This is hardly a decision which will have catastrophic consequences. But it promises to raise one more barrier against the police in the performance of their duty, and there are already barriers enough.

Judge Murphy held that an arrest for disorderly conduct based on the use of "loud and boisterous" language in public, whatever this may mean, is illegal unless at least three persons are involved. To support this, he went back 49 years to a decision by the Court of Appeals which held that if three or more persons assemble for a purpose which, if executed, could constitute a rout or a riot, but separate without carrying out their purpose, it constitutes "unlawful assembly."

Disorderly conduct, based on the use of loud and boisterous language, is hardly the same thing as unlawful assembly. Furthermore, it makes no sense to hold that conduct which is unlawful if three people were involved is legal if only one or two are concerned.

For our part, we hope the other General Sessions judges will not follow this irrational ruling.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no other business to be brought before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 23, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1967:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John S. Bagby, FV406530, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Goldsworthy, FV 398709, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John A. Lang, Jr., FV569020, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John S. Patton, FV1851377, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Col. James E. Fain, Jr., FV571605, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Ben J. Mangina, FV490249, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert B. Mautz, FV1820787, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Jack R. Miller, FV352874, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Leon C. Packer, FV432101, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Kenneth C. Spengler, FV385107, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Frank H. Spink, Jr., FV562106, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Edward G. Johnson, FG421750, Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Donald J. Strait, FG796042, New Jersey Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert E. Buechler, FG666236, Missouri Air National Guard.

Col. Doyle W. Hastie, FG722064, Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Col. Paul E. Hoover, FG2083068, Ohio Air National Guard.

Col. Victor F. Kilkowski, FG824646, Maryland Air National Guard.

Col. Joe F. Meis, FG2006856, Colorado Air National Guard.

Col. Peter R. Phillipy, FG701154, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Col. Oliver S. Ryerson, FG680085, Wisconsin Air National Guard.

Col. Alfred C. Schwab, Jr., FG727560, Minnesota Air National Guard.

Col. Marvel M. Taylor, Jr., FG739362, California Air National Guard.

Col. Edwin Warfield III, FG829783, Maryland Air National Guard.

Col. Rodger D. Young, FG2043130, Montana Air National Guard.

Col. Joseph D. Zink, FG825058, New Jersey Air National Guard.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. James Dyce Alger, O19848, U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Don C. Bowman, Jr.
Robert P. Owens
William H. Longley
Edwin J. Zimmermann, Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

George H. Reifenstein

DENTAL CORPS

Harry G. Ewart

SUPPLY CORPS

George F. Baughman
Heinz H. Loeffler

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Arthur H. Padula

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Donald F. Arnts, to be captain, and ending Daniel O. Williams, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 11, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 22, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths. Proverbs 3: 5, 6.

Our Father God, Thou hast given us the morning light, give us also the morning blessing as we lift our hearts unto Thee in prayer.

Grant unto us the blessing of wisdom—not only to make wise choices, but also to find the right paths we ought to take. Lift high our vision that we may see clearly and be given courage to walk in Thy way.

Grant unto us the blessing of love. Deepen our understanding, expand our sympathy, enlarge our capacity for good will. Give us grace to rise above the low prejudices that separate man from man and help us to enter the realm of high principles where men are brought together in spirit and in love.

Grant unto us the blessing of faith—in these difficult and trying times may we keep our faith with Thee and in Thee, and may this faith keep us strong and pure and good.

As statesmen grant us wisdom, grant us love, grant us faith that in these days we fail not man nor Thee, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 18, 1967, 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 and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1587. An act for the relief of Richard L. Bass;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley;

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe;

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States;

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism";

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee hearings entitled "Special Inquiry on Invasion of Privacy" and "The Computer and Invasion of Privacy"; and

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology 1818–1957 Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress—Volume 4, 1954–55," 89th Congress, first session.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

requested, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5357. An act to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, to codify the provisions of Public Law 89-487;

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9481. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document "How Our Laws Are Made."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9029) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9481) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 61. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Suarez-Diaz;

S. 62. An act for the relief of Dr. Pablo E. Tabio;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Dr. Noel O. Gonzalez;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Dario Lorenzo Platas-Prohias;

S.123. An act for the relief of Kathleen Styles;

S. 174. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Gonzalez;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado;

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon;

S. 281. An act to increase the amount of real property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome;

S. 344. An act for the relief of Louis Beaud (Brother Amable);

S. 503. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izquierdo;

S. 576. An act for the relief of Magaly Jane;

S. 610. An act for the relief of Lilliana Grasseschi Baroni;

S. 613. An act for the relief of Manuel Rodriguez-Fernandez;

S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force;

S. 809. An act for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez;

S. 906. An act for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Zofia Walasek;

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro;

S. 1160. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes;

S. 1354. An act for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim;

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to recognize the 175th anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union;

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Federal Role in Urban Affairs";

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day;

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week;

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month";

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth week in April in every year as National Coin Week;

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of July 23 through July 29, 1967, as "Professional Photography Week";

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers;

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967, as National Home Improvement Month;

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; and

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—PERMISSION TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1968.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

CHARLES K. PURCELL

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, young Charles K. Purcell is dead. He was 19. His parents live in Valparaiso in my district. Charles died in Vietnam earlier this month. Two weeks before his death he wrote a poem. His mother gave it to me when she told me that he had made the supreme sacrifice for America. This 19-year-old had a home and a wonderful family. He had a girl friend, too, and a great many friends for he was a wholesome American boy. All of them know what he has done and what other 19-year-olds are doing for our country. Perhaps his poem will help the rest of us to do more—even just a little more—to bring about victory.

