing the truth of the Kennedy assassination been exhausted? Representative THEODORE KUPFERMAN of New York, with many other Americans, does not think so. Next week he will ask Congress to establish a joint legislative committee empowered to review the whole case and, if necessary, to reopen it.

TO DIMINISH CONFUSION

A sound precedent for this is found in the joint Congressional group that reviewed the finding of the special Roberts Commission that first investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. The appointment of such a group in this case need have no implication that the Warren Commission was inept or unjust, or that Oswald was guilty or innocent; it would imply only that further investigation and sober second thought ought at least to diminish confusion, if not correct error.

And since the most despicable of convicted murderers has the right of appeal to a higher court, why should not Lee Oswald?

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former editor of the Bulletin of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association and as a trustee of the Consular Law Society, I have been interested in the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

In a recent issue of the aforesaid Bulletin there appeared an "Analysis of the Antidumping Laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom."

Currently there is consideration being given to the question of whether there should be an international antidumping agreement.

A very informative brief in support of this position has been submitted by two knowledgeable attorneys, Alan D. Hutchison, of Washington, D.C., and Thomas Brian Ketchum, of the firm of Ketchum, Meade & Wasserman, of New York City.

The contents of this brief I am certain will be of interest to my colleagues, and I set it forth here at length:

[Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Trade Information Committee, docket No. 66-1]

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON ANTIDUMPING

I. AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON ANTIDUMPING IS NEEDED TO INTERPRET AND APPLY THE ANTIDUMPING POLICY OF THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

The antidumping laws of many major trading nations reflect the basic antidumping policy of Article VI of the GATT; i.e., dumping is only actionable against imported products sold at less than normal value which are causing or threatening material injury to the domestic industry of the importing country or retarding the establishment of an industry.[1]

[1] See American Bar Association, Bulletin of International and Comparative Law Section: Analyses of the Antidumping Laws of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom, December, 1963.

It would seem, therefore, that there is already substantial agreement among the major trading nations, with the possible exception of Canada and the Republic of South Africa, on the definition of actionable dumping. However, an analysis of the antidumping laws of the major trading nations indicates a wide variance in the interpretation and application of the antidumping policy of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.[2]

The question is then raised whether it is desirable to amend Article VI of the GATT to provide for more precise definitions and procedures or whether to supplement Article VI with an International Agreement outlining general guidelines for the interpretation and application of Article VI. Considering the general acceptance of the GATT definition of actionable dumping and the wide variance in the interpretation and application of Article VI by the major trading nations, it would seem more desirable and practical to supplement Article VI by an International Agreement on Antidumping rather than amending Article VI.

II. WHILE THERE APPEARS TO BE GENERAL AGREEMENT AMONG THE MAJOR TRADING NATIONS ON THE DEFINITION OF "SALES AT LESS THAN NORMAL VALUE," IT WOULD, NEVERTHELESS, BE DESIRABLE TO FORMULATE UNIFORM PRACTICES TO ASSURE TRUE COMPARABILITY BETWEEN "NORMAL VALUE" AND "EXPORT VALUE"

Article VI of the GATT is reasonably explicit in defining "sales at less than normal value."[3] The antidumping laws of the many major trading nations reflect this rather explicit definition. Nevertheless, it would be desirable for an international antidumping agreement to promulgate uniform practices or guidelines to assure true comparability between "normal value" and "export value."

The first task of the contemplated guideline is to define the term "the like product" as used in Article VI. The term "the like product" should, in theory, mean a product which is identical or which is essentially the same. However, the U.S. procedure of using the definition of "such or similar merchandise" with necessary adjustments to take care of minor differences appears to be entirely satisfactory and should be incorporated in the International Agreement.

The second task is to provide for a comparison of the prices of the like or similar products at a common point of sale. This should be the point at which it is most convenient to adjust each of the prices which have been selected as the basis for the calculation. Again, the U.S. procedure of comparing, wherever possible, ex-factory or ex-mill prices for export and home market sales appears to be a satisfactory procedure.

The third and most difficult task is to provide guidelines for adjustments to home market prices and export prices to insure true comparability. Accordingly, allowances should be made for reasonably substantial differences between the physical characteristics of the product sold in the export market and that sold on the home market.

In addition, allowances should be made for justifiable differences in the costs and charges included in one price and not included in the other. Such costs and charges would normally include packaging, freight, delivery, insurance, storage and port charges, import duties and taxes, turnover and similar taxes, distributors' margins and commissions, certain advertising and selling costs, and in some instances, discounts and rebates. However, it should be reiterated that these allowances must be economically justifiable.

It is also suggested that in the formulation of an International Antidumping Agreement serious consideration be given to the "normal value" recommendations of the Business and Industry Advisory Committee concerning The Harmonisation of Anti-Dumping Legislations and Procedures within the O.E.C.D. Area.[4]

It has been suggested that a rule be devised to provide specific non-actionable margins of price discriminations. Considering the wide variety of products involved in international trade, it would seem such an inflexible rule would not meet the realistic requirements of each trade. For example, in the steel trade it appears to be a general rule that there must be a price spread of at least 10 to 15% between the price of domestically produced steel and imported steel before consumers will switch from domestic to imported. In the cotton greige goods market, it is understood consumers will switch from domestic to imported goods where the price differential is 1 to 2%. Assuming there is material injury present in a case, it would not be fair to all domestic complainants to dismiss certain cases as non-actionable because of a fixed margin of price discrimination.

III. THE DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY IS THE CRUX OF THE GATT ANTIDUMPING POLICY; YET MATERIAL INJURY IS NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO PRECISE OR MATHEMATICAL DEFINITION. IT WOULD SEEM, THEREFORE, THAT A DETAILED INVESTIGATION IS NECESSARY IN EVERY CASE TO DETERMINE IF THE DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IS SUFFERING FROM OR IS THREATENED BY SERIOUS ADVERSE EFFECTS DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE DUMPING

The antidumping laws of most major trading nations lack precise or absolute definitions of the important term "material injury." The decisions of the U.S. Tariff Commission in injury determinations under the Antidumping Act, 1921, while logical and reasonable on a case-to-case basis, do not provide any general guidelines regarding determination of material injury or objective measurements of material injury. The reason for the lack of preciseness in the antidumping laws and the lack of general guidance and objective measurements of injury in U.S. Tariff Commission determinations is quite understandable—material injury as used in Article VI of The GATT is not susceptible to precise or mathematical definition.

The facts in each individual antidumping case are so different it is necessary for a detailed investigation be made in every case to determine if the domestic industry is suffering from or is threatened by serious adverse effects directly attributable to the dumping. The injury investigation must establish: (1) a causal relationship between the dumping and the injury, and (2) that the injury caused is material.

In the case of a threat of material injury, the determination must be based on solid evidence that a continuation of the current dumping would cause material injury to the industry.

The effect of the dumped goods on competition within the importing country should definitely be one of the relevant economic factors considered in determining injury. It would seem desirable, as a general rule, that goods sold at "less than normal value" in order to meet competition of domestic producers or other major importers selling at normal value, should be a defense to a charge of material injury.

IV. THE SCOPE OF THE TERMS "AN ESTABLISHED INDUSTRY IN THE TERRITORY OF A CONTRACT PARTY" AS USED IN ARTICLE VI OF THE GATT IS SUBJECT TO VARYING INTERPRETATIONS. THEREFORE, IT WOULD BE DESIRABLE FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT TO ATTEMPT A MORE EXPLICIT DEFINITION OF INDUSTRY IN TERMS OF GEOGRAPHIC, MARKET AND PRODUCT COVERAGE

According to The GATT Report of Experts on Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,[5] the term "industry" should normally be related to the total national output of the product involved. The Group of Experts agreed that the use of antidumping duties to offset injury to a single firm within a large industry, unless that firm were an important or a significant part of the industry, would be protectionistic in character and not proper for the application of antidumping duties. Nevertheless, the Group of Experts recognize that individual cases would obviously give rise to particular problems in defining industry.

The problem of defining industry in the United States is exceedingly more difficult than defining industry, for example, in Denmark or even the United Kingdom, because of the geographic size and diversity of markets within the United States. It would seem the fairest interpretation of Article VI is to apply the term industry on a national basis whenever possible. It must be recognized, though, especially in the United States, that there are geographic marketing areas.

There are also classifications of firms within a particular industry which should be treated separately for purposes of antidumping injury determinations. For example, in the steel fabricating industry there is a definite distinction between integrated firms (i.e., firms which possess basic steelmaking capacity) and non-integrated firms. Imports could materially injure the non-integrated fabricators, who are generally located in port areas, and not injure the integrated steel fabricators usually located further inland at major steelmaking centers.

There is much to commend the view that the definition of injury for purposes of administering the GATT antidumping policy should be coordinated with the concept of relevant market areas as developed under the U.S. antitrust and unfair trade laws. However, the major legal obstacle in applying the relevant market area concept to the definition of industry for U. S. antidumping purposes is the practice of applying antidumping duties uniformly throughout the United States in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which requires that "all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

For example, in the British cast iron soil pipe dumping case the Tariff Commission found the injured industry was the cast iron soil pipe industry located in California. In particular, imports of cast iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom were being imported into the Los Angeles area at less than fair value. Cast iron soil pipe, a heavy, bulky, low-cost product cannot economically be shipped more than a few hundred miles from its point of manufacture or from the port where imported. However, an innocent importer of British cast iron soil pipe in Philadelphia was required to pay the additional dumping duties. A similar situation exists in several of the cement dumping cases. Clearly this is an unfair situation.

---

[2] Supra.

[3] Article VI defines a product as being dumped "if the price of the product exported from one country to another—

"(a) is less than the comparable price, in the ordinary course of trade, for the like product when destined for consumption in the exporting country, or

"(b) in the absence of such domestic price, is less than either—

"(i) the highest comparable price for the like product for export to any third country in the ordinary course of trade, or

"(ii) the cost of production in the country of origin plus a reasonable addition for selling cost and profit."

[4] B.I.A.C., "The Harmonisation of Anti-Dumping Legislations and Procedures within the O.E.C.D. Area," Working Document, Jan., 1966.

[5] General Agreement on Tariffs and the Trade, Geneva, March, 1961.

It is recommended, therefore, that the International Antidumping Agreement explicitly state that dumping duties are in the nature of penalties for international unfair trade practices and not in the nature of ordinary import duties. Such an interpretation would assist in obtaining the necessary amendment of U.S. legislation to permit the imposition of dumping penalties at specific ports serving affected relevant market areas; and would help overcome any constitutional objections to such legislation.

V. THERE IS A DEFINITE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT TO PROVIDE GENERAL GUIDELINES ON THE PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF THE GATT ANTIDUMPING POLICY

An analysis of the antidumping laws of the major trading nations indicates wide variance in the procedures used in prosecuting antidumping cases. In some nations the antidumping legislation does not provide any procedural guidelines and the matter is entirely within the discretion of the governmental authorities. In other instances where there are procedural rules it appears the government authorities are at liberty to ignore them. The United States which, undoubtedly, has the most complete and thorough procedural rules, is, nevertheless, criticized by many trading nations for its involved antidumping procedures. There is little question, though, that there is a definite need for an International Antidumping Agreement to provide general guidelines on the procedural aspects of The GATT antidumping policy.

The following general procedural guidelines, which are by no means all encompassing, are recommended for consideration in the formulation of an International Antidumping Agreement:

1. Complaint procedure

Application for action against allegedly dumped imports should be initiated only by the domestic producers of the like or similar goods who are materially injured or threatened with material injury as a result of the dumping.

Since the crux of The GATT antidumping policy is material injury to a domestic industry, it follows that antidumping investigations should not be instigated by governmental officials on their own motion, since sales at less than normal value unaccompanied by material injury are not actionable or reprehensible under The GATT antidumping policy. The U.S. policy of Bureau of Customs initiated antidumping complaints has been rightfully criticized by other trading nations.

The application by the domestic industry for action against the allegedly dumped goods should be supported with the most complete information available proving that the imported goods are being sold at less than normal value, and that these imports are causing or threatening material injury to the domestic producers or materially retarding the establishment of an industry.

The governing authorities administering the antidumping law should recognize, however, that it is often exceedingly difficult for a domestic producer to obtain accurate information on home market or third country sales. This is particularly true in the case of U.S. manufacturers. For example, European home market prices are often confidential and Japanese home market prices, when available, are often meaningless in terms of "normal value." It is unrealistic, therefore, to require domestic complainants to submit prima facie evidence of sales at less than normal value. In many cases the domestic complainant can only allege his belief that sales are less than normal value.

The antidumping complaint should, however, require reasonably clear and convincing evidence of material injury or a threat thereof. This is evidence the domestic complainant is certainly in a position to supply.

2. Notice procedures

The foreign exporters and manufacturers involved should be immediately notified upon the filing of an antidumping complaint and given an opportunity to answer the complaint. The U.S. procedure of public notice appears quite satisfactory and should be useful as a guide in drafting notice provisions for an International Antidumping Agreement.

As a matter of good international practice, it is recommended that the government of the exporting nation be notified of the antidumping complaint prior to the public notice.

3. Simultaneous preliminary investigation of likelihood of sales at less than normal value and material injury

It is well recognized that the mere fact an antidumping investigation is underway will often stifle or impede the international trade in that product. It follows, therefore, that antidumping investigations should be expeditiously handled so as to create the least disruption in international trade.

It would seem that one method of expeditiously prosecuting antidumping investigations is to provide for a simultaneous preliminary investigation of the likelihood of sales at less than fair value and material injury. This was the procedure followed by the United States before the 1954 Amendments to the Antidumping Act, 1921, transferring the injury determination from the Treasury Department to the Tariff Commission. The 1954 Amendments specifically provided that the Tariff Commission should not be given jurisdiction for injury determinations until the Treasury Department had first determined that there were sales at less than normal value.

This has been a prime cause for delay in the administration of the U.S. Antidumping Act. Mr. James P. Hendrick, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury concerned with the administration of the Antidumping Act, stated that after the 1954 Amendments, "the Treasury had to inquire into the pricing situation, even though its officials were reasonably sure that inquiry made at this point into the economics of the situation would show there was no injury."[6]

It is recommended that a simultaneous preliminary investigation be made on both sales at less than normal value and material injury. In the case of U.S. practice, the Tariff Commission is undoubtedly the best qualified agency to conduct injury determinations. There is no reason why the staff of the Tariff Commission could not conduct a preliminary investigation on material injury simultaneously with the Treasury Department's preliminary investigation of sales at less than fair value. If the Tariff Commission found little or no likelihood of material injury, the case could be immediately dismissed. Such a procedure would go a long way toward meeting the criticisms of the administration of the U.S. antidumping law and is a desirable procedural guideline for inclusion in an International Antidumping Agreement.

4. Withholding of appraisement

If the preliminary investigation outlined in No. 3 above discloses a likelihood of sales at less than normal value and a likelihood of material injury or a threat thereof, then the importing country should have the option to withhold appraisement or take other provisional measures. Withholding of appraisement is somewhat similar to the legal concept of restraining orders and temporary injunctions.

Withholding of appraisement is definitely necessary to prevent continued injurious dumping during the course of the detailed antidumping investigation. If appraisement were not withheld, the foreign exporters and importers would be tempted to increase their shipments and attempt to stockpile the material prior to the effective date of any dumping penalty.

In the recent U.K. antidumping investigation involving mixtures of diphenyl ether and diphenyl from the United States, the U.S. exporter was not notified of the antidumping investigation or given an opportunity to rebut the complaint on the grounds the U.K. Board of Trade had information indicating the U.S. exporter would move a two-year supply of mixtures of diphenyl ether and diphenyl from its warehouse in Holland to the U.K. before the effective date of any antidumping penalty. Had the U.K. Customs Duties (Dumping and Subsidies) Act (1957) provided for the withholding of appraisement, the U.S. exporter could have been given the opportunity to rebut the dumping charges and the U.K. chemical industry would have been amply protected during the course of the investigation.

It should be emphasized that withholding of appraisement should only be imposed after a preliminary investigation indicating the likelihood of sales at less than normal value and the likelihood of material injury or the threat thereof. Under these circumstances, there can be no legitimate criticism of withholding of appraisement or other provisional measures to prevent continued injurious dumping while the formal antidumping investigation is conducted.

5. Formal antidumping investigation

Throughout the formal antidumping investigation the foreign exporters or manufacturers, the affected importers, and the domestic complainant should have ample opportunity to discuss the case with the appropriate governing authorities and to confront one another in informal or formal hearings.

The confrontation between domestic complainant and the foreign exporters and manufacturers and affected importers serves a most useful purpose in the antidumping investigation, since there are many exceedingly technical aspects concerning circumstances of sale, cost of production differentials and commercial practices which are unique to the particular industry or product in question. In many cases, it would seem, the appropriate governing authorities can only gain a full understanding of the situation by allowing the opposing parties to confront each other and question the information submitted.

The confrontation should be extended to the determination of material injury. The foreign exporters or manufacturers and the affected importers should have every opportunity to question the domestic complainant's allegations of material injury.

6. Treatment of confidential information

It is difficult for a full and fair antidumping investigation to be conducted unless the interested parties have free access to all information submitted. Unfortunately, at least in U.S. practice, much of the information submitted is considered "confidential." It would seem, though, many firms are exceedingly over-sensitive to disclosing basic business information which really has little value to any one other than their direct competitors in the home market. Perhaps the objections to disclosure of confidential information and the desire to make all pertinent information available to all interested parties can be resolved by conducting in camera proceedings and swearing all participants to secrecy. For example, costs of production of the foreign manufacturer is almost always considered confidential in U.S. antidumping practice. Yet, the foreign manufacturers' cost of production is of no competitive advantage to a domestic complainant, unless the domestic complainant is also competing with the foreign

[6] Hendrick, "The U.S. Antidumping Act," AM. J. Inter. Law 914, 920 (1964).

manufacturer in his home market. In an instance where the information is generally considered confidential, but of no competitive advantage to the domestic complainant, and in camera proceeding with the domestic complainant sworn to secrecy would seem to fulfill the criteria of confidentiality and free access of all pertinent information to the interested parties.

As a general rule confidential information should be kept to an absolute minimum and information should only be classified as confidential when its disclosure would work a definite competitive handicap.

VI. AN INTERNATIONAL ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT SHOULD ESTABLISH A STANDING COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION OF THE GATT TO REVIEW THE ADMINISTRATION OF ANTIDUMPING PROCEDURES AMONG THE CONTRACTING PARTIES

It is evident that even with the formulation of an International Antidumping Agreement there will continue to be a diversity of interpretations and practices among the various trading nations so long as the power to decision regarding antidumping legislation, regulation, and proceedings continues to remain entirely with the national governments.

Accordingly, it is suggested that attention be directed toward the establishment of a standing committee or commission of the GATT to be charged with reviewing and taking appropriate action on any complaints of a contracting party against another party's protectionistic use or abuse of its antidumping legislation or regulations. Such a committee might also exercise its best efforts to assure conformity of domestic legislation and practice with the guidelines of the International Antidumping Agreement.

VII. CONCLUSION

An International Agreement on Antidumping is definitely needed to interpret and apply the antidumping policy of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, particularly to formulate uniform practices to assure true comparability between "normal value" and "export value," to provide guidelines for the definition of industry and to provide general guidelines on antidumping procedures.

Respectfully submitted.

ALAN D. HUTCHISON,
THOMAS BRIAN KETCHUM,
Amicus Curiae.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1966.

FOREIGN DUTY ON U.S. SHOES TWO TO FOUR TIMES U.S. DUTY ON IMPORTS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the problems of the domestic shoe manufacturing industry, particularly in regard to foreign trade as it pertains to this industry. I would like to call attention to some startling facts which indicate that there is no such a thing as "reciprocal" trade insofar as footwear is concerned. Instead, it is a one-way street wherein our foreign friends get all the benefits and the domestic industry has to take the short end of this so-called "free" trade.

The National Footwear Manufacturers Association pointed up some of the facts and problems when it said in its members' newsletter:

It seems ridiculous to the National Footwear Manufacturers Association that the incoming duty for the Canadian shoes (welts) in the United States should be 5% and the export duty from the United States to Canada should be 27½% plus 11% plus the exchange differential. The effective duty comes out at a little over 52% of the wholesale selling price in Brockton. Is this what they really call "reciprocal trade"?

This led me to the realization that U.S. shoe tariffs are the lowest of any trading country in the world, while duties levied by foreign countries on American-made shoes range from two or four times the U.S. level, as the following table illustrates:

Approximate foreign duty plus tax rates applied to leather footwear imports

Country	Duty ((percent) rate)[1]	Other taxes +/or exchange differences[2]	Net duty plus taxes
Common Market:			
Belgium	14 to 20	12 percent	21 to 27 percent.
France	16.5	25+2	49.
West Germany	14.4	6	21.
Italy	16 to 18	4+5	27 to 29.
Netherlands	16 to 21.6	5	22 to 27.
EFTA nations:			
United Kingdom	22.5 to 30	10+10	27 to 33.
Denmark	5.4 to 25	12	19 to 41.
Norway	10 to 20 crowns per kilo plus 13 percent + 50 percent for non-EFTA countries.	13.7	10 crowns (1.40) + 13 percent up to 20 crowns (2.80) + 13 percent. Add 50 percent for non-EFTA.
Sweden	14	10	15.4.
Switzerland	150 to 350 Swiss francs per 100 kilos.	5.4	150 to 350 EF ($35 to $81) per 220 pounds, + 5.4 percent.
Other countries:			
Japan	20 to 30	0 to 20	20 to 50.[3]
Canada	27.5	11×1.075 exchange rate.	52.1.
United States	5 to 20		5 to 20.