The poem follows:

DEPRESSED

(By Charles K. Purcell II, April 25, 1967, Cam Ranh Bay, South Vietnam)

I'm an American soldier,
My Country I protect
But I fight in Vietnam,
Which I did not select.

I was happy, I was care-free,
Still young and full of life.
I was torn from my world
To help end this strife.

I didn't want this war,
I just can't see the light.
It's for our homes and families,
So I have come to fight.

The Cong is our enemy,
The fight is always near.
But at home the draft-card burners,
Are attacking from the rear.

At home they pay no notice,
They could care less.
"Let the fools go over there
Heck, with the bloody mess".

The clergy prays for us,
The Mothers fret and cry.
We lie here and hope and wait,
At home they all just sigh!

"He was a good ole guy,
Too bad it had to be.
I know it is a terrible thing
But better him than me".

The girl friends drop the soldiers,
They cannot wait for some,
Who are fighting to protect them
But never may come home.

The war continues on
So I will let it ride.
I can last for just a year,
For God is on our side!

HISTORY RECORDS THE GREATNESS OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE

Mr. BRINKLEY. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, history records the greatness of the Hebrew peo-

ple, both in the land of their origin and in every other civilized nation. They gave us our greatest heritage, the philosophy of the worth and dignity of man. This spirit is embodied in the soul of America: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof"; the Bible, Leviticus 25: 10.

The measurement of these people can be seen in the stability of their home life, their industry, and their moderation. Mr. Speaker, I admire these qualities and I accord respect to the nation from whence they come; such respect indeed, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot and will not sit quietly by when it is threatened by a so-called subsidized friend of ours which has publicly stated through its chief of state that its friendship of toleration ends when the subsidy ends. Israel is an ally worthy of the name; Egypt is not.

We cannot permit Israel to be overrun. The primary responsibility would seem to rest with the United Nations and with us within that body to require action. While it is becoming for the strong to be meek, and to permit certain concessions, it is never the will of a free people to accede to the greed of a tyrant. Willingness to be reasonable should not be misinterpreted by the Secretary General of the United Nations as a license to favor our adversaries and those of our friends.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistaken conclusions; the American people stand with Israel.

CRIMINAL DETERRENCE AND REHABILITATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, those trying to conjure up a conflict between the FBI and the President's Crime Commission will serve the cause of law and order. The FBI says that the right way to fight crime is to strengthen deterrence. The Commission says that the right way to fight crime is to strengthen rehabilitation. Neither disputes the other. Both are right.

Recidivism statistics reported by the FBI illuminate a tragic truth. Most of the crime in this country is committed by repeaters. Some 57 percent of those released from Federal custody in 1963 had been arrested again before June 1966. For those paroled, the figure was 82 percent.

These statistics do not prove that rehabilitation is unworkable. Nor do they prove that deterrence is obsolete. All they prove is that both are inadequate in their present form.

While we must not coddle criminals, we must not be afraid to experiment with new techniques of criminal rehabilitation. While we must not impose cruel or unusual punishment, we must not be timid in fixing penalties commensurate with the offense. Successful rehabilitation saves society the burden of a second offense and serves a humane function as well. Proper punishment not only attacks the problem of recidivism; if it is swift and certain, it helps to spare society the burden of the first offense by others.

THE 1968 NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN CINCINNATI, OHIO

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Cincinnati, Ohio, has been chosen as the site for the 1968 National Governors' Conference, June 9 to 12. This will be the second consecutive time the Nation's Governors have met in Ohio during a presidential campaign year and is a tribute to the energies of Gov. James A. Rhodes.

The Queen City is an area on the move; 1967 marks the opening of the city's new underground parking garage, a new multistory office building, a modern convention center, and many other fine additions to Cincinnati's skyline. Cincinnati's city council deserves credit for its vision, its courage, its dedication in moving ahead on an ambitious urban development program—a program that is attracting major conventions, new industries, and events similar to the 1968 National Governors' Conference.

I know that my colleague, Congressman DON CLANCY, joins me in congratulating the city of Cincinnati, Gov. James A. Rhodes, Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and all other individuals and groups who worked long and hard to bring the National Governors' Conference to Cincinnati.

HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) to print as a House document "How Our Laws Are Made," with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. There shall also be printed fifty-one thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SITUATION IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying, every cloud has a silver lining. I just want to observe that if President Nasser of the United Arab Republic is foolish enough to send his tanks rolling into Israel, that silver lining is going to be the turning of a lot of the doves in this country into hawks immediately.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 96]

Arends	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Ashley	Hagan	Rees
Bolling	Halleck	Resnick
Bolton	Henderson	Riegle
Broomfield	Holifield	Ronan
Burton, Utah	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Cabell	Irwin	Roudebush
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Celler	Kluczynski	St. Onge
Collier	Long, La.	Shriver
Conyers	Lukens	Smith, N.Y.
Cowger	McEwen	Smith, Okla.
Daddario	May	Taylor
Dickinson	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Moss	Tiernan
Dorn	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Dulski	Myers	Whalley
Fascell	Nedzi	Willis
Fino	O'Hara, Mich.	Wilson, Charles H.
Fraser	Ottinger	
Gettys	Passman	Wolff
Giaimo	Pike	Wyman
Gibbons	Pool	Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—REQUEST TO RETURN H.R. 3399 TO THE SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 8, 1967.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 3399) entitled "An Act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission".

The request was agreed to.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is only with a sense of shame and sorrow that we observe today as National Maritime Day. This is supposed to be a day on which we remind ourselves of a fine merchant fleet to serve America's world needs in peacetime and in war.

It started on May 22, 1819, when the *Savannah*, the first steam-powered vessel, embarked on its first Atlantic crossing. Today its successor, the first nuclear-powered cargo ship in the world, the NS *Savannah*, is under sentence of death in spite of its successful pioneering in the field of nuclear energy applied to merchant shipping.

The U.S. merchant fleet has been allowed to deteriorate seriously as we witness a continuing battle between the White House on one hand and the industry and labor on the other. It is a battle which has made shambles out of merchant marine policy, and there is no relief in sight.

The only executive branch voices heard on this subject today come from the Department of Transportation which actually has no jurisdiction in maritime activities. The executive department agency having authority in maritime activities is the Department of Commerce which for several months now has lacked a Secretary of Commerce.

The Maritime Administration, as part of the Department of Commerce, is also headless today. There is no Maritime Administrator and there has not been any since July 1, 1966.

National Maritime Day this year is a sad day for all of us. We can only hope that the executive branch will find itself and provide the leadership needed to bring our merchant fleet back up to strength, if, indeed, it is not already too late.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 444

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in oversea dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes time for purposes of debate to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], pending which I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 444 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 7819, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

The elementary and secondary schools of the Nation are completing their first full year of operation in the act of 1965. There is overwhelming evidence of the successes of the various programs authorized by that act.

The act as passed in 1965 contained a 1-year authorization. School officials throughout the country have testified to the difficulties created by the Federal authorization and appropriation timetables. Program planning and personnel employment for a September to June school year are severely handicapped by uncertainty as to whether Federal assistance will be forthcoming. Therefore, H.R. 7819 contains a 2-year extension of the act—through fiscal year 1969. It is felt that such extension will alleviate the problem by providing State and local school systems with a meaningful basis on which to plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 444 in order that this most important legislation may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Resolution 444 makes in order the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7819, under an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

It will also be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purposes of amendment.

I might say that from the vantage point of today, more than a month after the Committee on Rules granted this rule, it may seem as though more time for general debate should have been provided. Looking back, after considering and reading all of the amendments that have been proposed by members of the great Committee on Education and Labor, I am of the opinion that perhaps it might have been wiser for the Committee on Rules to have sent this piece of legislation back to the committee for further consideration. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation that this House will consider this year, yet, we find ranking Members on both sides of this great committee now offering not minor, but major amendments, to it.

Today we are confronted with a major bill, needing a number of amendments that should have been offered in committee and thoroughly discussed. These amendments should not be offered on the floor and debated with insufficient notice to the members under the 5-minute rule.

I have been reading that the administration is making several concessions in order to gain support for this legislation. This House is entitled to know what concessions are being made and why they are being made. Everyone is concerned with the education of our children. Everyone wishes to see our children get a proper education.

Had we known the furor H.R. 7819 would cause, the charges of "wrecker" and "ripper" amendment thrown recklessly and irrationally at the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the Rules Committee probably would have provided more time for general debate in order that less heat and more light might be available to the Members of this House on this legislation. Like many Members of this House, we did not fully anticipate the events of the past month. We did not because at the time the Committee on Education and Labor requested a rule in mid-April, debate on the bill and possible amendments had not reached the intensity of the past few weeks.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. LATTA. I will yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would like the record to show that certainly it would have been in the interest of fair debate and full and complete understanding of the bill and the so-called substitute to have had more time and also to have it illuminated and described before the Committee on Rules. But the author of the substitute never bothered to attend or to present his substitute or to discuss it before the Committee on Rules. Is that correct?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman, as I remember, did appear before the committee but he did not testify upon that occasion.

Mr. CAREY. I recall being in the room and hearing the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee ask if there were any more witnesses who wished to be heard, and certainly the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota did not avail himself of that opportunity.

Mr. LATTA. Let me say in answer to the gentleman that the Rules Committee is not the primary place to debate a bill on its merits. This is the function of the legislation committee. We merely try to ascertain whether or not the bill is

worthy of floor consideration. In the past we have gone into bills when a legislative committee failed to do the job that it should have done, and I believe the gentleman is well aware of what I am saying.

I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota since his name was mentioned.

Mr. QUIE. As I understand, the purpose of appearing before the Rules Committee is to enable that committee to determine what kind of rule should be adopted and whether there is any objection to the proposed rule. My colleagues on the Rules Committee know that I had no objection to the rule, and that I felt 3 hours of debate was sufficient time because we would spend most of our time under the 5-minute rule considering amendments. I am going to offer my proposal as an amendment. I never did intend to offer it as a substitute.

When the Rules Committee asked if we needed a special rule for a substitute, I told them I did not intend to offer such a substitute.