[1] Based on c.i.f. landed costs, except Canada on higher of invoice or market value, and United States on f.o.b. foreign value.
[2] Applied to duty-paid value.
[3] Japan also requires a license for the import of footwear.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce and NFMA consul interviews.

During a period when tariff walls are stacked against us, we have to deal with theories and actions of well-intentioned persons and groups who believe that we can export willy-nilly to solve our imports problems. The brutal facts are that we cannot hurdle these barriers.

It has been trouble enough for American shoe manufacturers to compete here and abroad with the lower production costs of low-wage countries. Foreign industries and governments have reinforced their labor cost advantage with higher shut-out trade walls, and we are deprived of the natural competitive outlet of exporting. We lose both ways. It is an odd kind of reciprocity that does not speak well for our reciprocal trade policy of the past 35 years.

Many of our manufacturers are interested in shipping abroad. Some have tried it—for a brief time only. A few have carried on by setting up overseas operations or arrangements with foreign manufacturers.

ONE "EVEN BREAK"

When we get an even break—as in the Netherlands Antilles where the duty is only 6 percent—we do a consistently good shoe business. This small nation ranks among the top importers of American shoes.

In contrast, Italy, the United States best foreign shoe resource, has a net barrier of 27 to 29 percent against U.S. shoes. Why is this necessary? Is it possible that the Italian industry feels we will deluge their markets with cheap American shoes? Of course this is not the case. It appears to be protective trade policy beamed at all potential competition, whether real or imagined.

In my opinion, Japan with its 20- to 50-percent barrier and Canada with its 52-percent wall fall in the same category as Italy.

U.S. duties on foreign footwear range from 5 to 20 percent, with the average around 12 percent—lower by a considerable margin than foreign rates levied against our shoes.

If United States and foreign duties on shoes are to be cut in half at the next round in Geneva under the principles of GATT and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, this would still leave foreign barriers at two to four times U.S. levels—and foreign imports would really flood our domestic market.

I sincerely hope that these facts will be recognized by the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations before entering into further negotiations at Geneva.

THE NEED FOR A HOUSE SELECT INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE UNDER MINORITY CONTROL

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducting a House resolution which proposes creation of a select com-

mittee of 15 members, under minority control, that would have general authority to conduct studies and investigations of the administration and enforcement of Federal laws, subject to certain reasonable limitations.

The responsibilities and authority of this select committee shall be to conduct studies and investigations which would determine: First, whether Federal laws are being administered and enforced reasonably, effectively, and in a manner consistent with, and in furtherance of, the intent, purposes, and objectives for which such laws were enacted; second, whether such departments and agencies are conducting their operations economically and efficiently; third, whether each such department and agency is consulting with and seeking advice from all other significantly affected departments and agencies of the Federal Government in an effort to assure fully coordinated programs; and fourth, whether the departments and agencies of the Federal Government are supplying full and accurate information to the public in accordance with the requirements of law.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 issued a clear and compelling mandate that Congress "exercise continuous watchfulness" over the administration of laws. On July 28, 1966, the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress issued its final report together with supplemental and additional views.

There were many constructive recommendations made by the joint committee which would strengthen and improve the legislative machinery of the Congress. I am hopeful that many of the recommendations will be implemented after careful evaluation and consideration.

One of the most important recommendations included in supplemental views submitted by our distinguished colleagues, Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri; Mr. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire; and Mr. HALL, of Missouri, urged creation of a committee similar to that embodied in my resolution. In their supplemental views they pointed out the importance of minority control, stating in part:

> The genius of American Government has been its response to the will of the majority while protecting minority rights. Our proposal is based squarely on a reaffirmation of this important principle. We do not propose that the minority be given control of an investigatory committee for the sake of frustrating, thwarting, or obstructing the will of the majority. We do so because of our conviction that the control of an investigatory committee would redress the serious imbalance that occurs when the White House and both branches of Congress are locked tightly under the control of a majority party that enjoys enormous majorities in Congress and ever-proliferating power in the Executive.

We are aware of the need to strengthen the check-and-balance functions of the Congress. During recent years the legislative branch has been increasingly subordinated in the lawmaking process. Power has been increasingly concentrated in the executive branch. I am hopeful that this proposal may represent an important first step in assuring effective review and investigation by the legislative branch of the Executive's handling of the laws and appropriations as passed by Congress.

Americans today are disturbed about ethics in Government, conflicts of interest, and the credibility of Government pronouncements. We must take necessary steps to restore public confidence in our processes of Government.

Briefly, the select committee proposed by my resolution would function only when the executive and legislative branches of Government are controlled by members of the same political party. Its 15 members would be appointed by the Speaker, 8, including the chairman, from among minority Members of the House, and 7 from the majority. The minority party appointments would be made from a panel of at least 24 Members nominated by the minority leader. The committee's jurisdiction would be Government-wide but it would be specifically precluded from investigating any subject which was under active investigation by a standing committee or subcommittee.

The mere existence of such a select committee would tend strongly to encourage self-improvement in any administration, lessen the need for investigations, and help eliminate public impressions of poor government by strengthening the operations of good government.

I would hope that this proposal, along with others recommended by the Joint Committee, will be freely discussed by Members of Congress and students of government, and citizens generally across America. Then let us proceed to modernize and strengthen the congressional role in keeping with the mandate of the Constitution.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE ARKANSAS RIVER PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may extend their remarks following mine on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in brief remarks on the floor yesterday I reported that Richard M. Nixon, appearing in Oklahoma in behalf of the Goldwater-Birch Society candidate who is opposing me, had completely misrepresented the facts on two important points.

The first of these points, with which I dwelt yesterday, was the Nixon statement that I had "run away" from the issue of cutting off aid to nations dealing with North Vietnam.

Labeling this an outright, shameless falsehood, I referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 26 and September 20 of 1966. On both of these occasions I voted for legislation to cut off our aid to nations dealing with or shipping to North Vietnam, and the record is clear on this point.

In the second Oklahoma illustration of what I described as Birch Society tactics, Mr. Nixon told a press conference that I had no more to do with the Arkansas River development program "than Barry Goldwater did with the TVA."

It is almost impossible, Mr. Speaker, to account for this direct and monumental violation of the truth, by a man who once occupied one of our country's highest positions.

THE NIXON RECORD

In my remarks yesterday, I referred to the curious fact that Mr. Nixon had reportedly refused to endorse a Birch Society candidate while in Alaska last week, but had given no answer to a television newsman who asked him to account for appearing in Oklahoma in behalf of a Birch Society candidate.

When you look carefully at Mr. Nixon's statements and speeches in recent weeks, however, there is nothing surprising about his taking an inconsistent position on supporting Birch Society candidates.

On July 11, 1965, Nixon was given a big writeup in the Los Angeles Times in calling upon President Johnson to repudiate two Democratic Senators "for criticizing U.S. Vietnam policy."

In California on that date, Mr. Nixon said:

> It's important for America to speak with one voice when the security of America is involved.

In Oklahoma last week, however, Mr. Nixon spent a good deal of his time criticizing America's Vietnam policy.

In the Muskogee Daily Phoenix, for example, the headline over the story reporting his Oklahoma speech read as follows: "Nixon Raps Johnson Policy on Viet War."

Apparently it is all right for Mr. Nixon to criticize U.S. policy in Vietnam, but all others should "speak with one voice."

Another major point in the Nixon speech in Oklahoma was an accusation that Democrats are responsible for price increases which have taken place in recent years.

Most of the items cited by Nixon in this regard—bread, milk, and bacon, for example—represented a farm product.

Overlooked in the Nixon attack was the fact that when the President has moved to hold back or roll back price increases—as was the case on both aluminum and copper—Nixon himself was openly critical of Presidential action and labeled it "a declaration of war on prosperity."

In fact, the Washington Star for November 22, 1965, said the President was accused by Nixon of "heavy-handed use of presidential power" in his attempt to hold down prices on these metals.

Mr. Nixon, in short, is against price increases—especially on farm products—but also against use of Presidential power to stop those price increases.

On September 5, 1966, the Providence Journal had this to say about Nixon advice on Vietnam:

> From time to time Mr. Nixon has warned against our getting bogged down in a land

war involving masses of ground troops. But as recently as last Wednesday, in his speech before the American Legion convention, he was calling for a 25 per cent increase in the numbers of American troops on the ground in Viet Nam.

Last September he was dead set against negotiations. "I am against talk about negotiations," he said. "This prolongs the war. These people do not understand talk, and they take it as a lack of strength."

But last month, after other Republican leaders had come out in support of negotiations under Asian leadership to work out a peaceful settlement, Mr. Nixon changed his mind. "I think the idea is excellent," he said.

The net of all this appears to be that Mr. Nixon favors bombing North Vietnamese cities, but not the people in those cities; he wants more U.S. troops on the ground in Viet Nam, but doesn't want us involved in a ground war; and he is both in favor of and opposed to peace negotiations.

A POLITICAL CHAMELEON

On the record, Richard Nixon is a political chameleon without compare—capable of changing positions and colors on an instant's notice—with or without a foundation in fact and truth on which to stand.

One of the remarkable things about the reptile called a chameleon, aside from its ability to turn almost any color when threatened, is its further ability to shoot out its tongue to a distance almost equal its own length.

The Nixon performance in Oklahoma, in which he distorted the record on the issue of aid to North Vietnam, and further misrepresented the facts regarding the Arkansas River, is completely in character for Mr. Nixon.

The use of misrepresentation and falsehood against a political candidate is evidence not only of ethical bankruptcy on the side which uses such tactics—it is also evidence of their desperation in pursuit of victory.

Only a candidate who could find no legitimate, honest issues on which to run would resort to such tactics.

Only a spokesman for a party without legitimate, honest issues—hungry and desperate for votes and power—would employ such tactics in a campaign.

THE RIVER ISSUE

What are the facts concerning the role of Congressman ED EDMONDSON with respect to the Arkansas River development program?

Mr. Nixon said "Senator Kerr was responsible" for the Arkansas program, and I have no quarrel with anyone who wants to credit our late, great Senator with leadership in the Arkansas River program effort. No other Oklahoman made as great an individual contribution as did Bob Kerr.

But Mr. Nixon also said, and was quoted to this effect in the Tulsa World for September 24, that I "had as much to do with the Arkansas project as Barry Goldwater did with TVA."

Since Mr. Goldwater was never identified as a TVA booster, and was widely credited with proposing that TVA be sold by the Government, it is pretty obvious that Nixon would like to have the people of Oklahoma believe that ED EDMONDSON had nothing to do with the Arkansas River program—or possibly even opposed it in some way.

In the approximately 18 years of my own experience in politics and government, I have never run across a greater falsehood about a candidate. It is so completely inconsistent with the facts that it can only be explained as an exercise in John Birch Society tactics by a former Californian who has had an opportunity to observe those tactics for a long time.

If you are going to tell a falsehood about a man, says the Birch Society you might as well make it a big one. If you tell it loud enough, and long enough, someone will believe. And, in politics—so say the Birchers—the end justifies the means.

The facts regarding my position on the Arkansas River program—and my part in the fight for it—are part of the RECORD of this Congress. Every statement I make on this point can be verified in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

When I came to the Congress, in 1953, the Arkansas River program had already been authorized, and some flood control structures with power features had already been built or were under construction.

At that time, construction had not been started on any navigation structure, and no money for construction of navigation structures had been recommended.

In 1955, in the face of opposition by the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, a group of us in the House of Representatives determined to put an end to the "no new starts" policy in the field of water development.

We took the fight to the floor of the House.

I offered the amendment to add $900,000 to the construction item in the public works appropriation bill, for the specific purpose of starting construction of the Eufaula Dam and Reservoir in Oklahoma, and the Dardanelle lock and dam in Arkansas.

The amendment was adopted, and it was a part of the bill which the House sent to the other body.

In the U.S. Senate, Senator Kerr and Senator MIKE MONRONEY joined hands in fighting to hold this $900,000 item, and they were successful. The bill was passed, and the money made available to the administration.

It was the first construction money appropriated by the Congress for navigation structures on the Arkansas River, and Senator Kerr himself commented publicly upon this fact on many occasions in Oklahoma.

Having offered the amendment which provided the first funds for this purpose, I do not believe it is necessary to add many facts to establish the truth about my role with regard to the Arkansas River.

In the years which followed, I have testified regularly before the appropriations committees in support of additional funds for the river program.

I have also served for a number of years on the House Committee on Public Works, which has reported the bills providing most of the monetary authorizations for the Arkansas River construction program—the authorizations on which appropriations must be based.

The Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works, on which I have served for a number of years, has held the hearings on which these authorizations are established—and every member of that subcommittee, Republican and Democrat alike, is aware of my continuing interest in the Arkansas River program.

One of my most prized possessions is a handsome plaque presented to me, several years ago, by the Arkansas Basin Development Association of Arkansas, in recognition of my efforts in behalf of the river program.

Another prized possession is a life membership in the Arkansas Basin Development Association of Oklahoma, presented "to ED EDMONDSON in sincere appreciation for his outstanding leadership through the years and for his unwavering support and dedicated service to the program of water resource development."

Mr. Speaker, the Arkansas River program is proceeding on schedule, and navigation will be underway in 1970 if we are successful in maintaining that schedule.

This great program is the golden key to a better tomorrow for the people of my State, and for the people of our neighboring States in the Arkansas River Valley.

I am deeply grateful to the Members of this great legislative body, who have given their support to the Oklahoma delegation in its battle for completion of the program, and who are making that better tomorrow possible for our people.

With God's help, we shall finish the job.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, my State of Arkansas borders on Oklahoma, and Arkansas and Oklahoma have always been good neighbors. Arkansas and Oklahoma share the Arkansas River, and we share the hope for tremendous economic growth held forth by the Arkansas Basin navigation program, scheduled to be completed in 1970.

Throughout the long history of this project, Arkansas has had no better neighbor than the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Arkansas has no member on the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, but Mr. EDMONDSON has served our interests there, and he has served us well there. His interests and ours have been the same.

When the gentleman from Oklahoma sponsored an amendment in 1955 which provided the first funds for the Arkansas Basin navigation program, the amendment appropriated funds for one project in Oklahoma, and one in Arkansas. And he has worked just as hard for Oklahoma, for Arkansas, and for water development throughout the United States, ever since.

There is no Member of this body who has worked longer, harder, or more ef-

fectively for the development of the Arkansas River than ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

We, of Arkansas, are proud of our neighbor, Mr. EDMONDSON, for he has been a good neighbor.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight on what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has done with respect to the development of the Arkansas River. If anyone, Mr. Speaker, is familiar with what happened on that project, I am. I served on the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Appropriations Committee when the public works bill for 1955 was considered by the House. I serve on that committee today.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is absolutely responsible for the start of the Arkansas River development program. For it was Mr. EDMONDSON who offered the amendment to start construction of two of the dams in this great navigation project. Those dams are the Eufaula and Dardanelle. The record will show that the Edmondson amendment added $900,000 to the construction section of the public works appropriations bill and he offered it so that construction on these two dams could get underway. I know whereof I speak, Mr. Speaker, because I opposed his amendment. It was committee policy to eliminate any new construction at that time. The amendment of Congressman EDMONDSON carried and so construction for the Arkansas River development program was on its way.

Mr. Speaker, no other Member of the House has done more for the development of the Arkansas River than has our colleague, ED EDMONDSON. He has followed this project, since its beginning, with keen interest and persuasive and effective support. Anyone who says that he has done nothing on it, of course, does not know what he is talking about. Any such statement flies in the face of the facts and the record.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to set the record straight because I am intimately acquainted with precisely what occurred when this great Arkansas River program finally got underway. And I emphasize again. It was the gentleman from Oklahoma, ED EDMONDSON, who got it started in this House.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be on the floor back in 1955 when the gentleman in the well at the present time [Mr. EDMONDSON] introduced the amendment and actively supported the amendment making funds available for construction to commence the canalization of the Arkansas River.

At that time I had a project in Kentucky, the Jackson Cutoff, that I had been trying to get funds for for many years. We were unable to get a single start in the 83d Congress during the Eisenhower administration. It was not until the 84th Congress, when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] took the lead in the House of Representatives on that occasion in 1955 that, in the public works appropriation bill on this floor, we obtained funds for the Arkansas River. I think all Members of this body know that the Arkansas River would never have been canalized but for the dedicated efforts of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] who spent so much time and effort in organizing support from the Members of this body for several years.

I certainly feel that the statements made by our former Vice President, Mr. Nixon, were untrue, to say the least, and he certainly should have checked the record before the tried to cast any reflection of that kind on one of the most distinguished gentlemen in this body, Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank my good friend very much for those remarks.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the record of one of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives. I speak now of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. I do not know what total dedication of a kind greater than he has given could have been. There is no person who has ever been in the House of Representatives, the profits of whose work have been as valuable to us throughout the country.

All of us are proud of the great projects that we have realized throughout the country as a result of the work of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Right now I can account for some $9 billion worth of projects that we in the Public Works Committee have dealt with and authorized during the gentleman's tenure. We have measured every one of them and they have made sense. We have supplied the necessary money for them. We have done everything that would be required of the Congress of the United States to implement the whole course of water resource development. We have recreation; we have flood control; we have navigation. There is not a single aspect of the whole problem with which we have not dealt. Consequently, with the leadership of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], we have developed water resource commitments to furnish municipalities with water. We have built reservoirs and dams. We have done almost everything to meet requirements that communities would request of us.

We have done more in developing the water resources in the last decade than has ever been done in the last 100 years. Consequently, the people who have been dedicated to this proposition are people like ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, who has worked on this day in and day out.

There is not a single Member of this House who has not been beseeched by Mr. EDMONDSON for action on the water requirements of his area. We have tried to supply them, not only in the amount of water but the quality of water. In this effort we make today, if we try to segment it, if we let it depart for the good common course, then we would really make a catastrophe in our investments and our programing and all the rest. But the emphasis should be on the fact that in all those high qualities of analysis, we have the Member from Oklahoma who has done more in dealing with the problem than any Member I have been acquainted with. He has enlisted himself in the effort to try to deal with the total problem as we have to deal with it.

So I believe he is to be commended. I believe it commendatory that we have people like ED EDMONDSON, who is useful, who is knowledgeable, who is dedicated to the proposition of water resource development.

I am obliged to the gentleman for letting me speak. I would like to come out to his area and tell his people what I think about him.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the very kind words of my friend from Alabama, who I think is one of the pioneers in water resource legislation for our country.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, my dear friend, Judge TRIMBLE.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to congratulate my colleague from Oklahoma for his fine work in Congress. He is a jewel.

It is inconceivable to me that any thinking American would question Mr. EDMONDSON's record as an effective supporter of vital public works projects, particularly the Arkansas Basin navigation program. No member of this body has worked harder for public works or for Arkansas River development.

I certainly wish him well.

It is difficult for me to understand, though, how anyone could be so unaware as to be critical of the gentleman from Oklahoma in an area where his outstanding record is so clear.

Continually and consistently, Mr. EDMONDSON has been in the forefront as an advocate of a sound public works program. Mr. EDMONDSON has been an unexcelled leader in the great water development program in the Southwest, particularly the development of the Arkansas River. I have worked with him on these and other matters and I know firsthand of his outstanding dedication to his country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Now I yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Navajo proverb that says: "He who throws mud loses ground." I believe this is what the people of Oklahoma will find in connection with the Nixon charges the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. Nixon is off on one of his traveling medicine shows again, and we are going to be fortunate enough to have him in Arizona. I believe he was one of those who organized the GOP truth squad a few years ago. If this is true and if this

is the type of thing he is taking up now, I believe he has already lost his membership.

I believe the gentleman, instead of being perturbed, ought to be very honored. There has not been an outstanding public figure of the Democratic Party in the last 20 years who has not been attacked and slandered by Mr. Nixon. It puts the gentleman in the category of men like President Truman, who was outrageously slandered by Mr. Nixon, or Adlai Stevenson, John Kennedy, our former President, and all the others.

Mr. Stevenson once said of Mr. Nixon that he was the kind of man who would cut down a 2,000-year-old redwood tree, and then mount the stump to make a speech on conservation.

I believe if there is anyone in this House who has had anything to do with the Arkansas River project it is the gentleman from Oklahoma. I had not been in the House more than 3 or 4 days when he began to explain the virtues of this project to me. Of course, sometimes he told me more about it than I really wanted to know. This has been an overriding concern of my friend from Oklahoma, that this very important project go forward, be expanded, and be built at the earliest possible time.

One of the defects of my friend from Oklahoma is that he is one of those people who does not go out to seek a lot of credit. There is an old saying, "There is no limit to what can be done if it does not matter who gets the credit." This is the philosophy of ED EDMONDSON.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, if there were a secret ballot among the Members of the House to name 10 or 15 or 20 of the most sincere, effective, persuasive, and valuable Members of the House, the name of ED EDMONDSON would be on that list.

I hope the gentleman will not be dismayed by this attack. He is in a great fraternity of other great men who have been attacked. And, I suspect there will be a lot more great Democrats on the list before the fall of this even-numbered year runs its course.

All of this explains to me why Richard Nixon was not the President of the United States, why he was not the Governor of California, and why he probably will not hold any other major office in the United States. If they ever create a great hall of fame for inconsistency I would suggest that they put Mr. Nixon's statue in the front doorway.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much both for his kind remarks and also for his philosophy.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield with great pleasure to my good friend and colleague on the Oklahoma delegation.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for sounding the warning that Richard Nixon is on the loose again as the Republican Party hatchetman, spreading half-truths and falsehood, trying to stir up feelings about resorting to the facts.

I believe Nixon got a little too far out on his limb when he picked Oklahoma as the place to question Mr. EDMONDSON's role in the development of the Arkansas River. We of Oklahoma know Mr. EDMONDSON's role in this great project—it has been outstanding—and we resent the fact that a confirmed loser came into our State with the gall to question that role.

When ED EDMONDSON came to Congress in 1952, he was a confirmed believer in the late Bob Kerr's dream of navigation on the Arkansas, and he went to work immediately to help Bob Kerr make that dream come true. It was Mr. EDMONDSON who, in 1955, sponsored an amendment to the public works appropriations bill and led it through the House to start construction on the Arkansas against the Eisenhower administration's policy of no new starts.

Mr. EDMONDSON is Oklahoma's member of the Committee on Public Works, and, in that capacity, he works for all of Oklahoma on that committee and in the field of public works. His constituency is the Second Congressional District of our State, but, when it comes to public works, he represents all six Oklahoma districts.

Richard Nixon must have flown over eastern Oklahoma sometime during his trip into Bartlesville. All he needed to do was look out the window of his airplane to see how effective Mr. EDMONDSON has been. Had he looked out in any direction he would have seen one of the great lakes which make up the Arkansas Basin project. And the fine work of EDMONDSON has gone into every one of these lakes.

Mr. Speaker, probably the most important work Mr. EDMONDSON does in this great conservation campaign is in providing those of us who work on the Appropriations Committee with the highly important facts and technical data we must have when we go about funding these vital projects which have meant so much to our State. I for one wish to commend him for the fact that never have I called on him for information which would help us when he has not had it available and cooperated with us 100 percent.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commending my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for a fine speech and for the leadership which he has displayed on water development legislation.

There is no doubt about the key role of ED EDMONDSON on the Arkansas River program, ever since I came to the House. I am surprised that anyone has questioned that role.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the gentleman from Oklahoma, and to his excellent record in the field of public works.

I know it is not necessary to recount his record in this field before our colleagues in the House of Representatives, nor should it be necessary to recount his record for the benefit of his constituents in Oklahoma. We here know, and the people of Oklahoma know, of Mr. EDMONDSON's consistent, successful efforts toward greater water development.

But, if there are those who believe Richard Nixon knew what he was talking about when he sought to cast doubt on Mr. EDMONDSON's sterling record in this field, I want to set the record straight.

As a member of my Committee on Public Works, Mr. EDMONDSON studies hard and works hard. He is an honored and respected member of that committee, and he firmly believes that the future of his State rests firmly on completion of an ambitious, imaginative program of water development.

ED EDMONDSON has worked diligently for authorization of the projects which make up the Arkansas Basin program, and he has fought hard and successfully for the new construction starts necessary to keep this great program on schedule. He has worked hard to help put together the great omnibus public works bills. He has helped to guide them through this House, and in the first session of this Congress, he was a member of the conference committee on the omnibus bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON believes in the Arkansas Basin program, and any man with the record I have cited would most certainly be a vital, effective leader in the pursuit of a public works program he believes in. Mr. EDMONDSON has been this, and much more, to the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to believe that anyone, even Richard Nixon, could question the effectiveness of the gentleman from Oklahoma in the field of public works.

Mr. EDMONDSON has worked for public works throughout his service in Congress, and he has been an effective worker. He has appeared before my subcommittee every year when hearings have been held, and has made strong and convincing arguments for those projects he has believed to be good and beneficial for his people.

ED EDMONDSON's efforts on behalf of the development of the Arkansas River have been tireless. He believes in this project, and he has always been 100 percent behind it. He has worked hard and well for this project, and when it is completed, it will be as much a tribute to him as to any man.

Anyone who would question Mr. EDMONDSON's effectiveness as a worker in Congress for the Arkansas Basin program, or for any good public works project, anywhere, is either woefully behind in his homework, or is making a conscious attempt to mislead the voters in Mr. EDMONDSON's district.

NEW THREATS TO THE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in view of reliable reports that Communist China is now supplying munitions of war to the so-called Arab "Palestine Liberation

Army," I think the time has come for the United States to provide arms—on a grant basis—to Israel, the new target of Red China's fanaticism.

The United States is currently selling tanks, jet bombers, and other arms to Israel but on a cash-and-carry, hard currency payment basis. Israel, menaced by Soviet and Chinese weapons simultaneously, in the midst of pro-Communist neighbors, is forced to devote enormous amounts of its own strained resources to pay for defensive arms.

The Israelis are paying more for defense per capita than the citizens of the United States. The Israel defense bill is proportionately higher. Thousands of workers have lost their jobs on development projects in Israel that have been deferred because that Government lacks the means both to defend and develop the country at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, Peking would like to foment a Chinese-style "war of liberation" by the Arabs against Israel as a diversion in the Near East from U.S. efforts in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Peking extremists also see this as a means of undermining Soviet influence in the Near East and penetrating that volatile region in the chaos that an Arab "liberation war" would create.

American soldiers are now dying in Vietnam, partly as a result of calculated designs in Peking. It seems to me absurd that we do not immediately authorize, by act of Congress and executive department initiative, the granting of all necessary arms to Israel to deter Peking's Near Eastern plot.

The Israeli solider would be as valuable to the national security interest of the United States as our military deployments in the Far East. We can depend upon the Israelis to defend their independence and territorial integrity. The time has come to invite Israeli soldiers to Fort Benning and other installations for training in the antiguerrilla techniques we are learning, at such great cost, in Vietnam.

Israel's neighbors, where the Palestine Liberation Army is based, are friendly to Hanoi and the Vietcong whose agents operate openly, and in fact maintain offices in Cairo and Damascus. Arabs of the PLO have gone to Peking for training and some are serving in the forces of Hanoi and the Vietcong against the United States in order to gain experience for the unleashing of a similiar guerrilla war in the Near East.

Let us aid a stable nation while there is yet time to meet a situation before it developes to the disadvantage of the free world. We should make every effort to assist a free, stable state such as Israel against the threatened onslaught of Communist backed subversion.

CHANCE TO CANCEL BAD GUN DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our Government is presented today with a golden opportunity this week to extricate itself from the unfortunate deal under which we have agreed to buy some 4,000 substandard 20 millimeter automatic guns from a West German producer.

I plan to outline that opportunity in these remarks. And in doing so, I also plan to reveal the contents of a hitherto-undisclosed message from Bonn to the Pentagon which I believe other Members of Congress will agree substantiates the charge I have been making that the United States is buying this controversial gun, known as the H.S. 820, from Germany for political reasons and not because of the gun's merits, which actually are nonexistent.

The political reasons involved in the original 1964 purchase agreement were the West German demands that this country give Germany some munitions business, to help quiet the rising German domestic complaints about the so-called offset agreement. Under that pact, reluctantly signed by Germany in 1961, the West Germans agreed to buy $1.35 billion in American arms every 2 years, to offset the U.S. cost of maintaining its NATO troops in Germany.

It is particularly relevant to make the disclosure of the behind-the-scenes details of this deal today. Because West German Chancellor Ludwig Erhard is now in Washington with his Defense Minister, Kai-uoe von Hassel.

And the prime reason for their visit, as has been widely publicized, is to warn the United States that they will have to postpone part of their current biennial procurement of U.S. arms under the offset agreement, and that the next installment of offset procurements may have to be reduced by as much as 50 percent or more.

The political reasons for Germany's action today are the same as those that produced our commitment in 1964 to buy the H.S. 820 guns. The offset agreement is highly unpopular because of the burden it imposes on the German economy.

Similarly, the zeal with which Secretary of Defense McNamara seeks to keep the offset program in force is the same that motivated him to engage in the controversial gun agreement in 1964: his concern over balance of payments. At that time he agreed to buy a gun which has never measured up to standards in an effort to protect the offset agreement. The $150 million the guns and ammunition will cost will seriously reduce the monetary advantage of the deal, but he accepted that penality—even though he was under no obligation to do so.

The way the political winds are now blowing, the German officials will probably emerge from the White House with a modification of the offset-purchase obligation.

The minimum price President Johnson should exact for this is cancellation of the gun contract which was given final approval—after heavy pressure from the Germans—on June 30 of this year.

Just how heavy the pressure was is disclosed in a message from Bonn to the Pentagon in January 1965. It quoted Brig. Gen. Konrad Muehllehner, deputy to Dr. Bode, director of a division of the German Defense Ministry as saying that the German Government was very disturbed about the U.S. failure to buy a quantity of H.S. 820 guns for test purposes. He said failure to buy the guns would cause German officials difficulty in defending the military budget then pending before the German Parliament. He further warned that failure to buy the guns might affect the deal—signed as part of the gun procurement—under which Germany is buying three U.S. missile destroyers. The general was quoted as closing his warning with this observation: "Remember that we, too, have politicians we must satisfy."

German concern arose at that point over a temporary freeze placed on the gun procurement at the insistence of the U.S. Congress. The purchase of guns for test purposes was being negotiated at the very time that Secretary McNamara announced the closing of dozens of U.S. bases—including the Springfield, Mass., Armory where small arms are developed and tested. Massachusetts Congressmen lodged a protest against the purchase of German guns at a time when employees of the Springfield Armory faced the prospect of dismissal.

The protest led to a temporary freeze on the gun procurement, but the freeze was lifted in April.

The sharpness of the German warning showed clearly the determination of Germany to protect the gun deal at all costs—even to the point of reneging on the missile destroyer purchase.

Obviously the warning got through to Secretary McNamara and had the desired impact, because subsequently the standards against which the guns were being tested were lowered over the protests of high military officials, and the gun was cleared for procurement even though it did not measure up even to the lowered standards.

I have charged, in six speeches within the past 3 months, that this weapon is substandard, and that the real reason the United States finally signed a contract last June for procurement—despite the fact that the gun still does not work properly—was that we were secretly committed to West Germany to buy it.

It is particularly significant that in the volume of material the Pentagon has cranked out in response to my criticism, Mr. McNamara has never once tried to answer my most serious charge, although I have made it repeatedly. My charge was that we agreed to buy this gun at the time we did to give West Germany some U.S. business; that after we found that the gun still could not be made to work properly, we felt we had to proceed with the procurement anyway; otherwise Germany would retaliate by backing out of a sizable portion of its offset commitment; namely, the missile destroyer purchase.

This year the lengths we are considering going to pressure Germany to maintain the offset program include the threat to reduce our troop level in West Germany if the Germans cut their offset purchases.

Two years ago, the lengths we were willing to go to included agreeing to start purchases of the H.S. 820 cannon from Germany within 1 year's time, even

though at that time our ordnance experts had been unable to get the gun to perform up to U.S. standards, and had officially reported that it would take more than a year to modify the gun further so that it might be eligible for procurement.

The Defense Department has attempted, on several occasions, to answer my charges, which were detailed and wide ranging. I believe that the material I put in the RECORD September 20 makes clear that none of these attempts have been successful.

Last week, I met personally with Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor, at his invitation, to discuss my attacks on the H.S. 820 program. And again I pressed my contention that the cannon was being bought at this time, despite the fact that it did not work properly, because it was a quid-pro-quo. For the first time, I got from a Pentagon official an answer of sorts. He acknowledged that the Germans made no secret of the fact that they wanted to sell us the cannon. But he denied that Germany had received any flat assurance that we would buy the gun.

Today, I will reveal exactly what the situation was—a situation of which, to the best of my knowledge, neither the public nor the Congress was ever informed.

In November 1964, West German Defense Minister Von Hassel visited Washington for one of his regular meetings with Secretary McNamara.

At the end of that meeting on November 15, 1964, Mr. McNamara and Mr. Von Hassel issued a joint communique in which they stated—in separate unrelated paragraphs interspersed with other announcements—that West Germany was buying three missile-firing destroyers from the United States, under the offset program, and the United States was tentatively planning to buy the 20-millimeter guns.

The communique made clear that the destroyer "buy" was a firm agreement. But it indicated that American purchase of the guns was contingent upon progress aimed at eliminating several problems with the gum which had cropped up during U.S. tests of the weapon.

Absolutely no mention was made of any connection between the two procurements. The communique added that the United States was "optimistic" that the deficiencies in the German gun could be satisfactorilly eliminated.

"Optimistic" indeed. Reports which McNamara had on tests which we had been making on the cannon for 3 years, and a report by an inspection team that had visited Germany to observe the West German Army's utilization of the weapon, were anything but "optimistic." They indicated, instead, that despite lengthy tests and a yearlong U.S. improvement program, the gun still had numerous deficiencies, and the chances were dim that the entire weapons system, of which the H.S. 820 was a part, could be brought up to U.S. standards in much less than 3 years.

Yet we went ahead and made this supposedly "contingent" agreement—because, the General Counsel of the Army Materiel Command conceded in what may have been absent-minded candor: "Mr. Von Hassel needed something to show the Bundestag"—a quid-pro-quo that Von Hassel and Chancellor Erhard could show West Germany's complaining politicians.

Let me interject, at this point, that our Army's need for an automatic gun in the 20-millimeter class is not questioned. Indeed, it is a need that was officially but belatedly recognized—after much foot dragging—as far back as 1961. That need was what led the United States to survey the field of available 20-millimeter cannons, and then start testing the H.S. 820, in hopes that it could be made to work for U.S. troops until we were able to develop a successor weapon of our own.

Unfortunately, we learned in those tests that the German gun was far below standard. In fact, we had just completed a second round of those tests in early fall of 1964, when preparations began for Von Hassel's visit to this country.

During those preparations, involving lower level staff contact, it became evident that when Von Hassel arrived, he was going to demand that the United States buy some German armaments. Casting about for some weapons to fill that need, McNamara asked the Army what West Germany had in its Army and industrial inventory that the U.S. Army might use.

Army officials immediately thought of the H.S. 820. It was the obvious answer. The only problem was, it would not work—and the prospects appeared dim for getting it to work—at least not up to the standards that the "user" agency, the Army's Combat Development Command, said our troops needed.

Yet the pressure from McNamara's office was so strong—and our need for this cannon was sufficiently great—that top Army officials decided officially to reaffirm our requirement for the gun and tell McNamara to go ahead and purchase it from Germany.

The problem of its substandard performance would be solved, they decided, simply by lowering the standards. As the Army itself now virtually admits, it was decided to take the gun with whatever further improvements could be made within 1 year—and it was hoped that this added year of work would bring the weapon up to some sort of acceptable performance level.

Unfortunately, the gun has never measured up, as was easily predictable from any reading of the voluminous reports on the gun's performance up to that time. But under pressure from McNamara, the Army decided to gamble.

So the Army sent word to McNamara to make the deal—and make it he did.

What were the terms of that deal?

The terms were—as private correspondence between West Germany and our Government makes clear—that we flatly agreed to buy the weapon in return for Germany's purchase of the missile-firing destroyers. There was nothing contingent about it at all.

Unfortunately for Secretary McNamara, another factor intervened at this point. In December 1964, the economy-minded Secretary of Defense announced the planned closing or consolidation of more than 2 dozen military facilities that he said were unneeded or obsolete. Among them was the historic Federal armory at Springfield, Mass., long a developer of U.S. weapons.

As soon as McNamara made his announcement, the armory's numerous supporters immediately pointed out that the armory had a capability to develop and produce 20-millimeter cannons—and they demanded that instead of being shut down, the armory be given the new mission of developing such a cannon for the United States, or, alternatively, that it should be permitted to produce the H.S. 820 in this country, for the Army.

The armory's partisans raised such a cry that Congress refused to appropriate funds for further improvement and testing of the weapon, until McNamara proved his argument that we simply had to buy the gun overseas.

At this delay, the West German Government became anguished and angry. There ensued an exchange of cables, correspondence and conversations between their government and representatives of ours, in which Germany urged stepped up action on the H.S. 820 program, reminded us of our secret commitment, and threatened us with what was, in McNamara's judgment, dire consequences.

I have earlier given the contents of one of those cables. I am disclosing only one because these communications may be classified. I do not know that they are. But it would not surprise me if they were—not because they would require classification for national security purposes, but because they are a source of embarrassment to Mr. McNamara.

And the easiest way to bury an embarrassment, if you are in the Pentagon or the State Department, is to classify it, which is exactly what the Pentagon has tried to do with so many of the facts surrounding the malodorous H.S. 820 affair.

Needless to say, I did not obtain my copies of these cables through official channels in the Pentagon or the State Department. As has been the case with most of the other material I have disclosed, these came instead from high Defense Department officials, patriotically motivated, who are genuinely disturbed at the prospect of an American purchase of a substandard cannon that will be put in the hands of our unsuspecting fighting men as a weapon on which they are supposed to depend.

These officials are also disturbed at the spectacle of the highest officials in the Department of Defense making apparently deliberate misstatements of fact to Members of Congress about this gun.

Those misstatements, which are numerous, included some from Secretary McNamara himself, when he was interrogated on this procurement by both the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee.

At one point, McNamara was asked, point blank, if this cannon purchase was not actually a "deal" that stemmed from

an American desire to "give Germany some business" because of complaints about the offset agreement.

McNamara's answer was an unqualified "No." He insisted that the gun was being bought strictly on its merits, and at the request of the Army. True, the Army wanted a 20-millimeter cannon. But it wanted a working, effective 20-millimeter cannon. Instead, it had been pressured into accepting procurement of the H.S. 820.

Needless to say, Mr. McNamara did not find it propitious to explain that distinction to Congress. Instead, he flatly denied the existence of any deal as the motivation for the procurement.

Mr. Speaker, let us contrast his statements, made last March, with the implications of the cable I have cited, dated in January 1965, containing the message from the West German Government to our Department of Defense.

In that cable, Germany complained about the breakdown in our H.S. 820 program caused by what at that time was the congressional freeze on appropriations for the program, resulting from the Springfield Arsenal flap. The Germans pointed out that we had a firm agreement to buy the gun, and that they expected us to adhere to that agreement.

And as a clincher, they really lowered the boom.

"We, too, have politicians," the German officials warned, "who must be satisfied."

If U.S. politicians insisted on blocking purchase of the H.S. 820, they implied, then Germany might well have to reconsider its end of the bargain—the purchase of the three missile-firing destroyers—as many West German politicians were urging.

Now I ask each Member, was that "a deal" or not?

Does that sound like we had a "contingent" agreement dependent upon the successful U.S. improvement of the H.S. 820, as McNamara publicly contended in his communique of November 15?

Hardly.

Come what may, we had agreed to buy this gun, as AMC's general counsel said "to give Mr. Von Hassel something to show the Bundestag."

We imprudently agreed to buy it within 1 year, as the Germans requested—although the Army's own test reports indicated in advance that the H.S. 820 weapons system, including the M-114 armored scout car on which it was mounted, and its high explosive ammunition, could not be brought up to standard within that time.

And even after we lowered the standards, the gun still was not satisfactory.

But a deal was a deal, and we figured we had to go through with it. So the gun's final test results were manipulated, as I have documented; even more "improvements" and Rube Goldberg modifications were ordered, as I have also disclosed; and a contract for procurement of the gun was finally signed June 30, 1966.

Now, however, I suggest that a golden opportunity exists to get out of this very bad deal.

The West Germans are determined to delay and reduce their offset purchases. And the United States, in turn, is looking for a counterbalancing way to reduce our payments outflow to West Germany.

One possibility is obvious: Cancel our buy of the H.S. 820.

The H.S. 820 procurement will cost at least $150 million—with $75 million of that slated to go to the West German producers of the H.S. 820—the Rheinmetall Co., and its two associate firms—over a 3-year period.

We have signed the first-year agreement, totaling $25 million, with first deliveries due next March—a delivery date, by the way, that the Germans will not be able to meet because of the numerous changes we have had to make in their basic gun.

We should now seize this opportunity to stop their production at the first-year level or sooner; pay the penalty for canceling the contract, and thank the Lord that we are able to get out while we can.

Obviously, at this late date, Germany's contract to buy the missile-firing destroyers now being built in our shipyards is so far advanced that our cancellation of the H.S. 820 contract could not affect their destroyer purchase.

As I have recommended before, we should also launch a crash program to get into production the successor weapon to the H.S. 820 which is being successfully developed by American private industry.

As the Army's own closely guarded evaluations show, the program for the test and production of that gun could be drastically speeded up. The successor weapon, officials of the Army Weapons Command have estimated, could be available for our troops by early 1969, late 1968, or even sooner, if a genuine crash program were initiated, to meet the requirement that the Army itself has repeatedly described as "critical" and "urgent."

I also believe that a current reevaluation of the actual production timetable for the H.S. 820, and the possible timetable for the successor weapon, would show that the first of the successor gun production models could be made available within 6 months of the time when the substandard, trouble-plagued H.S. 820's eventually start getting installed on our M-114 armored vehicles.

If Mr. McNamara cannot bring himself to take these eminently logical steps on his own initiative, I urge that appropriate committees of Congress exert pressure on him to do so.

I again urge a full-scale congressional investigation of this procurement and its history.

I challenge Mr. McNamara and the State Department to make available to Congress all the cables, correspondence, and texts of conversations between our Government and Germany, involving the H.S. 820.