Mr. LATTA. By the same token, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has several amendments that she sent to the Members. As I recall, the gentlewoman from Oregon did not appear before the Rules Committee in support of her amendments.

Mr. Speaker, several issues have been largely forgotten and should again be brought to the attention of the House. The original bill provides for an extension through fiscal year 1968. That was the administration's proposal. Without hearings or an administration request to extend the program beyond 1968, the committee voted out a 2-year bill, through 1969. The bill also provides for a part of the authorizations requested for the enlargement and continuation of the Teacher Corps for the next 2 years.

I need not tell you that there are several Members of this House, including myself, who are very much opposed to the Teacher Corps, but we now find it in this authorizing legislation.

Prior to H.R. 7819 this entire program was a part of the Higher Education Act. This year the administration has decided to divide it and the requested authorizations between two education bills. It belongs in the Higher Education Act, as its purpose is to recruit and to train teachers in the special skills needed to cope with the problem of deprived school children. An effort will be made to unite the several parts of the Teacher Corps and place them in the Higher Education Act.

As I said, these issues were raised during the hearings. While it was well known the gentleman from Minnesota intended to offer his amendment, and it was clear that the administration would oppose it, the wide support for the amendment was not fully known, and the subsequent attacks and charges were not anticipated either by the Committee on Rules, or, I suppose, by the House itself.

I should like to turn now to the heart of the present furor, the Quie amendment. I want to stress what I believe is the central issue: In our modern and complex society, what is the proper relationship between the State and the local governments on the one hand, and the National Government on the other, with regard to the education of our children? Traditionally the education of our children has been viewed as a local matter, primarily financed at the local level with assistance, financial and otherwise, from the State. In recent years we have seen this traditional concept change. The biggest step toward direct Federal involvement with education was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which basically provided, under a complex series of formulas, for grants in specific categories of assistance from the Federal Government to State agencies and local school officials. There is no question that this was a major step toward involving the Federal Government directly in the local schools, particularly under title III, where the Commissioner of Education is empowered to deal directly with local school people.

I might add parenthetically that Commissioner Howe has been often embroiled in controversy with the public, the press, and Congress, when operating under title III.

I remember last year we had Mr. Howe before the Rules Committee. He was there by our invitation. When Mr. Howe was before our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of our committee, questioned Mr. Howe concerning the matter of busing pupils. He asked Mr. Howe this question:

My attention has been called to an article in the New York Times a few days ago, to the effect that something like $700,000 had been granted to the Hartford, Conn., school board, and in connection with that grant schoolchildren were being bused from the suburbs into the city and from the city into the suburbs. Is that program under the administration of your office?

Mr. HOWE. No, sir; it is under the administration of the school districts involved there. The Federal funds, granted to them for a rather comprehensive project that has to do with teaching methods and a variety of other things do not support the busing, but rather these other aspects of the program. The local school districts have made their own decisions that they believe their busing to be a useful experiment for the improvement of education of the youngsters involved and it is their decision, not ours, that this be done. Nor are we paying, in that particular case, for whatever busing is taking place. They are contributing that aspect of the budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. To what extent is the Office of Education involved in this $700,000 grant? Did you make a grant of some funds to that particular school district?

Mr. HOWE. Yes; we have made a grant. I would have to get the details of it from Mr. Seeley.

It is title IV money under the Civil Rights Act and they have also elected to use some of the money which they are eligible for under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is a rather comprehensive project connected with curricular materials and the learning experiences of youngsters and only a portion of it is to bring youngsters together who have not before been together in the schools and to assess the educational effects of this.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the grant is one under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the plan is approved, is it not, by the Office of Education?

Mr. HOWE. There are two sources. One of them is title III; yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. The plan has to be approved at some stage of the procedure by your office, or by the Office of Education?

Mr. HOWE. It does indeed. It is initiated by the local school district and it is what they wish to do and it is no sense imposed by us.

These are direct quotes of the interrogation of Mr. Howe before the Rules Committee last year on the matter of busing of schoolchildren. I call this to the attention of the House because in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 there is a provision specifically prohibiting busing of students:

Provided, That nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.

Yet Mr. Howe, in his method, gets around the prohibition in this act by saying that the money was granted for other purposes even though it releases other school moneys for busing. The law was violated in principle, the busing was accomplished, and congressional intent was ignored. This is typical of the type administration you can expect from Mr. Howe when educational policies are dictated from Washington.

I was pleased to note, during this intervening couple of weeks, when so much interest has been focused on this problem and on this particular bill, that the administration has seen fit to take certain functions away from Mr. Howe and to put them elsewhere. I am pleased to see this.

Because of recurring problems within the present law, even supporters of some Federal assistance to our elementary and secondary school systems have developed second thoughts about the act, primarily because of the manner in which it is being administered. Few have any desire to see the Federal Government get involved in local school board decision-making, but title III permits it. These same worried supporters who clearly see a danger to local schools in the present act are in turn beset by the most fundamental questioning of the present act by those who would normally be found supporting it—school boards, school superintendents, and teachers. They do so for the most natural of reasons—too much complicated paperwork, too limited categories of assistance, and delay and more delay in approvals. These educators are finding they spend too much time on paperwork and too little on teaching.

Educators who testified before the Committee on Education and Labor were overwhelmingly in favor of the block-grant approach, as contrasted with the present categorical-grant approach, requiring local school problems to be squeezed into a precut HEW mold without regard either to the individual local problem or to its priority in relation to the local school needs. This straitjacket grows increasingly restrictive and frus-

trating to State and local school administrators. They are being forced to support the concept of Federal assistance and then forced to work within a Federal assistance program which restricts their problem-solving ability, and forces them to plan in a limited categorical alley instead of a broad overall basis, and which bewilders them with its bureaucratic maze. They see their hopes for meaningful assistance swallowed up by a Federal frankenstein insensitive to their individual school problems.

Naturally, these educators do not like it. They freely have given testimony before the Committee on Education and Labor prior to this last month—and I emphasize that—showing their support for the new approach as offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not the complex document its opponents charge. It is simple and straightforward. It is something I have heard many Members of this House talk about for a good many years. When they talk about Federal assistance to education they say, "All this money comes from home; now we ought to send some of it back without controls attached."

How could we send it back in a better fashion than to send it back in a lump sum to the State school administrators who administer the State school programs?

This is all, simply stated, that the Quie amendment attempts to do. It will provide a block grant to each State based on the number of school-age children and the average personal income in the State. This will generally favor the lower income States, those needing the most help.

The current title I formula scatters money over more than 90 percent of the Nation's school districts, including the wealthiest in the country. There is little effort to particularly channel assistance to school districts with a lower tax support base and a proportionately larger number of schoolchildren, factors which are sure to lower the standard of education available to the children.

So many examples of the inequities inherent in the present formula have been publicized that we are all aware of them. I was made aware of how little Ohio is getting per child under title I just this week by the very able gentleman from Ohio, Congressman AYRES, when he pointed out that in our great State of Ohio we get only $223.18 per child, whereas in the great State of New York, if my memory serves me correctly, they get $393.14 per child.

I wonder how this came about? I do not know how this came about but I do know that the formula under which title I funds are distributed is basically unfair.

Rather than to attempt to remove these present distribution inequities, the administration and its supporters have chosen instead to throw up a smokescreen of false charges against the proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. They have said that States will get less money under the Quie amendment, but the amendment provides that no State—no State—can receive less in 1969, the first year it will be effective, than it will receive in 1968. They have said cities and educationally deprived children in poor rural areas will receive less, but the amendment requires—the amendment requires—that at least 50 percent of the money received by each State be specifically used for such children. Additionally, up to 93 percent of the money can be so used, a higher percentage than is possible under the present act. They have even caught themselves in their own swinging door, charging on the one hand that the Quie amendment makes it easier to evade civil rights guidelines, and on the other hand that it will be rougher on States charged with discrimination because it will permit the denial of funds to an entire State when a single school is found to discriminate.

The question is to be asked, how can both these arguments be made by the same administration, or is the administration merely becoming hysterical, charging one thing to one group and the opposite to another group in the hope that in so confusing the issue the facts will become lost?

The truth is the current law permits the denial of funds on a statewide basis, even though that power has never been used, and the Quie amendment in no way amends title IV of the Civil Rights Act. If it is approved or if it is defeated, it will not alter the enforcement of this particular title. They have charged the amendment will eliminate assistance to children in private schools and revive the church-state controversy which for so many years held off Federal assistance, but this charge has been laid to rest. The Quie amendment will use exactly the same procedure as the present act, which requires State and local school officials to provide equitably for such students and involves no commingling of State and Federal funds in administering the act. As a matter of fact, it actually enlarges areas of assistance available to students in private schools.

These, then, are the major administration charges thrown wildly at this proposed amendment. By throwing such inconsistent and inaccurate charges at the amendment with the recklessness that it has, the administration has caused Members who do not vigorously support Federal assistance to education to wonder whether the Quie amendment is not really the only sound approach to the problem of giving financial assistance to schools without Federal control.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. LATTA. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. First, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his very profound and thoughtful statement.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Ohio has pinpointed the real issue in this legislation; that is, whether or not we are going to permit the State authorities to have more authority over moneys given to them and sent back to them, as he points out, by the Federal Government. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the church-state issue had been raised not by the gentleman from Minnesota—we will get into that later—but that it had been mentioned, and I wondered, considering the thoroughness with which the gentleman has gone into this question in his position on the Committee on Rules as to whether or not the Office of Education to his knowledge has ever presented any dollar figure as to how much money under this bill actually went into the private sector.

Mr. LATTA. I am sorry. I do not have the answer to the question. This is a question that could probably be answered by someone on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. AYRES. I say to the gentleman from Ohio we have been attempting to get such a dollar volume figure from the Office of Education and it has not been forthcoming. That leads me to believe that they actually do not know what the dollar volume amount involved is and many of these statements and charges that have been made regarding the Quie amendment, stating that it would scuttle this and would create a financial hardship on our private sector, is just that—propaganda.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during my 25 years' service here in the House of Representatives, the most important piece of legislation that was passed for the permanent benefit and economical advancement of millions of our youths was the general aid to education bill. This legislation was passed during the 89th Congress 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I recall back about 15 years ago when we had a Federal education bill pending designed to help hundreds of thousands of children and students throughout America. We debated that bill on the floor of the House for 3 days—and it looked as though we were finally going to get an education bill. However, on the second day of debate there were four Members of this body, opponents of the bill, who went back there to the rear of the Chamber and engaged in a private conference. Through a trick of parliamentary procedure, a motion was made by one of them to strike out the enacting clause. This procedure, if successful, would kill the legislation. We lost on a rollcall by four votes. A switch of three votes and the youth of America could have had a Federal aid to education bill almost 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, just think of the hundreds of thousands of American children who have been denied an education during that period of time, if it had not been for those four votes which defeated that bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-financed effort, judging from the propaganda that is being circulated over the Nation against this bill—in order to again deter progress insofar as educating millions of American children throughout the Nation is concerned. It is the same, identical type of attack that was made upon a similar bill in the 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the then leaders of that Congress contributed more to make that Congress a one-