And if McNamara refuses, I urge Congress to demand that the material be officially furnished, in closed hearings, so that the Members of both Houses may see for themselves how they have been given deliberate misstatements of fact, and may judge for themselves what the real motivation was that led to the incredible procurement of an Army cannon that does not work.

If we do not take this action now, and do not pull out of the H.S. 820 contract immediately, the results will actually be detrimental to our national security.

For, contrary to the specific, repeated assurances of Mr. McNamara—who promised Congress that the H.S. 820 is being bought only for the M-114 armored vehicle—this substandard weapon will be incorporated in our logistics system and its use extended to other vehicles and other missions.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for cancellation of the malodorous H.S. 820 contract is at hand.

The time for action is now.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11487.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TURNING THE TIDE OF INFLATION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you, Chairman MILLS, and my colleagues in the Congress for taking the first important step in turning the tide of inflation and controlling the escalation of interest rates. The curbs on the investment tax credit and on accelerated depreciation are most essential, along with the other three points in the President's program. We should not deceive ourselves into thinking they are enough. Much more must be done—and soon—to get the economy back into balance.

EARLY EVIDENCE OF ECONOMIC TROUBLE

When the Federal Reserve Board raised the discount rate charged to member banks last December, I warned that—

> Inflationary interest rates can only result in a slowdown in homebuilding, and threaten to end the longest and most vigorous economic upturn the nation has experienced in modern times.

In a speech in Palm Springs, Calif., on March 25, I called for consideration of an excess-profits tax and for modifications in the investment tax credit instead of using personal income tax increases to minimize inflationary pressures and check overheating in the economy. At that time I said:

> There is nothing more destructive of long-range human values or more disruptive of

balanced economic growth than the economic strangulation of tight money.

On May 16, I inserted in the RECORD a disturbing letter from Oregon which described the tight-money pinch on homebuilding in the Northwest. As the writer testified, between December and May the interest rate on new homes had already shot up one-half percent, and discount on FHA-insured mortgages was already averaging 7 points. The result over that 6-month period, he pointed out, was a $1,725 increase for buyer and seller in the cost of a $15,000 FHA mortgage.

It became evident early this summer that the economy was getting out of hand. Inflationary pressures were building up and the gyrating interest rates were creating serious dislocations in our economy.

In June I conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers on the growing problems of the economy. Following these discussions, I wrote the White House expressing my concern that a mixture of monetary and fiscal policy is essential for restraining an overheating economy. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, responsible for tax policy, I could no longer remain silent on the obligation to use strong fiscal policy instead of relying solely on monetary restraint, as the administration was obviously doing. I concluded my comments by stating:

> You, Mr. President, are the only one who can effectively express and implement the basic policies and programs to meet this crisis in our economy.

I warned the President:

> Unless corrective action is taken soon, the tight money policies imposed by the Federal Reserve Board and supported by recent decisions of your Administration will destroy the economic gains we have made.

In late June, the impact of the intense competition between the thrift institutions, which traditionally finance housing, and commercial banks offering certificates of deposit became apparent. Figures were released by the Commerce Department indicating that new housing starts had suddenly dropped from about 1.5 million—seasonally adjusted annual rate—in March to about 1.3 million in May and June. Savings and loan institutions reported a loss of about $700,000 in savings accounts at the start of the second quarter. Loan rates in the West were already pushing 7 percent.

The dislocation was becoming clearly evident in other sectors where pressures for overexpansion were rampant. Machine tool orders in June were booming along at a rate of 47 percent above their 1965 average. Backlogs in machinery deliveries had increased by 21 percent. Federal securities were being traded at an effective rate of 5¼ percent and the prime rate charged by commercial banks for short-term loans to their best risk customers reached 5¾ percent.

HIGH-LEVEL CONFERENCE RECOMMENDED

On July 14, after studying these developments carefully, I went to the floor of the House and called upon the President to convene an emergency conference to combat the money crisis. The conference would bring together administration officials, congressional leaders, members of the Federal Reserve Board, and housing and financial leaders "to formulate an effective program to bring interest rates back into line, and to reestablish a healthy balance among financial institutions in the money market."

I said at that time:

> There is no one action that can restore the balance in our economy. An effective program would include actions by the Administration, by the Federal Reserve Board, by the Congress, by Government agencies, and by financial institutions. Lowering of discount rates, increasing reserve requirements, and Open Market Committee bond purchase would come under Federal Reserve Board jurisdiction. Stoppage of all "Fannie Mae" and sales participation offerings should be considered by the Treasury. Immediate repeal of the investment credit should be examined. Passage of an excess profits tax, especially in war industries, should be considered, as should restrictions on installment buying and restraint in federal appropriations. From a wide variety of tools, a concise program of action should be recommended to the President and Congress.

About this time, the National Association of Home Builders and the Commerce Department released two sets of statistics which justified my alarm. The first was a survey of contractors which showed that tight money had caused a 35-percent cutback in builders' plans for 1966—leading to a NAHB prediction that new starts would drop from 1.5 million in December 1965, to an annual rate of 1.1 million by December 1966. The threat of a recession in lumber and homebuilding had become a reality. The second announcement said that corporate spending on new plants and equipment in the second quarter was an enormous 17 percent above the rate of 1965's record year. It was thus apparent that for the third consecutive year, corporate expansion was advancing twice as fast as productivity.

During this period, I carefully analyzed all of the economic indicators. It became obvious that overexpansion in the private sectors of the economy was the cause of the major dislocations in the economy.

It now became clear that the proper course of action was to slow down corporate overexpansion and put the economic situation in perspective so that Congress could meet its responsibilities by appropriate fiscal actions. Selective tax restraints were called for, and I recommended appropriate cutbacks in Federal expenditures.

It was also obvious that only the President could present the policy recommendations necessary to bring the economy back into line. I accused the administration of "floundering in the field of economic policy," and noted that—

> Evidently the President has not yet awakened to the critical nature of the tight money situation and its effect on every community in this country.

THE DEFENSE EMERGENCY TAX ACT OF 1966

Mr. Speaker, it was at this time that I began drafting legislation, and on July 28 I introduced a comprehensive tax package and recommended other fiscal and monetary actions by the administration, the Congress, and the Federal Reserve Board. The judgment of subsequent events in the economy has shown this program to be timely and justified.

The first bill I proposed to the Congress, H.R. 16642, is in the form of a national defense emergency tax measure. It provided for suspension of the investment tax credit for 1 year and the imposition of a temporary 4-percent emergency tax on corporate income. In addition, my proposal would place a 5-percent surcharge on that portion of corporate income which exceeded a 4-year average. This legislation was entitled "The Defense Emergency Tax Act of 1966."

The second bill I introduced, H.R. 16643, would amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to permit the President to impose broad installment credit restrictions on the economy.

This legislation was carefully worked out in an attempt to effectively get to the source of the major dislocations in the economy. I made it clear at the time of introduction that other appropriate actions must be taken if our efforts in the Congress were to be effective. I said:

> It is absolutely essential that the Federal Reserve Board take corresponding action to lower discount rates and consider also use of Open Market Committee purchases to take the pressure off the securities markets, and raising reserve requirements for member banks.

During July and August I did not let up in my efforts to get a change of policy in the administration. As the weeks went by, an increasing number of my colleagues in the House and the Senate joined in the effort.

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL ACTION

In early September, President Johnson moved to meet the obvious threat to economic stability. In his message to the Congress on September 8, the President advocated: a 16-month suspension of the investment tax credit, a similar suspension of accelerated depreciation schedules for buildings and structures, careful review of appropriation measures and restraints in unnecessary spending, postponement of security offerings by Federal agencies, and increased cooperation with the Federal Reserve Board in stemming market demand and lowering interest rates.

In the Secretary of the Treasury's press statements of the following day, the administration announced the intention to stop new Federal agency borrowings from the investing public and to suspend the participation sales program. These decisions, as the President stated, "are an attempt to eliminate from the market as much of the Federal demand as possible." As an outspoken opponent of the participation schemes, I welcome the abandonment of this obvious source of inflationary pressure. The decision to resort to short-term Treasury bills to finance Federal spending will ease the marketplace competition for long-term financing, and hopefully turn interest rates downward.

SUSPENSION OF THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The administration's fiscal recommendations to the Congress—like their other fiscal decisions—may well fall short of their goal. While the suspension of the

investment tax credit was an integral part of my recommendations, I at no time felt that this fiscal action alone was adequate to slow down the rapidly accelerating corporate expansion.

There is no question that the suspension of the investment tax credit is justified as a significant first step. The announced suspension has already had a beneficial psychological effect, as witnessed by the rising bond market and the 6-percent rebound in stock prices when it was announced. But of far greater importance the 17-percent overall expansion in plants and equipment by American business over the 1965 level is an unsustainable and inflationary pace.

In my comprehensive tax package introduced in July, I recommended a more selective approach to the suspension than the administration's proposal. In recognition of this Congress' efforts to adequately meet a severe freight car shortage throughout the Nation and provide for orderly expansion in the field of transportation, my bill specifically excluded "regulated transportation corporations" from the 7-percent suspension.

Other features of my defense emergency tax bill imposed a 4-percent increase in corporate income taxes and a 5-percent surcharge on corporate income above a 1962–65 average.

Can industry afford it? The answer is apparent when one considers corporate profits. Corporate profits after taxes now stand at $48.7 billion, an increase of 11 percent from a year ago. Between 1960 and 1965, corporate after-tax profits rose 67 percent and dividends increased 43 percent. Profits as a proportion of national income increased by a full 25 percent between 1960 and 1965. These figures disregard depreciation allowances, which improve further the record of corporate profitmakers.

The continuous rise in business loans by New York banks shows that large corporations are still in the tight money market demanding funds for expansion.

While the corporate sector has expanded so dramatically during the past year, disposable personal income dropped from $2,287 per capita in the first quarter of 1966 to $2,277 in the second. The consumer price index, now climbing at an annual rate of 3.6 percent, is outstripping gains in wages and salaries. Between 1960 and 1965, weekly factory take-home pay went up only 21 percent—and barely 13 percent after allowance for price increases. The inflationary danger of the disparity between corporate gains and increases in the personal income sector, with major industrial labor negotiations scheduled for this fall and 1967, is obvious.

A GENERAL TAX INCREASE?

While a general tax increase may become necessary if Vietnam defense costs continue to rise, it cannot be justified at this time. First we should pinpoint the cause of inflationary pressures and take fiscal action to correct them. We must use selectively the sophisticated fiscal tools at our disposal to provide the revenues and the damper necessary to bring the economy back into balance and take the pressures off the money markets.

APPROPRIATE RELIEF FROM INFLATION

The next logical step in countering inflationary pressures is a 4-percent increase in corporate income taxes and imposition of a simplified excess profits tax of the kind in my defense emergency tax package. The pressures of corporate overexpansion are so great that additional fiscal action is essential now. To restore a small portion of the tax cuts of 1962 and 1964, in a time of national emergency, and in the light of record corporate profits and overexpansion, is a small price to pay for continued economic stability.

The dollar effect of my proposals has been estimated at between $5 and $6 billion—and as revenues measures clearly will not sustain the extra defense burden by themselves, but they offer the best course as the next important step we should be taking.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ACTIONS

President Johnson in his message on September 8 called upon the Federal Reserve Board to coordinate its policies with the administration and its agencies. For many months, I have warned against sole reliance on monetary policies to brake inflation—because, as the experience of the fifties has shown, tight money does not relieve demand, but instead drives up interest rates to record levels. With fiscal relief finally in sight, the Federal Reserve Board has acted appropriately at the discount window and stepped up reserve requirements.

The Board needs to do more. Presidents Roosevelt and Truman were able to finance World War II and the Korean war at interest rates of 2 percent and less. This obviously is not possible today, but the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation need to persistently use their authority to hold down interest rates. The Government should be able to meet its obligations at rates more reasonable than the record yield of 5.58 percent on 13-week Treasury bills and 6.04 percent on 26-week bills offered on September 19.

Once appropriate and selective fiscal remedies are applied, the Federal Reserve should clamp the lid on the money market by lowering the discount rate and should consider using the Open Market Committee to insure reasonable levels of financing costs on Government securities. The current defense emergency requires that open market committee purchases be reconsidered as a tool of Government finance.

IMPACT OF TIGHT MONEY

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have expressed their concern over the dangers of a segmented recession starting in the homebuilding and lumber industries, because home mortgages are priced out of the money market.

The unhealthy position of the thrift institutions which provide home mortgage loans, caused in part by the competition for savings funds generated by certificates of deposit at commercial banks, and attractiveness of record yields for corporate and Government bonds, has touched off a major slowdown in homebuilding. The most recent National Association of Home Builders survey shows that contractors plan to build 20 percent fewer new homes in 1966 than they did in 1965—a drop of approximately 300,000 units. New starts, the carefully watched economic indicator of the building industry, fell in August to the lowest level since 1960—1,056,000 units on a seasonally adjusted annual basis. This rate is a full 40 percent below the annual rate last December—before the Federal Reserve Board's discount hike touched off the high interest scramble. By September 1, the FHA announced that in the West the average resale price of its new insured 25-year loans gave the mortgage buyer a yield of 6.90 percent. The average existing FHA home loan interest rate in the West is now over 7 percent. These rates do not reflect the 5 to 9 points which must be paid by the builder or seller, before the home can be financed. Such exorbitant costs have made it prohibitive for home sellers to sell and for home buyers to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of tight money has had a particularly capricious and damaging effect on the economy of Oregon and the Second District which I represent. It has been estimated, for example, that approximately a third of the lumber produced in the State is used in new housing construction and over half of the softwood plywood finds it way into residential construction. In August, new orders for lumber were down considerably, and were about 20 percent below production. Each week I receive additional mail from my constituents indicating layoffs, short workweeks, and extended vacation periods at the lumber mills. The latest labor statistics available show a drop of 1,600 jobs from June to July in the wood products industry. One savings and loan association reports that it has not extended a new loan commitment since April 20. New homebuilding has virtually ceased in many areas.

THE CHALLENGE TO THE NEW ECONOMICS

The breakdown in our new economics is one of techniques. But it is not in any way a repudiation of the basic concepts. The new economics involves a sophisticated, articulate approach to economic problems. Across-the-board tax increases are normally just as invalid as across-the-board spending cuts.

We need to establish the machinery to coordinate the defense requirements with the domestic economy. A drastic military expansion must be met in advance by corresponding offsetting actions in the domestic economy.

We have the ability to find where there is too much pressure as well as where there is too little growth in our economy. We need to increase expenditures and reduce taxes in areas which are stagnating. At the same time, we need to reduce spending and increase taxes in areas which require restraint. Sensible monetary policies by the Federal Reserve, credit regulations by the administration, coordinated borrowing policies between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury,

appropriate fiscal restraint by the Congress, are all part of the package for restoring a proper balance for economic growth.

Perhaps the greatest challenge to our time will be to correct the deficiencies in a democratic way and learn from our mistakes.

This task will require all of the cooperation implicit in the "new economics" for its accomplishment.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY LEGISLATION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon consider anti-inflationary legislation to suspend the 7-percent investment tax credit. The need for positive action by the Congress is immediate and clear, but in considering appropriate steps, we must take into account all segments of the economy which will be affected, to insure that action now will not result in more serious economic problems later.

I therefore respectfully urge my colleagues to include in this legislation specific provision to protect farmers and small businessmen, and to make allowances for larger contracts already underway so as to avoid inequities with regard to current corporate commitments.

The intent of the tax credit suspension is to slow down major capital spending, which is one of the most serious causes of present inflationary pressures. I would point out, however, that farmers and small businessmen are rarely involved in large-scale capital outlays, and their tax credits are relatively minor in terms of the percentage of Federal revenues. Eliminating the credit at these lower levels would have no significant beneficial effect on the economy, but could seriously endanger the small operations and enterprises involved.

A blanket suspension of the credit would have a critical impact on the farmer who must purchase tractors and equipment to meet his production demands, and would, in turn, cause serious unemployment problems in farm implement companies who depend upon continuing orders to maintain work forces.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives should retain the tax credits for investments up to $15,000. This will permit the continued purchase of the most essential equipment, while discouraging additional expenditures which would add to our present economic problems.

Action now by the Congress will assist in countering inflationary pressures, but it would be naive to think that this will provide the full solution. In this regard, it is crucial that every sector, and particularly the Federal Government, defer all nonessential spending if we are to continue economic stability and reasonable, orderly growth.

SCHOOL BUSING

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion recently on the subject of reported proposals for the busing of schoolchildren between school districts. I am including in the RECORD the following telegrams, one I sent to Governor Rockefeller and one I received from U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II, in an effort to clarify this controversy, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1966.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
State Capitol,
Albany, N.Y.

SIR: It has come to my attention that rumors are being circulated concerning an alleged proposal for the forced exchange and busing of New York City and Nassau County school children.

If such a plan were to be seriously advanced by the Federal Government I would be unalterably opposed to it, as I do not believe this approach would provide a cure for the evils of discrimination. The truth, however, is that upon checking I find that the Federal Government has made no such proposal, in spite of careless charges to the contrary. U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe II has stated flatly the position of his agency and the Administration that educational decisions and control reside exclusively in the local community and State, and that no Federal legislation is under consideration that would include any provisions for busing.

Therefore, Mr. Governor, if the Federal Government has not advanced such a proposal, any decision on such a plan must rest with you as our State's chief executive, and with your Commissioner of Education Mr. Allen. I call upon you to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the destruction of our suburban school systems and to see that high education standards are maintained in our State.

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1966.

Congressman LESTER L. WOLFF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLFF: Thank you for calling to my attention an allegation that the U.S. Office of Education is planning to introduce legislation to require busing of students to achieve integration or for any other purpose.

This is just not true. Additionally, I want to reaffirm clearly and explicitly our conviction that educational decisions reside in the local community as they traditionally have over the years. The role of the Office of Education in these matters is to stimulate innovative planning and to help support local schools in their search for better methods to create quality and equality of education for all youngsters in their community. The means to these ends are completely within the discretion and control of the local community itself.

HAROLD HOWE II,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

H.R. 18008, A BILL TO CHANGE THE OCCUPATIONAL DEFINITION FOR OLDER WORKERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill, H.R. 18008, which will help answer a question which has plagued us and our offices for years. It is probably the question most frequently asked about the social security disability program. The question is:

"I have suffered a disabling injury which makes it impossible for me to continue to work. Why am I not entitled to disability benefits?"

In answer to such a letter we have pointed out that the law requires that you must be disabled for any substantial gainful activity and that just because you cannot work at your previous occupation does not, as such, qualify you for benefits. We point out that the law is stricter than most staff retirement systems, such as civil service, which require that you only suffer a disability which prevents you from doing the work you previously did. Last year's Committee on Ways and Means report stated:

In line with the original views expressed by your committee and since reaffirmed, to be eligible an individual must demonstrate that he is not only unable, by reason of a physical or mental impairment, to perform the type of work he previously did, but that he is also unable, taking into account his age, education, and experience, to perform any other type of substantial gainful work, regardless of whether or not such work is available to him in the locality in which he lives.

I find it particuarly difficult to explain this test to older workers. For most of them inability to work at their old jobs means inability to work at all. Vocational rehabilitation for them is much more difficult than for younger workers. Moreover, it seems to me a trifle harsh to impose a test that requires them to leave their homes of a lifetime to seek "theoretical" employment in other parts of the country.

I think the Congress recognized the harshness of this provision last year when it adopted, in the conference committee, a provision that individuals aged 55 or over who are "blind"—as defined in the law—may qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations.

The bill I introduce would merely extend this test to all persons age 55 or over, whether blind or not, so as to entitle them to benefits if their disability is such as to prevent them from engaging in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The adoption of this "occupational" definition for our older workers will bring more realism and justice to the social security disability program. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to study this legislation and present it to the Congress in the near future.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL STUDY COMMISSION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1966, the President transmitted to the Congress the Second Annual Report—House Document No. 466, 89th Congress—of the agency created under Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990). This report summarizes the work of that agency during the last fiscal year, outlines its organizational setup, and gives the present status of the work.

It will be recalled that following the submission of the First Annual Report of this agency—House Document No. 253, 89th Congress—I made rather detailed commentaries on it in a statement to the House on August 25, 1965. Later, in the RECORD of June 6, 1966, I discussed at length an information pamphlet issued by the same agency. More deftly prepared than the other two publications, the Second Annual Report shows the influence of some of my criticisms. It is less vulnerable to attack, and adopts some of my ideas.

Among these are provision in the studies of engineering feasibility for the evaluation and updating of cost estimates for the modernization of the existing canal—page 6—"for comparative purposes," the listing of such modernization as the first alternative—page 8–7—and publication of brief experience records of the five members of the Commission—pages 1 to 3. It is noted that of these, two—only two—have engineering backgrounds.

As regards the organizational setup for the study—pages 1 and 2—this is rooted in the executive branch. The Commission—pages 1 to 3—is not an independent, broadly based body but purely an Executive-appointed agency not requiring Senate confirmation of nominations. It is, in effect, only a part-time consulting board whose members are otherwise employed at the present time.

The four sea-level canal routes mentioned in the report for consideration are:

8. Nicaragua-Costa Rica, Canal Zone.
17. Caledonia-San Miguel Bays.
25. Atrato-Truanda.

The emphasis placed on the Canal Zone site, for both the lake-lock and sea-level lock designs, serves further to confirm what informed observers know; that the site so chosen for major construction is at or near the present location.