term Congress for the Republican Party than any action their party took in that session. Of course, during the 80th Republican Congress in 1947–48 when the leaders opposed progress on education, social security expansion, housing, and so forth, they helped elect President Harry Truman and a Democractic Congress in November 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people on the left side of the aisle are on their way to repeating what happened in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list here, that I wish to incorporate with my remarks, of a number of the leading schools, universities, and educational societies in America. They support the extention of this legislation and oppose the Quie amendment.

I believe they are more experienced, equipped, and qualified to gage real, practical progress to advance education for the youth of this country.

Mr. Speaker, they are the National Education Association, U.S. Catholic Conference, American Council on Education, National Congress of Parents & Teachers, the AFL–CIO Executive Council, Citizens for Educational Freedom, Agudath Israel of America Organization, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO; James E. Allen, Jr., commissioner of education, New York State; Dr. Ralph Dailard, superintendent of San Diego City Schools; Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., superintendent of public schools, Pittsburgh; Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, superintendent of New York City public schools; Dr. Melvin W. Barnes, superintendent of schools, Portland, Oreg.; Dr. Harold Spears, superintendent of schools, San Francisco; Richard H. Goodman, executive secretary, New England School Development Council; and Robert H. Marden, director, BRIDGE project of New England School Development Council, Cambridge, Mass.

Also Dr. Theodore R. Sizer, dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. William H. Ohrenberger, superintendent of public schools, Boston, Mass.; Dr. John B. Davis, Jr., superintendent of schools, Minneapolis, Minn.; Dr. Richardson Dilworth, president, the Board of Education of Philadelphia; Dr. Joseph Manch, superintendent of schools, Buffalo, N.Y.; Dr. James A. Hazlett, superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. E. C. Stimbert, superintendent of schools, Memphis, Tenn.; Dr. Robert B. French, superintendent of schools, Dayton, Ohio; Ernest Stapleton, assistant superintendent of schools, Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Dr. James Hazlett, superintendent of schools, Kansas City, Mo.; Fred Breit, deputy superintendent of schools, Seattle, Wash.; Hugh Calkins, member of Cleveland School Board; and a number of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate with my remarks this list of individuals and organizations, together with their remarks where they oppose destroying the great progress we made to educating additional millions of American youth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material referred to follows:

EDUCATORS SPEAK OUT AGAINST SUBSTITUTE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

National Education Association, April 24, 1967: "It [the Elementary and Secondary Education Act] attacked the most critical problems of instruction in a politically feasible manner, effectively bypassing the emotional and legal issue of church-state separation. . . . NEA testified in its behalf during the recent hearings and is committed to its support."

National Education Association, May 2, 1967: "NEA believes that there is no acceptable substitute for H.R. 7819 before the Congress."

U.S. Catholic Conference, May 5, 1967: "We remain convinced the amended bill (H.R. 8983) fails altogether to provide adequate assurances to protect the rights of children in private schools."

American Council on Education, May 3, 1967: "In the case of acts as important as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the product of years of effort on the part of dedicated legislators. . . . We believe strongly that if members of the Congressional committees are considering substitute legislation, that legislation should be introduced prior to the opening of hearings so that witnesses may have an opportunity to testify on the merits and demerits of both the legislation before the committee and any proposed substitute."

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, April 27, 1967: "We in the National PTA have long looked forward to general federal aid to public education. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned that a proposal for general aid to education may be substituted for the present federal aid program without an opportunity for public discussion and public testimony."

AFL–CIO Executive Council, May 8, 1967: "The AFL–CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress not be destroyed . . . In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice."

Citizens for Educational Freedom, May 1, 1967: "CEF has decided to lend its full support to H. R. 7819 and have so advised our officers, advisers and friends throughout the Nation."

Agudath Israel of America, April 20, 1967: "By giving the local State educational agencies complete discretion over the use of these funds, the intent of ESEA to equally help underprivileged nonpublic school children would probably be thwarted. . . ."

James E. Allen, Jr., Commissioner of Education, New York State, April 29, 1967: "The momentum achieved under this Act toward much greater attention to the needs of the disadvantaged and toward increased innovation and change in American education must not be lost or attenuated. Its extension is, therefore, of utmost importance."

Dr. Ralph Dailard, Superintendent of San Diego City Schools, April 26, 1967: "The major titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be continued and fully funded."

Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Superintendent of Public Schools, Pittsburgh, May 1, 1967: "Any effort toward general aid should be in addition to, *repeat* in addition to, the present categorical support, not instead of. When Federal funds are available at some future date in quantities sufficient to justify noncategorical distribution, over and above present categorical needs, we would strongly encourage such aid."

Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of New York City Public Schools, April 26, 1967: "Administratively, these changes [under any of the proposed substitutes] would throw the present federal assistance programs into chaos. It would change all the current rules and upset patterns of successful innovation and service begun in the past two years."

Dr. Melvin W. Barnes, Superintendent of Schools, Portland, Oregon, May 1, 1967: "I oppose the Quie amendment because educational affairs in Oregon are not yet ready to accommodate such changes in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For the present I believe we should stay with the legislation as it stands."

Dr. Harold Spears, Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, May 2, 1967: "Urge opposition to the Quie amendment to ESEA and other Federal education programs in order to avoid disruption or delay in operating Fall 1967 projects. Early authorization needed to insure efficient planning and conduct. Suggest any proposed changes be studied for possible future legislation but schools need immediate approval to proceed with Fall term programs."

Richard H. Goodman, Executive Secretary, New England School Development Council and Robert H. Marden, Director, BRIDGE Project of New England School Development Council, Cambridge, May 3, 1967: "It is imperative that the gains secured by public and private school pupils under 89–10 should be maintained—and indeed improved upon—if changes are to be made. Therefore, it is the sentiment of this influential group of superintendents that they oppose passage of the Quie Amendment at this time."

Dr. Theodore R. Sizer, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, May 4, 1967: "The House Republican alternative to the continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as presently constituted should be defeated. Improving the education of disadvantaged children is a national problem and at this time should be administered on a national basis. The commitment of the states to equal opportunity, and their capacities to administer a high and complex program, vary too greatly to insure that the intent of the Congress will be fulfilled."

Dr. William H. Ohrenberger, Superintendent of Public Schools, Boston, May 5, 1967: "The Boston School Committee and the Superintendent are deeply concerned about the passage of an Education Bill. We sincerely hope that you will support H.R. 7819 as this is best suited for the education of the disadvantaged children in Boston. We hope you will oppose any substitute proposals as such proposals will not put the money where it is most sorely needed."

Dr. John B. Davis, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, Minneapolis, May 2, 1967; "Fortunately, federal aid programs have been effective under N.D.E.A., Vocational Education and the E.S.E.A. These categorical aids have permitted us to concentrate on specific curriculum areas or on the specific health and education needs of students. . . . I do not feel this Bill [the Quie bill] has sufficient provisions to meet the intensive needs of urban education."

Dr. Richardson Dilworth, President, The Board of Education of Philadelphia, May 8, 1967: "With greater strength, I urge you to oppose enactment of so-called 'Quie Amendment' H.R. 8983, which is in every respect a regressive measure as regards Federal aid to education, especially in our city and other urban areas."

Dr. Joseph Manch, Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo, New York, May 8, 1967: "Wish to record unalterable opposition to H.R. 7477, Quie proposal would imperil all present and projected ESEA services for educationally disadvantaged children in Buffalo."

Dr. James A. Hazlett, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Missouri, May 5, 1967: "Kansas City, Missouri, Schools have benefited greatly under the ESEA Act. We urge you vote for the extension of ESEA without any cuts in appropriations and permit

programs just getting started to move ahead. Any substitute proposals at this time would jeopardize what has been started."

Dr. E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent of Schools, Memphis, Tennessee, May 5, 1967: "School districts with high concentrations of children from poor families have received their greatest direct financial support under ESEA. Substitute proposals will do major harm to these districts."

Dr. Robert B. French, Superintendent of Schools, Dayton, Ohio, May 8, 1967: "Urgent you support Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as proposed in H.R. 7819. Proposed amendments we think will create endless confusion."

Ernest Stapleton, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico, March 9, 1967 (Congressional hearing): "Public Law 89-10 has been a tremendous program for the Albuquerque district."

Dr. James Hazlett, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, Missouri, March 9, 1967 (Congressional hearing): "I would agree that there would not be the emphasis on educating the disadvantaged, under a general Federal aid program."

Fred Breit, Deputy Superintendent, Seattle, Washington, March 9, 1967 (Congressional hearing): "If the same amount of money that is now going into Title I came as general aid, I doubt that you would get the same degree of concentration. It probably would be spread over a wider area."

Hugh Calkins, Member of Cleveland School Board (letter to the Editor of the Washington Post), May 9, 1967: "The bipartisan majority which enacted ESEA of 1965 was farsighted, courageous and correct in its appraisal of the final priority for Federal support to elementary and secondary education. Let not that decision be hastily abandoned."

E. Craig Brandenberg, General Secretary, Board of Christian Education, Evangelical United Brethren Church; Carman Hunter, Director, Department of Christian Education, Episcopal Church; Charles K. Johnson, Secretary General, Division of Parish Education, United Presbyterian Church; Edward A. Powers, General Secretary, Division of Christian Education, United Church of Christ, April 29, 1967: "Alarmed at efforts by Committee Minority to substantially change Elementary and Secondary Education Act. ESEA has made important contributions to education and we support its continuance in present form."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to incorporate with my remarks an editorial from the Criterion, a nationwide newspaper that affects the State of Indiana particularly. Other States are in a similar position as Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the Criterion, May 5, 1967]

EDUCATION BILL

What happens in the legislative battle is of prime concern to every parent with children attending nonpublic schools.