In making the lock canal studies it is to be hoped that the estimates for this type will not be loaded down with unwarranted construction items that would make the lock type estimates almost as great as for a canal at sea level as was done in the 1946–47 Isthmian Canal studies. See American Society of Civil Engineers Transactions, volume 114, 1949, page 619.

Later the exposure of the 1947 exaggerated costs for the lock type by independent engineers resulted in substantial reductions in the estimates. In the same place, page 884.

Mr. Speaker, as regards the argument over type of canal at Panama, I would invite the attention of the Congress to a prophetic statement on May 31, 1924, by Jay J. Morrow, one of the ablest Governors of the Panama Canal, to former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens:

> The sea-level project is a hardy perennial, and apparently there will always be someone to argue for it, no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such scheme within practicable limits of time and cost may be demonstrated.

If it is finally determined that the required increase of canal capacity is to be provided at the present site, it is my judgment that the proposed consolidation of the Pacific locks south of Miraflores is the wise solution. In addition to costing far less than any so-called sea-level canal on the present site, it would not require a new treaty. I hope that the Commission will not waste its time and the time of the Congress in studying any lock canal plan at Panama that does not eliminate the locks at Pedro Miguel.

While the report mentions—pages 8 to 16—the great difference between the tidal ranges of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, its constant reference to a sea-level canal as replacing the existing canal is false and deceptive in that authoritative sea level advocates do not actually propose a lockless open waterway but one with tidal locks near the Pacific end. To this I may add, that every sea-level plan at Panama so far conceived since the time of De Lesseps has provided for tidal locks. Moreover, important navigation interests, both private and naval, as well as experienced navigators, have demanded such locks in the past as part of a sea-level project.

As to the diplomatic problem, the report—pages 9 to 12—makes no mention of the fact that under existing treaty provision the present canal could be modernized by consolidation of the Pacific locks and other improvements without the necessity for a new treaty. This angle is a paramount factor that cannot be ignored.

If the proposed sea-level design prevails, it would, according to its advocates, throw out of employment thousands of Panamanian employees now required. In such case, Panama would undoubtedly demand and be paid a huge indemnity and greatly increased annuity, which would go to the Panamanian Government and not to the Panamanian employees. This is a consideration that should be taken into account.

Moreover, the report clearly indicates that those conducting the canal study are working hand in hand with those seeking to bring about the annulment of the 1903 treaty with Panama and retrocession of the Canal Zone to that country.

As to such retrocession, Mr. Speaker, I ask why is the executive branch so anxious at this period of Communist revolutionary aggression to drive the United States from Panama and to destroy our influence and prestige in all of Latin America? What will better serve the purposes of Communist revolution in the Western Hemisphere than our surrender of power and authority on the Isthmus to an unstable, mob-dictated government likely to be overthrown at any moment by Red power.

In regard to tolls, the question arises as to whether there is contemplated any substantial raising of tolls. The policy of our Government embodied in law is that the canal enterprise must operate on a self-sustaining basis—Public Law 841, 81st Congress. Various studies outlined in the report indicate that consideration is being given to the subject of subsidies, apparently with the idea of aiding the shipping of our country and possibly other nations, including Panama. The purpose of such subsidies would be reimbursement to world shipping for greater tolls that they would have to pay.

The report shows that long delay will be involved in making exhaustive studies of canals at Nicaragua, Darien, and Colombia. This means that it will take years to reach conclusions from all attendant circumstances involved, which conclusions seem already to have been administratively determined. The studied avoidance by administrative officials, including members of the Commission, to give serious attention to the study of well-conceived plans for increased Panama Canal capacity emphasizes the predetermination that underlies the enactment of Public Law 88–609, which I exposed in extenso in two addresses to the House on April 1 and July 29, 1965, under the title "Interoceanic Canal Problem: Inquiry or Cover Up?"

Another pertinent question that arises from a reading of the report is: Why should the U.S.-owned Canal Zone, with all the vast investments that our Government has made therein for the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal, be given to Panama before any new canal is built to replace the existing canal; and this without a dollar of reimbursement? Any such action would be gross stupidity. And why at this time when Red terror is kindling throughout the world—especially in Latin America—the flames of terror and destruction.

To sum up, the Second Annual Report is replete with concealments and deceptions and fails to give a true picture of realistic conditions involved.

The determination of the Isthmian Canal policy of our country is not a mere routine matter but one of transcendent significance. In order to help keep what should be our country's true objectives clearly in focus, I would stress again and again the key Isthmian Canal issues:

First, the overriding responsibility of our Government to safeguard our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory for the efficient and adequate maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and thereby the defense and protection of all the Western Hemisphere.

Second, the vital subject of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing high-level lake-lock canal to provide a summit level anchorage in the Pacific sector to correspond with the layout at Gatun. Some $75 million of taxpayers' money was expended on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, which were completed before work was suspended during World War II. Many millions more have been expended on the enlargement of Gaillard cut. These would be major contributions toward construction of a modernized lock canal already paid for, time tested and proven.

Third, the question of a so-called sea-level design at or near the present canal.

Fourth, the matter of an alternate canal at a site other than the Canal Zone, including Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, under the 1964 authorizing statute, the present canal study group is committed to a single predetermined and unobjective treatment of the Isthmian Canal problem and, as previously indicated, the lock canal studies it may undertake are only "for comparative purposes."

The Second Annual Report emphasizes more strongly than ever the necessity for an objective and comprehensive inquiry and consideration of all tangible solutions in the manner that were obtained in the building of the present canal. Such inquiry can be achieved only by means of an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canal Commission as contemplated by H.R. 6963, H.R. 6126, and H.R. 4871, introduced by Representatives ANDERSON of Tennessee, Bow, and myself.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with all these remarks, I would commend to Members of the House and Senate a reading of House Document No. 474, 89th Congress, dealing extensively with pending Isthmian problems.

The objective action which is really indispensable for just and adequate treatment of these complex problems would be in line with President Johnson's first authoritative statement on this subject on January 14, 1964, 5 days after the Panamanian mob assault on the Canal Zone. I deem it most unfortunate that the President has since been surrounded by advisers who have been chiefly motivated with the purpose of surrender and appeasement rather than by realistic considerations.

HIGH INTEREST, TIGHT MONEY HITS CLOSE TO WASHINGTON

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the effects of high interest rates and tight money are being felt within sight of Capitol Hill.

The situation faced by Virginia's Fairfax County schools illustrates what school districts are up against all over this country.

Last week, the Washington Post reported that Fairfax County was forced to sell $7.5 million worth of school construction bonds at what the newspaper described as a "whopping" interest rate of 4.4843 percent. At this rate of interest, the county will pay back more than $4.5 million in interest. Furthermore, many of these issues are refinanced, and the interest costs generally end up equal to if not in excess of the principal amount borrowed. On this issue alone, every time the taxpayer pays $1, he will only be paying 62 cents to reduce the principal, the rest, 38 cents, goes for interest.

Fairfax County, like political subdivisions everywhere, did not want to go into the high interest rate money market but the expanding needs of the county forced them to do so. The school population is growing so rapidly in Fairfax County that school districts there must build at least one classroom a day just to keep up. So, Fairfax County had no choice. It either had to go into the money market and pay record high interest rates or turn its schoolchildren away.

Mr. Speaker, what happened in Fairfax County is one more warning to this Congress that it must do something about high interest rates and tight money. How many warnings like this do we need?

I place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post on September 22, 1966:

INTEREST IS $4.5 MILLION ON $7.5 MILLION IN BONDS

The nationwide pinch of tight money was painfully evident to the Fairfax Board of County Supervisors yesterday when they sold $7.5 million in school construction bonds at the whopping interest rate of 4.4843 percent.

Walter W. Craigie, the County's financial consultant, asserted that the money market is "chaotic" and "in a state of near panic," and recommended that the Supervisors hold off selling bonds if at all possible.

But Fairfax must build schools at the rate of more than a classroom every working day, and the Supervisors reluctantly decided to go ahead.

At the rate of interest accepted yesterday, the county will have to pay back $4,556,250 in interest—60.8 percent of the principal sum. "This is rough on taxpayers," consultant said.

"The failure of the Administration in Washington to take any fiscal action has placed an impossible burden upon the monetary authorities." Craigie maintained.

Craigie said the County should collect real estate taxes semiannually instead of once a year to speed up the flow of revenue and make it possible to pay for more capital improvements out of current funds.

Supervisor Stanford E. Parris, only Republican on the Board, took a few digs at "the Texas cattle baron we would think would be more interested in locking the barn door before the horse was stolen," then moved that the staff be directed to study semiannual collections. His motion passed unanimously.

Craigie said the County's problems are shared by municipalities throughout the state and country.

"The financial management of the county has resulted in an excellent credit rating but money just isn't available at reasonable rates," he said.

The interest rate agreed to yesterday was comparable with those on bonds recently issued by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and the State of California and lower than rates recently accepted by such municipalities as Knoxville, Tenn., and Chicago.

A year ago, according to County Budget and Research Director, Philip Dearborn a rate of 3.5 percent would have been the highest the County would have accepted.

Yesterday's buyer was Halsey Stuart & Co. of Washington and New York.

U.S. SECURITIES SALES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about what our Republican friends call "fiscal gimmickry" concerning the Participation Sales Act. In order to make the record a bit clearer on this issue, I would like my Republican colleagues to read the following letter which Professor Seymour Harris wrote the New York Times recently on the issue of "fiscal gimmickry."

Professor Harris outlines the numerous occasions when the Eisenhower administration resorted to measures which my Republican colleagues today would call gimmicks. The present administration has a broad past record of the Republican administration upon which to pick such "gimmicks."

Professor Harris' letter follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 17, 1966]

SUSPENSION OF U.S. SECURITIES SALE

To the EDITOR:

In your Sept. 13 editorial "End of a Fiscal Gimmick," you criticize the Johnson Administration for selling participation issues, notably participation in Federally secured loans, and approve the termination of sales by the Johnson Administration.

This kind of "gimmickry" is not new. The party in power increasingly prefers a system of accounting that minimizes the size of the budget.

For example, in Eisenhower's first four years the sales of certain capital assets were five times as large as in Truman's last four years. The recourse to guarantees—not counted as budgetary expenditures—as against loans—counted as expenditures—was at a record level under Eisenhower.

Among the practices used by the Eisenhower Administration were not to appropriate money equal to earnings to trust funds such as the Civil Service Fund; borrowing outside the Treasury, with borrowings not included in the national debt; sales of assets by the Government inclusive of mortgages and claims on commodities; financing capital improvements by paying rent instead of capital expenditures as in the past, and, finally, setting up trust funds as a means of excluding expenditures from the budget. Let us not

forget Eisenhower's proposal for a $101-billion road fund outside the budget.

TO CUT PRIVATE SPENDING

The Times seems to imply that there is no case for participation issues. Certainly the Treasury has to issue long-term securities at some time. It is a mistake to issue these securities in periods of high unemployment, for they then weaken recovery forces in private markets, and it is considered smart policy to issue them in the midst of an overheated economy to reduce private spending. Surely the case for long-term issues, participation or others, to contribute toward anti-inflationary pressures, seemed strong late in 1965.

A crucial reason for the Administration's abandonment of its participation policy was that the money market had become much tighter than could have been anticipated in the last quarter of 1965, when the Administration was putting its final touches on the 1967 Budget. Surely neither the Administration nor economists could have anticipated such extreme and unprecedented increases in interest rates. The independent action of the "Fed" could also not have been anticipated.

It is perhaps over-simplifying the problem to say that the Johnson Administration's "desire to make the budget deficit look smaller led it to forge a policy that effectively reinforced the Federal Reserve's monetary stringency."

The fact is that there were other objectives also: giving private credit facilities an increased stake in the credit markets; contributing to an anti-inflationary policy through sale of assets in an anticipated overheated economy, reducing the upward pressure on short-term rates and treating the excessive recourse to short-term markets.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *Sept. 13, 1966.*

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 17 last, I had the great honor of being a guest at a luncheon sponsored by Poland's Millennium Committee here in Washington. The guest of honor on this occasion was His Excellency, Bishop Wladyslaw Rubin, auxiliary to Stefan Cardinal Wyszinski, primate of Poland. During the course of the luncheon I had the opportunity to have an extremely interesting conversation with Bishop Rubin, who is quite proficient in the English language. I came away with the impression of having met a truly dedicated and patriotic man.

Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1966, Nowy Swiat, the Polish Morning World, published an editorial which had earlier appeared in the Tablet, the official organ of the diocese of Brooklyn. The editorial follows:

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

The Diocese of Brooklyn will honor and be honored Thursday, Sept. 22, when Bishop Ladislaus Rubin, Auxiliary to Stefan Cardinal Wyszinski, Primate of Poland, celebrates Mass at St. James Pro-Cathedral. To be presided over by Archbishop McEntegart, the liturgical solemnities here will be part of the current commemoration of Poland's millennium as a Christian nation, an anniversary that is being duly observed these days in all parts of the free world. Our own federal government, for example, has issued an artistically striking postage stamp commemorative of the occasion.

One thousand years ago, with the baptism of Prince Mieszko, ruler in Posen, the christianization of Poland began. The present anniversary of that event calls for widespread and prolonged jubilation, signalizing as it does so extended and so honorable a span of time as all of ten centuries. Under happier conditions than those which now obtain, Poland would be celebrating with becoming unrestraint and festivity its people's oneness in faith and culture—both at home and abroad.

Mindful of the way in which the Communist regime's systematic and ruthless suppression of civil and religious freedom in that country is marring the joy of the millennium observance, Archbishop McEntegart directed that the following petition be added this year to the Prayer of the Faithful in the Sunday Liturgy for May 1, Feast of St. Joseph the Workman:

"That Our Lady of Czestochowa continue to inspire the valiant Polish people and that, by her intercession, they be granted the grace and the strength to survive with undaunted faith their present oppression as they have so many times in the past, we pray to the Lord".

The Church in our Diocese owes much to Polish immigrants who in large numbers come here to escape oppression of one kind or another in the homeland they loved. Msgr. John K. Sharp in his very readable and rewarding "History of the Diocese of Brooklyn 1853–1953" recalled their arrival on our shores:

"From 1851 to 1890 over 500,000 Poles, with a background of religious and political repression and persecution . . . came to the United States. Prussian Poland furnished the majority of these immigrants until 1890, when Poles from Russia began surpassing them in number. By 1870 they had become noticeable in Brooklyn and Greenpoint. Most of them had been farmers but in America they became industrial workers."

With their strong faith, tempered by adversity, and their high sense of Christian morality, fortified with the elements of heroism and sacrifice, the Polish settlers in our midst made their special and considerable contribution to the formation of a great American diocese.

In thankful recognition of what these newcomers of a not too distant yesterday have done for the Diocese of Brooklyn, we hail the flourishing Polish parishes in Kings and Queens Counties. We think too of the many vocations of the priesthood and to the religious life with which the families of those parishes have enriched this Diocese's numerous apostolates.

On a local, national and international level, Polish history reveals an exemplary truth. A thousand years of Polish Christianity have blessed the Church and the world with a people unsurpassed in that best of twin allegiances: devotion to the City of God and devotion to the City of Man.

We are honored to join with our Archbishop in celebrating with gratitude the Polish people's abiding service to Church and State. Together with him we mourn the suffering now being endured by Poles in their home country. We are with them in praying for an early deliverance from the evil forces that oppress them.

Our prayer for them and our acclaim of them is one and the same: Long live that noble land of Christ's heroes and heroines!

DEDUCTIBILITY OF TEACHERS' EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me today to join other of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in sponsoring legislation to insure the tax deductibility of educational expenses and certain travel incurred by members of the teaching profession.

For teachers the expense incurred in going to college is an ordinary, necessary and customary business expense, and, therefore, should be deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

Since the issuance of the present Internal Revenue Service ruling that such educational expenses are deductible, the allowance of such deductible items has been varied throughout the country, and in some instances teachers have experienced difficulty in deducting such necessary business expenses. On July 8, 1966, the IRS published proposed regulations on the deductibility of educational expenses. The proposed regulations, if made final, would make most teachers' educational expenses nondeductible.

Teachers in the United States today are of a necessary and commendable high quality. It is a requirement today for maintaining high quality teachers in our schools for members of the profession to return to college for additional training.

Our teachers are keeping abreast of developments in teaching techniques and sharing in the new stores of information rapidly becoming available, by returning to colleges and universities after meeting minimum requirements for the job. I believe it is fine commentary on American teachers that continued education is a professional requirement. It is such a requirement, and, therefore, a bona fide deductible item and one to be encouraged.

It is well to bear in mind in this connection the shortage of teachers in the United States today. As members of the Congress we must assure members of this profession, at the very least, the deductibility of a legitimate business expense, a right to which members of other professions are entitled.

My legislation will write into law the present IRS regulations regarding educational expenses, and negate the proposed regulations. My legislation will clarify this issue of tax policy and guarantee to teachers the income tax treatment that is reasonable and equitable. Under this legislation a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the 4 preceding taxable years will be allowed to deduct from his gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and certain travel expenses relating to this education.

The excellence of education and America's teachers is at the very heart

of our advancement. The accomplishments of the 89th Congress have been notable in the field of education. The swift enactment of this legislation will be in accord with this wise educational policy and to the credit of the 89th Congress.

BUSINESSMEN SHOULD WAGE PRIVATE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we take up this week the legislation that would extend the war on poverty, I think it highly appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Mr. J. C. Murray, Jr., president of the Greater Trenton Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Murray's article, which appeared in the September issue of the chamber's magazine, is entitled "Businessmen Should Wage Private War on Poverty."

Mr. Speaker. I can think of no action which could be more beneficial to the goals we are seeking than to have our business community enlist in the war on poverty. While government can do much to help provide opportunity to those who need it, I am convinced that our efforts will come to naught if the private sector of our economy does not enlist in this effort. Happily, the chambers of commerce throughout the country are coming to realize they have a role to play, and I am enormously pleased that Mr. Murray has enlisted the Trenton Chamber of Commerce in this effort.

Mr. Murray's article is as follows:

BUSINESSMEN SHOULD WAGE PRIVATE WAR ON POVERTY

(By J. C. Murray, Jr., president, Greater Trenton Chamber of Commerce)

If you are wondering where the war on poverty is going to lead, you are not alone. Businessmen throughout the country are getting restless with what they see and hear. Some of these men have rolled up their sleeves and waded into battle.

What do these front line veterans say? Their report is clear. "It is imperative" they say, "that business leaders throughout the country become more involved on solving the nation's social problems."

This conclusion will not really surprise most of us. We have known, as the President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has said, that supplying money and criticism is not enough.

It is probable that most businessmen feel they are already carrying a heavy load. But if we are needed, what does getting more involved mean? And what are the stakes we are playing for?

Getting more involved means getting interested. It means "applying to social problems the same analytical treatment we give business problems". It means devoting a larger proportion of our available time to the top social problems of our community. It means truly seeing these needs, not being superficially aware of them.

Businessmen and others who have looked into the antipoverty programs and other welfare programs find them tending toward habit forming dependence on government. Some are ineffective and some overly costly. If we are interested in individual freedom and private initiative, we must shape the proper solution. We are needed to encourage policies which promote economic growth "the greatest force in the fight against poverty."

What have some businessmen done in this field? The President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has pointed out three examples. (1) one Chamber of Commerce has started its own private job training and employment program. (2) in another city, several local businesses encourage high school dropouts to continue their education and also place them in jobs at the same time. (3) one business which manufactures building supply materials is experimenting with rehabilitation of slum housing. They are looking for ways to make this method profitable for private investors through improved materials, techniques and other economies. Throughout the country your fellow businessmen are applying their training and experience to the difficult social needs.

What are the stakes on this battle for improved welfare of the people of our nation? They are the highest of stakes, the familiar ones, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We are once again being tested to determine whether as a society we possess a sufficient sense of individual responsibility to be free, or whether we will defer to an all-powerful government. Some of our fellow businessmen have said "It is imperative that business leaders throughout the country become more involved in solving the nation's problems." What is your answer?

WASHINGTON'S STREET LIGHTING PROGRAM

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Leonard Downie, Jr., that appeared in the September 20, 1966, issue of The Washington Post on Washington's street lighting program.

HISTORIC GLOBES BELOVED BY MANY—RELIGHTING NEARING COMPLETION, BUT NOSTALGIA FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PERIOD LAMPS MAY HINDER PROGRESS

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Washington's highway officials are nearly finished with an eight-year, $10 million effort to relight Washington's streets, but they still are not sure if they will be able to eliminate darkness in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Since 1962, the District Highway Department has replaced more than 40,000 street lights in Washington. Most of the Northeast and Southeast quadrants of the city have been relit. Work is now progressing in the Northwest.

But lighting experts fear that nostalgia over the old "Washington globe" lights still standing in Georgetown and the Capitol Hill and monument areas downtown will block efforts to improve lighting in those areas.

The specially designed, egg-shaped Washington globe, standing atop its fluted post, became the street light standard for the Capital City in 1923.

Lighting experts have since criticized it as a dangerously inefficient light source which leaves huge gaps of total darkness on the street and sidewalk midway between two lightposts; throws as much light into the sky as onto the ground, and creates a dangerous glare for drivers looking into it from the surrounding darkness.

"When you drive down the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue, for instance," one critic said, "you're in total darkness."

But when the city got the money in 1962 to begin replacing all the old globes with mercury vapor lights hung high over the street on slim pendant poles, a flood of protests engulfed the Highway Department.

The Fine Arts Commission didn't want the Washington globes replaced by "goosenecks" on monument streets like Pennsylvania Avenue. Residents of Georgetown, the Capitol Hill restoration area and other residential neighborhoods objected both to the new light's design and the bright light that shined into some of their second-story bedrooms.

At one point, the Highway Department decided to go ahead with the installation of mercury vapor lamps only on freeways and heavily traveled commercial streets. The Washington globes, with brighter bulbs inside and on top of slightly taller poles, would remain everywhere else.

Then came protests from lighting engineers that the old lights would leave the streets havens for nighttime traffic accidents and street crimes.

The Highway Department compromised and began installing higher-powered incandescent lights (not mercury vapor) on existing wooden utility poles in most residential areas. They brought the brightness of lights on those streets up to recommended standards.

Then along came Rep. CHARLES P. FARNSLEY (D-Ky.), a freshman Congressman and former Mayor of Louisville who has devoted much of his career to the cause of good street lighting to cut crime and traffic accidents.

He told the Highway Department that it ought to be lighting up the city's alleys, too. Now, they are being relit with the brighter incadescent lamps on wooden poles.

By 1968, the Highway Department expects to have the job finished everywhere but in Georgetown, the Capitol Hill area and the monument streets, where the Washington globes remain.

Perhaps significantly, night street crimes have been on a sharp upswing recently in the Georgetown and Capitol Hill areas.

Rep. FARNSLEY has collected statistics showing that relighting campaigns in sections of Chicago, Louisville, St. Louis, Kansas City and New York City resulted in sharp reductions of nighttime traffic fatalities and street crimes.

Daniel J. Hanson, deputy director of Washington's Highway Department, says highway officials are trying to satisfy those objecting to replacing the Washington globes on esthetic grounds by experimenting with mercury vapor lamps on top of the old fluted poles.

The mercury lamps don't work too well in the old globes, so the Highway Department is trying several other fixture designs intended to go well with Federal-period townhouses in Georgetown and classical revival Government buildings. Many of these experimental lights line 12th Street ne., just north of Pennsylvania Avenue.

THE COPYRIGHT LAW REVISION BILL, H.R. 4347—THE FIRST MAJOR REVISION IN OVER 57 YEARS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on the Judiciary began consideration of an amended version of H.R. 4347, for the general revision of the copyright law. This law has not been revised since 1909. Meanwhile, major changes in technology have rendered an overhauling of the statute more than overdue.

The committee's deliberations follow a unanimous recommendation of Subcommittee No. 3, the Copyright Subcommittee, on September 21, 1966. It marks the culmination of 2 years of concentrated work on the subcommittee's part. In the first session, the subcommittee held 22 days of public hearings on the measure, receiving testimony from more than 150 witnesses. In the present session, it devoted 51 executive sessions to study of the legislation. We have striven to produce a bill that will effectively and fairly accommodate conflicting interests, that will encourage authorship and still be fair to users of copyrighted works.

The subcommittee deeply appreciates the tireless and devoted cooperation and assistance rendered it by the Register of Copyrights, the Honorable Abraham L. Kaminstein, and his staff, notably George D. Cary, Deputy Register, Abe A. Goldman, General Counsel, and Barbara Ringer, Assistant Register.

I, personally, wish also to thank my colleague from Virginia, Mr. POFF, and all my other subcommittee colleagues for their scholarly and patient nonpartisan labors in mastering this complex and important legislation and bringing the subcommittee's task to fruition.

Because of the wide interest in the revision project and the fact that several days may well elapse before the amended bill and committee report are generally available, I am inserting in the RECORD a summary of the principal provisions of H.R. 4347 as amended by the subcommittee, as follows:

H.R. 4347, AS AMENDED, SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 1: SUBJECT MATTER AND SCOPE OF COPYRIGHT

Section 101: Definitions

The significant definitions in section 101 will be mentioned or summarized in connection with the provisions to which they are most relevant.

Section 102: Subject matter in general

Requirements of Copyrightability

The basic subject matter of copyright is specified as "original works of authorship" that have been "fixed" in a "tangible medium of expression." Under the definition in section 101, a work is "fixed" if its embodiment in a physical object is "permanent or stable" rather than "transitory," but the form of fixation is immaterial as long as the work is capable of being perceived directly or made perceptible through any existing or future machine or device.

Categories of Copyrightable Works

Section 102 specifies seven categories of copyrightable works, but the list is "illustrative and not limitative." The enumeration includes all classes of works that are copyrightable under existing law and adds a new category of "sound recordings." "Pantomimes and choreographic works" are linked together as a new category; "motion pictures and other audiovisual works" are specifically designated as a separate category.

Section 103: Compilations and derivative works

Section 103 makes clear that compilations and derivative works, which are works employing pre-existing material or data, are fully subject to the basic standards of copyrightability, and defines the interrelationship between protection of pre-existing and of "new" material in a particular work.

Section 104: National origin

Copyright protection for unpublished works would be granted by section 104, as is now the case under the common law, without regard to the author's domicile or nationality. Like the present statute, the bill would protect published works of foreign origin only if the country of origin were covered by a treaty or a Presidential proclamation; the President would be authorized to issue a proclamation if he finds that the country it covers extends protection to U.S. works and to its own works "on substantially the same basis."

Section 105: United States Government works

The present prohibition against copyright in Government publications is retained and expanded to cover any published or unpublished "work of the United States Government"; the term is defined as "a work prepared by an officer or employee of the United States Government as part of his official duties." The provision would not prohibit copyright from being secured in works prepared independently under a Government contract or grant, but without exception would forbid copyright in any "work of the United States Government."

Section 106: General scope of exclusive rights

Under the general approach of the bill, section 106 sets out the exclusive rights of the copyright owner in broad terms, and sections 107 through 116 specify various limitations and qualifications applicable to particular situations and particular kinds of works. The five basic rights made exclusive under a copyright are: (1) the right to reproduce the work in copies or phonorecords; (2) the right to prepare derivative works based on the copyrighted work; (3) the right to distribute copies or phonorecords of the work to the public; (4) the right to perform the work publicly; and (5) the right to display the work publicly. The concept of "public" performance or display is defined to include activities at places open to the public and where "a substantial number of persons outside of a normal circle of a family and its social acquaintances is gathered." The concept also includes transmissions of performances and displays to members of the public.

Section 107: Fair use

Section 107 recognizes the present judicial doctrine of fair use and restates it in a way that offers guidance to users in determining when the principles of the doctrine apply, but without changing its scope. (See also section 504(c)(2) regarding innocent teachers as to what constitutes a "fair use.")

Section 108: Reproduction of works in archival collections

Nonprofit institutions having archival custody over manuscripts or similar collections of unpublished works of scholarly value are given the privilege of making facsimile reproductions of works in their collections, as long as the reproduction is not done for profit and is "for purposes of preservation and security, or for deposit for research use" in another institution of the same type.

Section 109: Effect of transfer of particular copy or phonorecord

Section 109 restates and confirms the principle that, where the copyright owner has transferred ownership of a particuliar copy or phonorecord of his work, the person who becomes the owner is entitled to dispose of the copy or phonorecord by sale, rental, or any other means. This principle does not apply where a person has acquired possession under a rental or loan arrangement, without obtaining ownership of the object. Under section 109(b), the owner of a copy would be able to display it publicly "to viewers present at the place where the copy is located," as long as he does not project more than one image at a time or transmit images by television or similar devices.

Section 110: Exemption of certain performances and displays

Face-to-face Teaching Activities

Clause (1) of section 110 extends to all types of works, and exempts from copyright control their performance or display by "instructors or pupils in the course of face-to-face teaching activities of a nonprofit educational institution," where the activities take place "in a classroom or similar place devoted to instruction." A special exception to this privilege is made for motion pictures or other audiovisual works in certain cases where the copy used for the performance was not lawfully made.

Instructional Broadcasting

Under the limited conditions specified in section 110(2), certain instructional transmissions would be exempted from copyright liability. The exemption would apply only to transmissions made "by a governmental body or other nonprofit organization," and would cover displays of any type of work and performances of nondramatic literary or musical works (not including motion pictures and other audiovisual works). The performance or display must be "a regular part of the systematic instructional activities of a governmental body or a nonprofit educational institution." The transmission must not cover a radius of more than 100 miles, thus excluding from the exemption simultaneous satellite or nationwide network transmissions, and its time and content must be controlled by the transmitting organization, thus excluding transmissions of intructional material to individual users by means of computers and the like. The transmission must be intended primarily for reception: (1) in classrooms or similar places; or (2) by "persons to whom the transmission is directed because their disabilities or other special circumstances prevent their attendance in classrooms"; or (3) by "officers or employees of governmental bodies as a part of their official duties or employment."

Religious Services

The exemption in clause (3) of section 110 covers performances of a nondramatic literary or musical work "or of a dramatico-musical work of a religious nature," and displays of works of all kinds, "in the course of services at a place of worship or other religious assembly."

Certain Other Nonprofit Performances

Section 110(4) exempts the performance of a nondramatic literary or musical work, "otherwise than in a transmission to the public," where there is no profit motive and no "payment of any fee or other compensation for the performance to any of its performers, promoters, or organizers," if either of two conditions is met: (1) no direct or indirect admission charge is made, or (2) the net proceeds are "used exclusively for educational, religious, or charitable purposes and

not for private financial gain." In the second situation, however, the coypyright owner would be entitled to forbid fund-raising performances for purposes to which he objects by giving notice at least seven days before the performance.

Mere Reception in Public

Under section 110(5) there would be no copyright liability for merely turning on an ordinary radio or television receiver in a public place.

Section 111: Secondary transmissions, including community antenna television

General Purpose of the Section

Section 111 sets out various limitations on the exclusive rights of the copyright owner with respect to secondary transmissions of his works to the public. Secondary transmissions covered by the section include the operations of community antenna systems, nonprofit boosters and translators, passive common carriers, and relays to hotel rooms and the like.

General Exemptions

The following secondary transmissions are exempted from copyright liability under section 111(a): (1) mere relays to the private rooms of hotels and the like, unless there is a direct charge for the retransmission; (2) secondary transmissions of instructional broadcasts exempted under section 110(2); (3) secondary transmissions by common carriers who have no control over program content or selection of the recipients of the secondary transmission, and who merely provide communications channels for the use of others.

Nonprofit Secondary Transmissions

Wholly noncommercial secondary transmissions by governmental bodies or other nonprofit organizations (boosters, translators, cooperatives, etc.) would be exempt unless the secondary transmitter also engages in one of the activities covered by section 111(b).

Exemption of Secondary Transmissions Solely Within Primary Transmitter's Normal Area

Where a secondary transmitter does not operate beyond the area normally encompassed by the primary transmitter, he is exempt from copyright liability unless he engages in one of the activities covered by subsections (b) or (c) of section 111.

Secondary Transmission Fully Actionable

Except for the relays to hotel rooms, instructional retransmissions, and passive common carrier activities covered by subsection (a), a secondary transmitter is fully liable if he does any of the following: (1) alters program content; (2) originates programs (with some limited exceptions); (3) charges for particular transmissions; (4) picks up primary transmissions not intended for reception by the public at large; (5) operates outside the primary transmitter's normal area and has not recorded his identity in the Copyright Office; (6) operates outside the primary transmitter's normal area and within an area adequately served by other primary transmitters; or (7) operates in any area normally encompassed by one or more transmitting facilities other than the primary transmitter, if he has received notice that one of them has already acquired the exclusive right to transmit the copyrighted work in that area.

Limited Liability for Certain Secondary Transmissions

Unless section 111(b) is applicable, liability for certain secondary transmissions would be limited to recovery of a reasonable license fee; this would generally be true where the secondary transmittter is not operating in an adequately served area and has not received notice of an exclusive license. Where the court finds the infringer failed to accept a reasonable offer, recovery of a reasonable license fee may be increased up to three times (and in no case to less than $250); and where it finds that the copyright owner failed to accept a reasonable offer, it may withhold monetary recovery and award costs and attorney's fees to the infringer.

Section 112: Ephemeral recordings

Section 112 of the bill, unlike the present law, recognizes the right of a transmitting organization to make "ephemeral recordings" of works (other than motion pictures and other audiovisual works) that it is entitled to transmit to the public. Under subsection (a), an organization that has acquired the right to transmit the work (or that is free to transmit it under section 114) may make a single copy or phonorecord of a particular program embodying a performance or display of the work if it is used solely for the organization's own transmissions within its own area and after six months is destroyed or preserved solely for archival purposes. Section 112(b) deals with the special situation of nonprofit organizations that are free to transmit a work under the instructional broadcasting exemption of section 110(2); it would allow reproductions of two copies or phonorecords under certain conditions and would extend the period of use to one year. A work that came into being as the result of an ephemeral recording could not be copyrighted without the consent of the owners of copyright in the pre-existing works employed in it.

Section 113: Reproduction of pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works in useful articles

Section 113 is intended to make clear that nothing in the bill changes the present law, as expressed in the court decisions, concerning: (1) the copyright status of a work that is employed as the design of a useful article, or (2) the rights of a copyright owner in a "pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work that portrays a useful article as such" with respect to "the making, distribution, or exhibition of the useful article so portrayed."

Section 114: Sound recordings

Under the bill, as provided by section 106 and in more detail by section 114, sound recordings would be recognized as copyrightable works in themselves, and would be protected against unauthorized duplication and the distribution of phonorecords duplicated without authority. However, the owner of copyright in a sound recording would not be given an exclusive right of public performance, nor would he have rights against someone who merely imitates his recording without capturing the same sounds.

Section 115: Compulsory license for phonorecords

The essential features of the present compulsory license for the making and distribution of phonorecords of copyrighted musical works have been retained in section 115, but with a number of modifications and clarifications. The present statutory royalty for each composition recorded under a compulsory license would be raised to a rate of two and one-half cents per phonorecord, or one-half cent per minute of playing time on each phonorecord, whichever is larger. The bill also provides that the failure to obtain either a compulsory or a negotiated license, or a default in payments under a compulsory license, would make the user fully liable as an infringer.

Section 116: Performances on coin-operated phonorecord players

Instead of the outright exemption of the present law and the proposals to impose full liability on "jukebox" performances considered earlier, the bill in section 116 adopts a system of compulsory licensing for public performances by means of coin-operated phonorecord players. In general, a jukebox operator who has not negotiated licenses with the owners of copyright (or their agents) in the compositions publicly performed on his machines could obtain a compulsory license by: (1) recording the phonorecord player in the Copyright Office at specified intervals; (2) posting a certificate of the record on the box; (3) filing a statement in the Copyright Office listing the songs performed during the preceding year that were not covered by a negotiated license; and (4) making quarterly statements of account and royalty payments to copyright owners who are identified on phonorecords performed without a negotiated license. Special provisions are made to require a copyright owner to claim payment when he was not identified on the phonorecords used, and there are also provisions making noncomplying operators fully liable for copyright infringement. The royalty rate established by section 116(c)(2) is payable for each quarter during any part of which the song is available in the phonorecord player, and is either (1) three cents, or (2) a prorated amount of less than three cents, based on box capacity and the total number of songs available for performance during the quarter.

CHAPTER 2: OWNERSHIP AND TRANSFER OF COPYRIGHT

Section 201: Copyright ownership

Initial ownership

Section 201(a) restates the established principles that copyright ownership originates in the author, and that the authors of a "joint work" are co-owners of the copyright. Under section 101 a "joint work" is defined as "a work prepared by two or more authors with the intention that their contributions be merged into inseparable or interdependent parts of a unitary whole."

Works Made for Hire

Subsection (b) retains the present principle governing works made for hire: that in such cases "the employer or other person for whom the work was prepared is considered the author." A "work made for hire" is defined in section 101 to include not only "a work prepared by an employee within the scope of his employment," but also a group of special types of works that have been "specially ordered or commissioned" for certain specified purposes, if there has been an express agreement to consider the work as one "made for hire."

Contributions to Collective Works

Section 201(c) states explicitly that each individual contribution to a collective work such as an encyclopedia article or a story first published in a magazine, is considered a separate work in which copyright ownership "vests initially in the author." Subsection (c) also establishes a presumption that, in the absence of an express transfer, the author retains ownership of copyright in his contribution and the publisher acquires only certain publishing rights.

Transfer and Divisibility of Copyright

Copyright ownership is transferrable under the bill, as under the present statute, by any means of conveyance or by operation of law. Clause (2) of section 201(d) is intended to solve the problems that have arisen under existing law because of the theory that copyright is indivisible; it provides that "any of the exclusive rights comprised in a copyright, includng any subdivision of any of the rights specified by section 106, may be transferred * * * and owned separately."

Section 202: Distinction between ownership of copyrights and material object

Section 202 makes clear a principle also stated in the present law: that ownership of a copyright, and ownership of a material object embodying a copyrighted work, are separate and independent, and that transfer

of one does not necessarily mean transfer of the other. The bill would reverse a presumption, held to exist under common law, that an author or artist transfers his literary property rights when he transfers ownership of his manuscript or work of art without reserving them.

Section 203: Termination of transfers and licenses

For works copyrighted after the effective date, the bill drops the renewal provision of the present statute under which, in certain circumstances, copyright ownership reverts to the author or other specified beneficiaries at the end of 28 years. Instead, section 203 permits the termination of any grant made by an author, or by two or more authors of a joint work, after 35 years (or 40 years in some cases). Termination of a grant can be effected by majority action of the authors who signed it or of their interests; if an author is dead his right to terminate can be exercised by the action of a specified majority of his widow and children or grandchildren. Termination would require the serving of an advance notice on the grantee within specified time limits. Grantees would be given the equivalent of a right of "first refusal," and any grantee who has made a derivative work under his grant could continue to use it even after termination.

Sections 204 and 205: Execution and recordation of transfers

The bill would clarify and tighten the provisions of the present law dealing with the execution and recordation of transfers of copyright ownership. Registration and proper identification of the copyrighted work it covers would be conditions for according a recorded document constructive notice.

CHAPTER 3: FEDERAL PRE-EMPTION AND DURATION OF COPYRIGHT

Section 301: Single Federal system

The present dual system of protection of works under State common law (or statute) before they are published, and under Federal statute after publication, is replaced by a single system of Federal statutory protection for all published and unpublished works. Common law protection would continue for works that are not fixed in any tangible form, but as soon as fixation takes place they are subject to exclusive Federal protection under the bill even though they are never published or registered. Under the definition of "fixed" in section 101, a copyrightable work that is being transmitted and fixed simultaneously is considered "fixed" at the moment of its transmission.

Section 302: Duration of copyright in works created under new law

The new law would change the present term of copyright (28 years from publication or registration, plus a renewal of 28 years) and, for works created after it comes into effect, would provide a basic term of the life of the author and 50 years after his death. As in most countries, "joint works" would be protected for fifty years from the death of the last surviving author. A term of 75 years from publication, with a maximum limit of 100 years from creation, would generally be provided for anonymous works, pseudonymous works, and works made for hire. Under section 302 the Copyright Office would maintain records of information concerning the dates when authors died, and a system of presumptions is established to cover situations where a user cannot determine the date of a particular author's death.

Section 303: Duration of copyright in preexisting works under common law protection

Unpublished works under common law protection when the new law becomes effective would be brought under statutory protection and given the applicable statutory term. To insure that a reasonable period of protection is given to all these works, and to induce their publication, the bill provides that in no case will their term expire before 1992, and that, if published before then, the term in these works will extend at least to 2017.

Section 304: Subsisting copyrights

Under section 304, copyrights subsisting in their first term when the new law takes effect would last for 28 years from the date they were secured, but could then be renewed for a second term of 47 years. Subsisting renewal copyrights would automatically be extended, and would expire 75 years after first publication or registration. In both cases the bill contains provisions similar but not identical to those of section 203, permitting the termination of transfers and licenses under certain circumstances during the last 19 years of the extended copyright.

CHAPTER 4: COPYRIGHT NOTICE, DEPOSIT, AND REGISTRATION

Sections 401 and 402: General notice requirements

Sections 401 and 402 require that a prescribed notice of copyright appear on all visually-perceptible copies of copyrighted works, and on all phonorecords of sound recordings, whether published "in the United States or elsewhere." Unlike the present law, however, compliance with the notice requirements of the bill is not an absolute condition of copyright.

Section 403: Contributions to collective works

Section 403 is aimed at clarifying the situation with respect to contributions published without a copyright notice in collective works bearing a general notice of their own. A contribution may continue to bear its own notice but, except for independent advertisements, "a single notice applicable to the collective work as a whole" is generally sufficient to cover the separate contributions it contains.

Section 404: Effect of omission of notice

Omission of copyright notice, whether deliberate or inadvertent, would not invalidate a copyright if: (1) the omission was from a "relatively small number" of publicly distributed copies or phonorecords, or (2) copyright registration for the work is made before or within five years after the notice was omitted, and a reasonable effort has been made to correct it. In both cases section 404 would shield an innocent infringer, who had been misled by the omission, from liability for actual or statutory damages under certain circumstances.

Section 405: Error in notice with respect to name or date

Under section 405(a), the use of the wrong name in the copyright notice will not invalidate a copyright. Unless the error has been corrected in the records of the Copyright Office, however, an innocent infringer who had been misled by the error and had acted under the supposed authority of the person named in the notice would have a complete defense. Under subsection (b), an antedated notice might shorten the term of protection but would not otherwise affect the validity of the copyright. Notices postdated by more than one year and notices lacking in either a name or date are treated the same as cases where the notice has been omitted altogether.

Section 406: Deposit for the Library of Congress

The deposit of copies or phonorecords for the Library of Congress, and their deposit for registration of a claim to copyright, are closely related but separate under the bill. Under section 406 the right of the Library to obtain copies and phonorecords for its collections would be preserved, but "this deposit is not a condition of copyright protection" and does not need to be coupled with copyright registration. The sanction for failure to comply with the deposit requirements would be a fine rather than loss of copyright protection, and certain categories of material not needed or wanted by the Library could be exempted from the requirements.

Sections 407, 408, 409: Copyright registration

Registration, which would not be required as a basic condition of copyright protection unless the notice had been omitted under 404, could be made at the same time as deposit for the Library, thus allowing a single deposit to serve both purposes. The Register of Copyrights is given authority to establish flexible deposit requirements to cover certain classes of material, thus enabling him to accept optional forms of deposit and the grouping of related works in special cases. Under section 409 the certificate of registration would be "prima facie evidence of the validity of the copyright and of the facts stated in the certificate" if registration is made before or within five years after first publication; otherwise the court may give it the evidentiary weight it considers appropriate.

Sections 410 and 411: Effects of failure to register

The present requirement that copyright registration precede the institution of a suit for copyright infringement is retained in section 410, but that section would also permit an applicant whose claim to copyright has been refused registration to maintain an infringement action if the Register of Copyrights is notified and permitted to join the suit. Except for a grace period of three months after publication, section 411 would require a court to withhold any award of statutory damages or attorney's fees for infringements occurring before registration.

CHAPTER 5: COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND REMEDIES

Section 501: Parties to infringement suits

Consistent with the principle of divisibility of copyright established in section 201(c), section 501(b) permits the "legal or beneficial owner of an exclusive right under a copyright" to bring suit for infringement "of that particular right committed while he is the owner of it." The subsection also contains provisions with respect to notice, joinder, or intervention of others who may have an interest in the copyright, aimed at protecting their interests and avoiding a multiplicity of suits.

Sections 502 through 508: Remedies for infringement

Aside from damages and profits, the remedies for copyright infringement available under the present law are retained without substantial change in the bill. Under section 504, the copyright owner would be able to elect recovery of either his "actual damages and any additional profits of the infringer," or statutory damages. The bill would permit recovery of profits in addition to actual damages to the extent that they are "attributable to the infringement and are not taken into account in computing the actual damages." The copyright owner could, at his option, recover statutory damages of not less than $250 or more than $10,000 for all of the "infringements involved in the action, with respect to any one work, for which any one infringer is liable individually, or for which any two or more infringers are liable jointly and severally." The $10,000 maximum could be increased to $20,000 in cases of willful infringement; the $250 minimum could be reduced to $100 where the infringer was entirely innocent, or could be

remitted altogether in the case of "an instructor in a nonprofit institution" who infringed by reproducing copyrighted material for classroom use in the honest belief that what he was doing constituted a fair use.

CHAPTER 6: MANUFACTURING REQUIREMENT AND IMPORTATION

Section 601: Manufacture of certain copies in the United States

General requirement

The present law, which is subject to many exceptions and limitations, requires English-language books and periodicals to be manufactured in the United States in order to be protected for the full copyright term. The works principally affected by this requirement today are those by American authors. Section 601 retains a manufacturing requirement, but with substantial changes that would narrow its scope and prevent it from causing technical forfeitures of protection.

Scope of requirement

In addition to narrowing the classes of works covered by the manufacturing requirement, section 601 defines "manufacture in the United States" in such a way that the printing of copies in this country from imported "reproduction proofs" would be outside its scope. The number of copies of a foreign edition that could be imported without violation of the requirement would be raised from 1,500 to 2,000.

Enforcement

Instead of the complete loss of protection that can result from violation of the manufacturing clause today, section 601 provides for the possible loss of certain rights against infringers.

Section 602: Infringing importation

With certain exceptions, the unauthorized importation of "copies or phonorecords of a work that have been acquired abroad" is an infringement of copyright under section 602(a). The limited exceptions apply to importation for governmental use, for use (not sale) by individuals, and for library or archival use; there are special restrictions with respect to audiovisual works. Although an unauthorized importer would be liable for infringement whether the copies he was importing were "piratical" or were lawfully made, the Bureau of Customs would be authorized to exclude only "piratical" copies.

Section 603: Enforcement of importation prohibitions

The prohibitions against importation in sections 601 and 602 would be subject to enforcement under regulations by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. Section 603(b) would permit establishment of a new procedure for dealing with articles alleged to be "piratical," and subsection (c) deals with the disposition of excluded articles.

CHAPTER 7: COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Sections 701 through 708: Administrative provisions

The provisions of Chapter 7, dealing with the administrative responsibilities of the Copyright Office, are generally restatements of provisions in the present statute. Section 704 provides for unpublished deposits to be retained throughout the term of copyright and for published deposits to be retained as long as possible; a new procedure would permit applicants to request permanent retention of their deposits. Continued publication of catalogs of copyright registrations is required under section 707, but the Register of Copyrights is given more discretion to determine the form and frequency of publication. The fee schedule in section 708 is consistent with the fees provided by Public Law 89-297, enacted by the present Congress and effective November 26, 1965.

CONGRESS INTENDED BANKS TO COME UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of Banking magazine carries an article entitled "Congress, Justice—and Mergers." The article contains a number of comments of several Congressmen contending that Congress, in passing the Bank Merger Act of 1966, in some ways attempted to remove banks from coverage of the antitrust laws.

Nothing could be further from the facts. The act clearly reasserts the intent of Congress that banks shall not be exempt from the application of the antitrust laws.

In order to set the record straight, I have written to the editor and publisher of Banking magazine, outlining the facts surrounding the Bank Merger Act of 1966. I am enclosing a copy of my letter which more vividly points out the fact that banks are indeed subject to antitrust laws:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. September 27, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAM P. BOGLE,
Editor and Publisher,
Banking,
90 Park Avenue,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I was very much interested in the comments printed in the September 1966 issue of Banking on the Bank Merger Act. The Domestic Finance Subcommittee held eight weeks of hearings on the Bank Merger Act of 1966. I attended each and every session of the Subcommittee hearings and supported the legislation reported to the House by the full Committee. In the House, I supported the bill to final passage. I have set forth this detailed record of my participation and support of the Bank Merger Act of 1966 because I must respectfully disagree with the comments of my colleagues concerning the construction of that Act.

The Act clearly reassert the intent of Congress that banks shall not be exempt from the application of the antitrust laws. For the first time the Act specifically requires the banking agencies to give paramount reliance on antitrust criteria in considering bank merger applications. For the first time the Bank Merger Act of 1966 expressly declares that no bank merger may be approved by the banking agencies which violates Section 2 of the Sherman Act (the antimonopoly provision). If this standard had been applicable prior to the merger in the Lexington case, the banking agency involved would have had to deny the application. In my view, this is a prime example of how the antitrust laws will apply to bank mergers "not only with equal, but more force than before."

What the Congress did in enacting the Bank Merger Act of 1966 was to assume the responsibility for the confusion created by the Bank Merger Act of 1960. Under the earlier legislation, the banking agencies were authorized to apply one standard in their approval of bank mergers while the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the courts were required to apply another standard. Because of this confusion, Congress provided an exemption for three bank mergers occurring before the Supreme Court had an opportunity to clarify the effect of the Bank Merger Act of 1960 on the application of the antitrust laws to bank mergers. The exemption provided for those three bank mergers was provided, not because Congress sought to exempt banks from the application of the antitrust laws. That action was justified by a Congressional determination that the equities in those cases indicated that the mergers had taken place in good faith, the banks having had reasonable grounds to rely on the banking agencies to approve mergers under the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

The principal purpose of the Bank Merger Act of 1966 was to provide for the banking agencies and the courts alike a single yardstick for the evaluation of bank mergers. It re-enforced the application of the antitrust laws to such mergers by prohibiting agency approval of a merger which would result in monopoly. Furthermore, it prohibits those mergers which have a substantial anticompetitive effect unless the proponents of the merger are able to establish that the convenience and needs of the community for the merged institution clearly outweigh this anticompetitive effect. This provision does represent a slight modification of the absolute application of antitrust laws to bank mergers. However, it should be noted that the burden of persuasion is on the proponents of the merger, which burden must be demonstrated by the preponderance of the evidence.

The Bank Merger Act of 1966 was a reaffirmation by Congress of its intent to continue the application of the antitrust laws to bank mergers. In so doing, Congress further reaffirmed its determination to preserve a competitive banking system for it must be remembered that antitrust exemption inevitably leads to total rate regulation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

SUPPORT FOR A NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make clear my support of the statement issued by 290 distinguished Americans who have formed the Educational Committee To Halt Atomic Weapons Spread and to express my opposition to the remarks of my distinguished colleague Representative FINDLEY, printed in the September 15 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, taking issue with the committee's statement. The committee, headed by Dr. Arthur Larson, director of the Rule of Law Research Center at Duke University, seeks to bring resolution to the major issue dividing the United States and the Soviet Union in the quest for a nuclear nonproliferation treaty that would halt once and for all the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

There is perhaps no more compelling issue on mankind's agenda than to shackle forever the destructive power of

the atom. The hope of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty is to put existing weaponry under effective control to prevent other nations from developing or obtaining these devices of disaster. Those who seek such a treaty see the possibility of a future in which small nations possessing such weapons could turn a minor border conflict into a major human disaster for all mankind.

They see in this treaty also a second step, following upon the great nuclear test ban treaty agreed to while the late President Kennedy was still in office, to effectively gain international cooperation to end the fear of atomic weapons and their use.

There is today one major outstanding issue preventing the accomplishment of such a treaty—the question of nuclear weapons sharing, specifically with West Germany. Until now the United States has insisted that any nonproliferation treaty must allow the United States to share its weaponry under a joint command system with West Germany. Those who formed this distinguished committee of citizens point out quite rightly that this sharing is neither necessary nor desirable. They believe, as I do, that such sharing can only increase the Soviet fears of German militaristic renaissance. Such sharing also would deprive the United States of some measure of its effective control of atomic weapons ever being used.

Representative FINDLEY has argued that to deny Germany a share in the control of nuclear weapons for their self-defense and the defense of Europe would alienate the Germans and perhaps would make them seek to develop a weapons system of their own.

At this point I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Anatole Shub, foreign correspondent of the Washington Post, printed in the Sunday, September 25, 1966, issue:

GERMANS ARE LIBELED BY OFFICIAL MYTHS—LEGENDS ARE FOSTERED BY BONN—AND WASHINGTON—TO BOLSTER POLICIES OF CONSERVATIVES

(By Anatole Shub)

The West German capital of Bonn sits across the misty Rhine from the Seven Hills in which the Siegfried legend—the most powerful of the German myths—is said to have taken place eons ago.

In recent times, too, Bonn has been the source of potent mythology whose effects have not been limited to West Germany but have even crossed the Atlantic. Indeed, as the master mythmaker, Konrad Adenauer, used to play the game, the easiest way to persuade his fellow Germans of anything was to have it labeled "Made in the United States."

To persuade the United States, Adenauer evoked a variety of specters. There were the neo-Nazis and nationalists waiting in the wings if he, the moderate, was not appeased. There were the secret (because otherwise invisible) proponents of a "new Rapallo," a German-Russian alliance, who had to be fended off.

There were the Communists, the neutralists and of course the Social Democrats—whom Adenauer was really worrying about. The Socialists were as anathema to Stalin as to Hitler, but Adenauer managed to get John Foster Dulles and others to help persuade the Germans that a vote for the Socialists would deliver the world to the Communists.

NEW MYTHMAKERS

Adenauer is gone now, and a few of the old myths have worn thin enough for all to see through, but the mythmaking habit lives on in Bonn and in Washington. Franz-Josef Strauss and Gerhard Schroeder have in turn proven adept disciples of the old specter-raiser and willing collaborators have not been lacking in this Capital even after the departure of the Dulles brothers.

In fact, much of the nervousness in official Washington in connection with this week's visit by Chancellor Erhard springs from a series of long-cherished myths which some people in the Administration have begun to question but others remain determined to defend. A few topical examples:

A NUCLEAR PHOBIA

Myth: "The Germans" want nuclear weapons, and if they don't get them from us, they will turn elsewhere.

Fact: Public opinion polls have shown consistently that the overwhelming majority of ordinary Germans want to stay as far away from atomic weapons as possible. Bonn political leaders are so defensive on the subject that they rarely raise it in public; in Erhard's successful campaign for re-election last year, he never once mentioned it on the hustings.

The Social Democrats and Free Democrats, who together form a majority in the current Bundestag (parliament), have formally urged Erhard to renounce all claims to possession or "co-possession" of nuclear hardware. Backbenchers in his own Christian Democratic Union feel the same way.

Neither Russia, Britain nor China has ever shown the slightest disposition toward abetting German nuclear ambitions. As for the French, Strauss did evoke some interest among Paris officials in the last days of the Fourth Republic but Gen. de Gaulle spiked the idea firmly upon his return to power. He has been urging the United States for eight years to return an equally flat "no" to Bonn's nuclear hints. In the atomic field, as in others, Bonn has nowhere else to go but Washington.

"FEAR" IS POLITICAL

Myth: An East-West treaty to ban the spread of atomic arms would cause a political explosion among "the Germans," who are primarily worried about their security.

Fact: Parliamentary debates and party congresses this year have shown that there is a clear majority in Bonn to ratify a nonproliferation treaty and no political party, including Erhard's CDU, has dared attack the nonproliferation idea openly. In private, Bonn government opposition is based less on fear of Soviet attack than on the fear that East Germany would sign the pact and thus upgrade its international status.

A WELCOME PRUNING

Myth: "The Germans" would be upset if the Western allies reduced the number of their troops in West Germany.

Fact: Most ordinary Germans, especially those living near Allied garrisons and bases, probably would welcome a phasing out of the "occupation." There would be a shock if everyone went home at once, but a partial cutback (say, by two American and one British divisions) would hardly cause a ripple among the general public unless Bonn officials deliberately stirred up a storm.

As for these officials, their resistance to Allied troop reductions is primarily political, on two counts: (1) any dramatization of the East-West detente weakens their "hard" posture toward Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and other Eastern countries, and (2) any easing of external tensions tends to help the Social Democrats as the party of domestic reform.

PHANTOM EXPELLEES

Myth: The Bonn government cannot accept the present German frontiers and make peace with Poland and Czechoslovakia because of the "ten million" expellees who "control a fifth of the vote."

Fact: Of the original 9.6 million expellees, many have died, many were too young to remember the expulsion and most are thoroughly integrated into West German life. Separate expellee parties have failed dismally and the expellee lobbies that harass the democratic parties are frequently criticized as unrepresentative.

More important, the expellee organizations are largely a creation of the Bonn government; they could scarcely exist without the massive official subsidies they receive. Their main function is to persuade the outside world that Bonn officials "cannot" do what they do not wish to do in the first place.

THE EXTREMIST BOGEY

Myth: The present Bonn government led by Erhard, Schroeder and Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel must be propped up by the United States because it is "moderate." If it falls, "extremists," "Gaullists" or "neo-nationalists" will take over.

Fact: From the viewpoint of American efforts to relax tensions in Europe, the Erhard team has been as hard to budge as Adenauer in his heyday. If it fails, the main political beneficiaries will indisputably be the Social Democrats, whose foreign policy hero is not Otto von Bismarck but John F. Kennedy and whose domestic program is indistinguishable from the Great Society.

If the promotion of a stable democratic system in Germany remains one of the objectives of American policy, most nonofficial observers agree that a change of administrations must come sooner or later. The present period is at least as propitious as any other because there is no external crisis, both major parties are responsible and the rising younger generation is clearly being alienated by the stodgy conservatives so long in power.

The extent of youth's alienation is shown not only by voting statistics (the SPD has a clear majority of under-45s) but by some rather disturbing polls. For example, nearly half the Germans under 25 would rather live in some other country; a full third would prefer to be in the United States.

UNITY SECONDARY

Myth: "The Germans" are determined to reunify a single nation-state within the 1937 frontiers.

Fact: This is certainly the position of current Bonn policy-makers, some of whom were also in government service in 1937. But for many others—including nearly everyone under 35—the Eastern territories are lost irrevocably and "unity" in a single nation-state matters less than freedom and a decent life for the 17 million citizens of Communist East Germany. If that territory could become another Austria—free and open—most Germans on both banks of the Elbe would be satisfied.

A LIBELOUS STEREOTYPE

The underlying myth, therefore, is that "the Germans"—the stereotype conjured up by Bonn and Washington bureaucrats resisting a thaw in the cold war—bear any resemblance to the real German people.

In a way, the stereotype is a libel, for the 59 million citizens of West Germany, by and large, are as interested in peace and prosperity as any other people. Twenty-one years after the war, West Germany has grown up and can face the facts of life. The mystery is why the United States finds it so difficult to act accordingly.

As can be seen from this article, the argument that Germany desires nuclear weapons or that they would seek to develop their own if they were not allowed a share is one of the great myths of our

time. It is clear that this "obstacle" to a nuclear nonproliferation is not an obstacle at all.

In view of this there surely should be no objection to the report of the Educational Committee To Halt Atomic Weapons Spread. It is my hope that the U.S. Government will redouble its efforts, remove the remaining obstacle and allow us to push forward along the long and difficult road to the day when nuclear war will no longer be a threat to mankind.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express my support for H.R. 15111, the 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. I urge the House of Representatives to take action on this proposal so that the Office of Economic Opportunity may proceed with the urgent business of waging the war on poverty.

This legislation, as reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor, does not call for a great increase in appropriations. The total amount of money requested to support the nine programs throughout the country during fiscal year 1967 is $1,750 million. This is only a modest increase over the $1½ billion appropriated in fiscal 1966. The major purpose of the amendments is to continue and expand the more successful programs, improve those which have not yet demonstrated their effectiveness, and initiate several new projects in answer to specific, pressing needs.

H.R. 15111 provides for the expansion of three programs which have shown the greatest evidence of success—the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Headstart, and VISTA. The amendments ask for an authorization of $496 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, as compared with the $271 million obligated in fiscal year 1966. During fiscal year 1966, 528,296 persons between the ages of 16 and 21 were enrolled in 1,477 Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. Through this program these high school dropouts or potential dropouts have been given a second chance in life, a chance to continue their education, to return to school or to obtain a job. The proposed amendments offer several improvements in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Eligibility to enroll in the Corps would be extended beyond the present limits of 16 to 21 years of age to students in the 9th through 12th grades. The program would also be expanded to allow profit-making organizations to participate. The Neighborhood Youth Corps would finance the training costs for youths employed by such businesses and the employer would pay the wages. Greater emphasis would be placed on locating jobs which offer a chance for permanent careers to these young people, particularly those who will not return to school for future education. These improvements, along with the increased expenditure, will mean that the Neighborhood Youth Corps will be able to reach more young people and give them new hope for the future.

We are all familiar with the outstanding accomplishments of the Headstart program over the last year and a half. This past summer 575,000 children were enrolled in preschool programs. But it is estimated that there are over 2 million children ages 3 to 5 who could benefit from Headstart programs. The proposed amendments ask that the funds for Headstart be increased from $180 million in fiscal 1966 to $352 million in fiscal year 1967. This will not only mean that the program can be extended to reach more children, but also that it can offer medical and dental diagnosis and care, in addition to educational service. More money will also enable more children to participate in year-round Headstart programs. The record of Headstart more than justifies the expansion requested in this legislation.

The third program to be enlarged under H.R. 15111 is VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America, whose appropriations would be doubled from $15 million for fiscal year 1966 to $31 million in fiscal year 1967. Currently 3,274 volunteers are in training and on the job, serving the Nation's poor and disadvantaged at settlement houses, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, Appalachian mountain hollows, and nighborhood centers in slum neighborhoods. The VISTA program has not only benefited those for whom the volunteers worked, but also has been a broadening educational experience for many who have wished to be of service to their country.

I do not intend to mention all of the amendments proposed by this bill. They show evidence of much thoughtful consideration on the part of the committee responsible for this legislation. Some of the changes are for the purpose of tightening up the regulations in the Job Corps and the community action programs. Two new programs are proposed—the establishment of experimental projects related to the prevention and treatments of narcotic addicts, and a program of loans of up to $300 to be given to low-income families to meet emergency needs.

Increased emphasis is being placed on job training for those formerly considered unemployable. The program employing the chronically unemployed in beautification projects would be replaced by a more comprehensive work-training program for the hard-core unemployed, especially those over 45 and nonwhite, in which they would work in many areas of public service, including health, education, safety, welfare, and conservation activities. The work experience programs under title V will be revised to provide greater coordination with the manpower and development training program and the State public employment offices. This reorganization should mean that those persons eligible for this program will be trained in a skill which is marketable and will be assisted in locating permanent employment.

Mr. Speaker, my examination of this bill has convinced me that its enactment is a necessity. The proposals are carefully conceived and are designed to expand successful programs and improve those which have received criticism. The additional emphasis on education and training should do much to overcome the inadequacies facing many of those who are poor. I urge favorable consideration and passage of this legislation.

This program has been the target of criticism from its inception, but, like any other program of this magnitude, there will be some deficiencies in its overall operation. One would not tear down an entire house just because the builder erred in the placement of light switches or outlets, or his painter used the wrong color paint on some wall. The proper way would be to make corrections of these errors to obtain an adequate product.

We have embarked on a program which has, in many instances, proven successful. This legislation will permit us to continue it and make corrections where there have been deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, I support this program, and it is my hope that we will not spend the time and energy to tear it to shreds. I believe that the bill before us is good legislation and will, in time, remove much of the criticism leveled against it.

HEADSTART FOR WHAT?

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the widespread waste and mismanagement which have characterized the administration of the antipoverty program have been a source of serious concern to many Members of this body, myself included. It has been pointed out on numerous occasions that the overwhelming evidence indicates that instead of easing the plight of the impoverished, the war on poverty has served largely to line the pockets of bureaucrats and purchase new power for unscrupulous politicians.

Even more distressing is the fact that poverty funds have often been utilized by civil rights activists bent on inciting strife and civil disobedience. A well-documented article appearing in the September 26, 1966 edition of Barron's, a highly respected national publication, outlines the significant relationship between one federally financed poverty project in Mississippi and the militant black power movement. "The Story of the Child Development Group of Mississippi" is extremely timely this week when we are being asked to authorize $1.750 billion to continue the poverty program.

I hope my colleagues will closely scrutinize this article since it dramatically points up the necessity of amending the present law to prevent any recurrence of such a scandalous situation. Moreover, it confirms the view that poverty programs must be administered by responsible local citizens rather than irresponsible outside elements.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the aforementioned article from Barron's, entitled "Headstart for What?" as part of my remarks:

HEADSTART FOR WHAT? THE STORY OF THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT GROUP OF MISSISSIPPI

(By Shirley Scheibla)

"No part of the (anti-poverty) funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the (Office of Economic Opportunity) Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant."—1966 anti-poverty program appropriation bill.

WASHINGTON.—Like thousands of others throughout the U.S., a group of poor little children in Shubuta, Miss., have been attending Head Start classes under federal auspices to prepare them for entering elementary school. They must have gotten a liberal education. For classes were held next door to, and run from the home of, a militant civil rights leader, Mrs. Allie Jones, chairman of the operation. Other groups used the home, too, including one woman in residence there accused of transporting persons for the purpose of prostitution. Civil rights meetings were held and according to signed affidavits, breaches of peace occurred and murder was attempted on the premises.

The Shubuta classes are just one example of scandalous Head Start operations, run with federal grants of $7 million, by the Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDMG), an unincorporated organization controlled by leftist militant civil rights workers, representing chiefly the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality and others.

INCITING TO RIOT

SNCC, the Negro group which launched the cry, "black power," is led by Stokeley Carmichael, who was recently arrested in Atlanta on charges of inciting to riot. Mr. Carmichael also has urged Negroes to refuse to serve in Vietnam. The National Director of CORE is Floyd McKissick, who declared on a television program last month: "Nonviolence is a thing of the past. Most black people will not agree to be non-violent."

Investigation just completed by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the General Accounting Office, the Office of Economic Opportunity and Sen. JOHN C. STENNIS (D, Miss.) reveal that funds given to CDGM have been used to finance civil rights violence. Investigators have irrefutable evidence that those responsible for the Head Start program have paid money directly to SNCC, and that Head Start school rooms, kitchens, grounds and automobiles have been placed at the disposal of civil rights activities.

With its entire $7 million grant already spent, the Child Development group has made a request for $21 million to finance year-round operations. However, owing to the investigation, the Office of Opportunity has been asked to withhold further funds from CDGM. In the face of overwhelming evidence, the agency is expected momentarily to comply.

CHECK TO SNCC

Here is the almost incredible story. On May 18, 1965, OEO announced a grant of $1.4 million to Mary Holmes Junior College, West Point, Miss., for a Head Start program. In less than two weeks, the college gave at least one check for $200 to SNCC. (A photostat of the cancelled check is in the files of Sen. STENNIS.)

The college then contracted with CDGM to carry out the whole propram. Paul J. Cotter, investigator for the Senate Appropriations Committee, later testified that the college was "used merely as a conduit for the federal Head Start grant . . . to avoid the possibilities of a governor's veto." (Section 209 of the Economic Opportunity Act says a governor may not veto an OEO grant "to any institution of higher education.")

Sargent Shriver, who heads the War on Poverty, insisted that there was nothing unusual about finding a college to operate a Head Start program; OEO, he said, does so in many states. Mr. Shriver, however, failed to add that for the other Head Start programs, the National University Extension Association arranges one-week orientation courses for teachers. Mr. Shriver made an exception for CDGM and allowed it to give its own orientation courses. He also permitted the agency to select and train non-professional teachers from among the poor (in line, says OEO with the Economic Opportunity Act, which stresses maximum feasible participation of the poor in the War on Poverty).

The Group's Head Start program is unique in other respects, too. It doesn't come under the direction of local community action programs. Moreover, Senator STENNIS has discovered that most of its Head Start areas are identical with SNCC's organizing targets.

MILITANT ARM

CDGM began its statewide operations from its headquarters at Mount Beulah, a former Negro college at Edwards, Miss., which also happens to be the conference headquarters of the Delta Ministry, the militant Mississippi arm of the National Council of Churches. Perhaps the most outstanding member of the Delta Ministry is its associate director, the Reverend Warren McKenna. Herbert Philbrick, who was a Communist for the FBI, declared in Congressional testimony "When I was an active member of the Communist Party, I knew McKenna well as one of the leading collaborationists of and apologists for the Soviet Union. At one time we spoke together from the same platform at a Communist-sponsored youth rally."

Rev. McKenna also has been listed as a faculty member of the Samuel Adams School in Boston, the principal Communist Party training unit in New England. In 1957 in defiance of the U.S. State Department, he led a group of 41 young Americans into Red China. While there, he had his picture taken with Premier Chou En-lai.

Dr. A. D. Beittel, Chairman of the Board of CDGM, is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Delta Ministry.

The Reverend Arthur Thomas is a director of both the Delta Ministry and CDGM. Also on the CDGM board is Miss Thelma Barnes of the Greenville office of the Delta Ministry.

Of the 30 people who organized CDGM, 21 had militant civil rights backgrounds. Here are a few examples: Louis Grant, a field coordinator for CDGM, was a field organizer for SNCC and also a member of CORE in New York City. He was arrested on June 14, 1965, in connection with civil rights demonstrations in Jackson, Miss.

Frank Smith, Coordinator of the CDGM Community Staff, also was arrested in Jackson on the same date for the same reason. He is a member of both SNCC and CORE.

LAUNCHED CORE CHAPTER

Miss Jeanne Herron, Program Coordinator for CDGM, launched the CORE chapter in Philadelphia. John Harris, CDGM Field Coordinator, was a chapter chairman for SNCC and handled voter registration demonstrations.

R. Hunter Morey, a member of the CDGM central staff, has a business card which identifies him as a representative of both SNCC and CDGM. In effect, he is the Mississippi director for SNCC.

So much for who's who in CDGM. Shortly after its inception, it was in so much trouble that the General Accounting Office, the Senate Appropriations Committee and OEO itself started to investigate. They charged that $1,129 of federal money was used to pay expenses, fines and bail of Head Start employes. When Jeanne Herron and Robert Dodge demonstrated on the U.S. Capitol grounds on August 9, 1965, against U.S. involvement in Vietnam, they were employed by CDGM headquarters.

Mr. Shriver finally got the CDGM to refund $373 to OEO. In the other cases, he said the Group wasn't using federal money and that he could not control what Head Start employes did off duty.

The books of CDGM proved to be in chaotic condition, once Congressional investigators obtained them. On this score they told the Committee: "CDGM books and records were removed surreptitiously from the Mount Beulah headquarters and taken to New York City by the accountants. It took three days to get the books back to Mississippi."

In all, the investigators questioned expenditures of $400,000. Here's what Senator STENNIS told the Appropriations Committee: "Checks on federal funds (were) . . . issued to individuals in the amount of $100 each and charged to petty cash without supporting vouchers. Some of these checks were issued to individuals who had been arrested in connection with marching protests in Jackson. Checks were issued to individual members of the central staff . . . for many hundreds of dollars without supporting receipts . . . Thousands of dollars had been spent for supplies and equipment, much of which is placed in churches and other private buildings without adequate inventory or other records, and recovery of this property is improbable if not impossible.

FEE OVERSTATED

Here are some excerpts from OEO's own Audit Findings and Recommendations: "The $30,710 fee paid to the Delta Ministry at Mount Beulah for feeding and housing CDGM employes during the week of teacher orientation . . . appears to be overstated by approximately $21,000 . . . We found documentary support for only 657 of the 831 persons who supposedly attended the conference . . .

"We found no evidence to support CDGM's non-federal share contribution of $180,568. (Federal law requires grantees to provide at least 10% of the cost of Head Start projects.) The approved budget indicates that the non-federal share will consist of volunteers' services, donated equipment and facilities . . .

"Three thousand chairs . . . were purchased at a cost of about $6,500, although the grant conditions prohibit project funds from being expended for the purchase of furniture . . . CDGM rents a fleet of about 12 automobiles. However, . . . no procedures or controls were in existence to restrict the use of such vehicles to official business."

Like the Committee investigators, OEO also questioned outlays totaling $400,000. Its officials indicated they thought the matter should be cleared up before granting further funds.

GREENVILLE "SQUAT-IN"

Shortly thereafter, demonstrators broke into a locked empty building at the U.S. Air Force Base at Greenville, Miss., for a 29-hour "squat-in." Their leader was the aforementioned Rev. Thomas. At least three Mississippi newspapers quoted him as saying that one of the major purposes of the "squat-in" was to jar loose funds from OEO for the financing of CDGM.

After the demonstrators refused to obey the U.S. Attorney General's order to leave, the Air Force brought in air policemen from four

states to remove them. They had to carry out Rev. Thomas.

Here's what the Delta Democrat-Times reported on February 2, 1966: "Rev. Art Thomas . . . observed that most news stories he had seen made a point of saying that the demonstrators kicked, screamed, cursed and bit the airmen who were under orders to remove them from the building. Rev. Thomas said the demonstrators had considerable provocation for the cursing and abuse they heaped upon the airmen."

On the same date, the Commercial Appeal quoted Suffragan Episcopal Bishop Paul Moore, National Chairman of the Delta Ministry, as saying that the decision to carry out the Greenville operation "was made during a conference last week-end at Mt. Beulah."

REUTHER SPEAKS OUT

A few days later Walter Reuther spoke out. (Besides heading the United Auto Workers, he is Chairman of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, which achieved notoriety a couple of months later when it booed Sargent Shriver out of its meeting and staged a near-riot.) Said Mr. Reuther, "The poor of Mississippi need their faith in the federal government restored by immediate and vigorous federal action . . . Current delay in funding the pre-school program sponsored by the CDGM had produced great frustration and lack of faith in the intentions of the federal government. Poor children should not be made to pay the price of administrative delay." (Minutes of a CDGM board meeting on June 5, 1965, indicate that the CCAP had donated $4,000 to the Group.)

When the Greenville operation failed to produce fresh federal funds for CDGM, the latter tried another tactic. It sent 48 of its Head Start students to Washington for three days. Accompanied by 25 teachers and parents and two nurses, they sang for members of Congress, toured the White House and presented a gift to Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson.

Meanwhile, CDGM was negotiating with OEO. The former managed to get a refund of $4,223. While OEO auditors recommended that an additional $12,338 be recovered, at last report it had not been.

"MERELY FORGIVEN"

Negotiations continued, and OEO finally got the items in question down to $31,726. This, however, prompted Senator STENNIS to remark, 'The unauthorized and questioned expenditures of $400,000 were neither recovered nor explained; they were merely forgiven."

At OEO's suggestion, CDGM agreed to put $35,000 in escrow, an amount they both deemed adequate to cover the questioned items. Subsequently, OEO gave the Group a grant of $5.6 million for 1966.

Abuses, on a grander scale, continued. For three days in June 1966, about 200 participants in the so-called James Meredith march in Mississippi camped at and used the facilities of the Belzoni Head Start center. On June 24, the Reverend James F. McRee, Chairman of the Board of CDGM, fed several hundred Meredith marchers at the Canton Asbury Head Start center.

Asked why black power signs were displayed in its Head Start classrooms, CDGM declared, "Some buildings used by CDGM during the day serve as community centers which host a number of different activities during the evening . . . It would in no way reflect on CDGM for black power signs to be displayed in such a building in connection with the other organizations in the community it serves."

Still without any public explanation is why CDGM wrote checks to "employees" who did not live in Mississippi. For instance, one for $101.29 and dated August 12, 1966, was made out to Willie Watley, whose reported address at the time was Chicago.

THREATEN BOYCOTT

On July 22, 1966, a school day, the aforementioned Mrs. Allie Jones and three paid Head Start teachers visited at least two stores in Shubuta, Miss., during school hours to make demands not connected with Head Start classes. At both places the women presented a paper headed Shubuta Head Start Commitee which said, "We, the members of the Community Planning and Improvement Committee . . . make these demands . . ." They included colored employees in all business concerns, more jobs, new factories and Negroes added to law enforcement agencies. They threatened to boycott Shubuta merchants unless the demands were met within one week. They carried out this threat, and on August 6 and 20 demonstrated in front of Shubuta stores.

Complaint affidavits signed by Shubuta citizens before the Mayor's Court of Shubuta testify that the following events took place at Mrs. Jones' Home:

April 7, 1966—John D. Smith, son-in-law of Mrs. Jones, disturbed the peace in the home. Joe Staten another son-in-law of Mrs. Jones, made threats with a shotgun in the yards of the home.

September 5, 1966—Rachel Smith (wife of John D. Smith and daughter of Mrs. Jones) "did unlawfully assault and attempt to take the life of John D. Smith with a 30-30 rifle."

September 5, 1966—Minnie Lee House, who makes her headquarters at the Jones home, unlawfully transported persons for the purpose of prostitution.

As for the physical condition of the Jones home, the local bank appraises it at $1,000 maximum.

Here's what Committee investigators found regarding other CDGM Head Start centers: "Several centers were little more than four room shacks with bath, accommodating 60 to 80 children with a staff of 10 or more They were over-crowded and in soiled condition."

For its centers, CDGM paid rents ranging from $140 to $400 a month, "while their owners went out and rented better accommodations for the going rate of $35 to $37.50 a month," according to investigators.

As a rule, Head Start programs, like other anti-poverty measures, come under the direction of local groups overseeing all anti-poverty Community Action Programs. However, this is not true of the CDGM Head Start program. The Group supervises its own work in 28 counties and is responsible only to OEO.

SITUATION IN GULFPORT

Here's how Taylor Howard, President of the Harrison County Civic and Voters League of Gulfport, describes his local situation: "We have petitioned the Board of Supervisors of Harrison County to assist in creating a workable Community Action Committee . . . so we can bring all these poverty programs under one county committee. We feel that programs would be better managed. In our effort to help in this we have been vilified, and outright interference with public meetings has been one of the tactics used by CDGM personnel in . . . Harrison County . . ."

Meantime, CDGM is enthusiastic about its efforts. As noted, it wants to enlarge Head Start to a year-round program. It originally asked OEO for $41 million, but was persuaded to scale down the figure to $21 million.

So far, OEO appears to be succeeding beyond its wildest expectations in getting money from Congress for its nationwide Head Start Program. It requested $327 million for the program for fiscal 1967, but the Senate Labor Committee last week voted $527 million for Head Start, following a vote for $352 million by the House Labor Committee. The Senate Committee also approved $2.5 billion in spending authority for OEO—nearly $750 million more than the agency requested.

Head Start often has been called the most popular of the programs of the War on Poverty. Who, it is argued, can be against help for poor little children? But who, on the other hand, wants them to be taught by members of organizations charged with inciting riots? And who wants Head Start money to be used to finance riots?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MEEDS (at the request of Mrs. HANSEN of Washington), for Tuesday, September 27, and Wednesday, September 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 10 minutes, on September 29; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BUCHANAN to revise and extend his remarks during the debate on the poverty amendments today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE to include extraneous matter in his remarks made during general debate today.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. GOODELL as part of the debate in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.

Mr. REUSS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2040. An act for the relief of Dr. Dean H. Gosselin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Arturo D. Lagasca, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2467. An act for the relief of Rosa Agostion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2513. An act for the relief of Dr. Anselmo S. Alvarez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2543. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2587. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2754. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Valdes-Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2757. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto Fernandez-Bravo y Amat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2762. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael Jacinto Nobo y Pividal (Rafael Nobo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcial Alfredo Marti Prieto (Alfredo Marti); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3016. An act for the relief of Dr. Hector Jesus Sanchez-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3209. An act for the relief of Zofia Zych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3300. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3358. An act for the relief of Theodora Bezates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3566. An act for the relief of Wen Shi Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3817. An act to authorize the merger of two or more professional football leagues, and to protect football contests between secondary schools from professional football telecasts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 483. An act to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the effect of disclaimers on the allowance of the marital deduction for estate tax purposes, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7546. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired);

H.R. 11253. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in the State of Pennsylvania; and

H.R. 15510. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to hold prepayments made to the Secretary by insured loan borrowers and transmit them to the holder of the note in installments as they become due.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3353. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the transfer of three paintings to the Federal Republic of Germany in trust for the Weimar Museum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 28, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2753. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the San Filipe division, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187 (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2754. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting a report of savings available if uniform items are furnished to postal employees in lieu of allowances, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2756. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, for the fiscal year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of 43 U.S.C. 1331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11475. A bill to provide for the control or elimination of jellyfish and other pests in the coastal waters of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2088). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2089). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 17996. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 17997. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance, direct loans, and bond guarantees, administered through a Bank for Urban Renewal and Development within the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to supplement existing housing and related programs of such Department; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 17998. A bill to share Federal revenues with State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 17999. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 18000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 18001. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 18002. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 18003. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 18004. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize certain rank, pay, and retirement privileges for officers serving in certain positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 18005. A bill for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1 of Klickitat County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 18006. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18007. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the excused absence from duty, without loss of pay or reduction in annual or sick leave, of Federal employees in areas covered by official warnings of imminent danger of hurricanes or other inherently dangerous weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 18008. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of "disability," based on previous occupational experience, for purposes of disability insurance benefits in the case of individuals who have attained age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 18009. A bill to provide for the admission into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 18010. A bill to correct certain deficiencies in the law relating to the theft and passing of U.S. postal money orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 18011. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use

of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 18012. A bill to establish a National Council for the Handicapped, and to declare a national policy for the adjustment, education, rehabilitation, and employment of the handicapped, with emphasis upon development of the handicapped in a manner calculated to enable them to take their rightful place in society, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 18013. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 18014. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 18015. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 18016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 18017. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain fabrics containing wool and silk; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 18018. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 18019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct an addition at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 18020. A bill to authorize a survey for flood control, bank erosion control, and other related water resource problems on Beaver Creek in Nebraska and Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 18021. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18022. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 18023. A bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 18024. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18025. A bill to authorize an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 18026. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for door delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 18027. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 1020. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 1021. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to modifications of rates of duty under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Res. 1031. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the administration and enforcement of Federal laws; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 18028. A bill for the relief of Essie Christopher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18029. A bill for the relief of Millicent E. Christopher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18030. A bill for the relief of Raphael Christopher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 18031. A bill for the relief of Donald E. Crichton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 18032. A bill for the relief of Alberto Viana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 18033. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez-Cubas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 18034. A bill for the relief of Dorotea Caporrimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18035. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Liuzza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 18036. A bill for the relief of Miss Bettina Woon Sum Yau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 18037. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Proposes "Bank for Urban Renewal and Development" Instead of "Demonstration Cities" Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 27, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to develop our cities without Federal social coercion. My proposal is a "Bank for Urban Renewal and Development" to operate under the auspices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

What I dislike about the administration's urban legislation, specifically the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is that it is nothing but a vehicle of Federal control. It sets up no new programs, but merely ties old ones together into a vehicle for control aimed at imposing Federal social standards on our cities. This I am against. I want to give cities carrots, but not ones with fishhooks.

The money promised by demonstration cities is not going to do a job $96 billion has not done in the last 10 years. This is the sum cited by Senator RIBICOFF. We need a new approach. And we do not need rampant Federal control, headed by L.B.J.'s proposed "commissar/expediters" who are to be sent into each city. My proposal does not put the Federal Government in the sociological saddle, yet I believe it would help the cities to mobilize their own resources far better than the administration has to date.

I am proposing a Bank for Urban Renewal and Development. It would be set up within HUD, its Board of Directors appointed by the Secretary. The bank would have three principal functions. Succinctly, they are: First, to insure loans made to public and private corporations, in amounts up to $50 million per loan, for housing and transportation projects meeting the criteria of FHA loan programs and Mass Transit Act grants, but under more stringent financial standards of audit and repayment; second, to make direct loans to the same eligibles, such loans not to exceed $5 million, for rehabilitation of housing located "in urban areas of extreme socioeconomic tensions and pressures"; and third, to guarantee municipal bonds which are issued to finance projects or activities for which loans could be insured or made under the first two programs.

I believe that the Bank for Urban Renewal and Development would help America's cities without serving as a tricky vehicle for rent supplement housing, scattered-site public housing in reluctant communities, and artificial devices to end racial imbalance in the schools. Our cities need development, not coercion.