The Quie substitute—or amendment as some still are calling it—would jeopardize every cent of Federal aid that is presently being used in behalf of non-public school children.

What Mr. Quie and his colleagues want is to hand the states control over the distribution of Federal education funds by giving the aid to the states in lump sums, in contrast to the present system of allotting funds for individual programs.

Only through the individual programs have non-public school children been able to benefit in any way, shape or form from federal funds.

The simple fact is that 33 states—including Indiana—have constitutions which specifically outlaw aid to non-public schools. These states are forbidden to give assistance to any but public school systems and public school pupils. Now the Quie bill would turn over all federal funds to be administered under such prohibitions.

When opposition began to stiffen against his bill, Rep. Quie rejected the idea that private schools would be left out in the cold. He insisted that such schools—if their state denied funds—could ask the U.S. commissioner of education to petition the individual state to arrange for such aid on an equitable basis. Now wouldn't that be a neat bureaucratic tangle for any nonpublic school pupil to get lost in?

The truth is that Quie has been reacting to the opposition to his bill, and he has rewritten it three times—at last count—in an effort to appease critics. But it still is vaguely worded and subject to all sorts of interpretations on the part of both the states and educators.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act which the administration is seeking to extend for another two years came into being in the first place because states either could not or would not consider the needs of certain groups of special children—private school pupils, the handicapped, the educationally deprived and the children of slum and backwoods schools that were neither equipped nor staffed to educate them properly.

Now the Quie bill is poised to torpedo that enlightened understanding and the subsequent aid that has been given to problem areas in education.

Without delay, parents of non-public school children should inform their respective representatives and the two Indiana Senators that they are opposed to the Quie bill and are in favor of the administration proposal, House Resolution 7819.

Federal assistance to private school students is little enough. But even that little helps and in due course will increase unless the Quie amendment succeeds in setting back the clock.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have in my office a report from General Hershey on the number of draftees who were sent back home during World War II because they were educationally deficient and could not qualify as privates in the Army or as third-class seamen in the Navy.

It is astounding to see the draft rejectee breakdown of the 50 States. There are some States where as many as 33 out of 100 boys could not read or write and they were rejected and sent home as unqualified to serve their country.

There were about 10 States where between 25 and 33 out of 100 were sent home because they could not read or write.

There are some States that were as low as 4 percent—about 15 States ranged between 20 to 33 percent in rejected illiterate draftees. The opposition amendments to the present bill would again abolish equality for all American boys and girls to enjoy the right and privilege to receive educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Quie amendment is defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the gentleman from Indiana did not include the endorsement of the Quie amendment by the State superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction of Indiana.

I might just read a letter from him dated April 27, 1967, which is addressed to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] on the subject of his amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Act. It is as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 27, 1967.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: Your proposed amendment to the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965, which combines many Federal Acts into a single plan is supported by the Indiana Department of Public Instruction. It is time that Congress properly places the responsibility for administration of Federal Programs in the respective State Departments of Public Instruction. The Indiana staff is perfectly capable of properly administering any and all aspects of State and Federal Educational Programs.

It is hoped that the arbitrary, untimely and dictatorial concepts of Federal educational authorization be removed from the scene of educational progress. I am greatly opposed to Commissioner Howe's belief in Federal Legislation which identifies the "State Agency" as the Governor of that respective State. Any amendment that you offer should clearly designate the State Educational Head as the proper officer for execution of the State plan and receipt of Federal funds.

As to the amount of funds that should be authorized for implementation of the above concepts, I regret that I am unable to recommend a specific amount due to lack of information on my part.

I will send copies of my letter to other members of the House with the thought that States can regain control of its educational prerogatives.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD D. WELLS,
State Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I have just read is from the State superintendent of public instruction from the gentleman's own State of Indiana and raises the real issue. The question is whether or not education is going to be controlled in Washington or whether it is going to be controlled back home. This is the only issue.

This question of continued aid to private and parochial schools is not involved. Everybody who has studied the Quie amendment knows full well that these schools are adequately protected and knows that they are going to get the same money in the future that they received in the past.

This administration propaganda is merely intended to stir up an issue that has been laid to rest with the sole purpose of mustering opposition to the block grant amendment. I certainly would not support this amendment if this question was being raised again by it. We all have parents in our districts who send their children to private and parochial schools, and we want to protect their rights under existing law and they are adequately protected.

So, this is merely a smokescreen laid down by individuals who want to keep the control of education in Washington under Mr. Howe, the gentleman whom the Rules Committee had to call before

it by special invitation to find out how he is getting around a provision in the 1964 Civil Rights Act concerning the busing of schoolchildren to bring about a racial balance. This man has defied the wishes of the Congress, so what chances would some small school administrator have against such a man when he arbitrarily takes an illegal position against his little school?

Mr. Speaker, this is the issue and we are at the crossroads in the field of education. Are we to control our schools at home or is this control to pass into the hands of some Washington bureaucrat vested with dictatorial powers?

Granting that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. QUIE's, amendment has undergone some perfecting amendments since he first submitted it. This indicates that he wants to improve it, the same as the administration's proposal has had many, many amendments proposed to it since it was introduced.

Certainly the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], a member of the committee, would not be proposing amendments to the bill if it were in perfect form. Neither would the gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee, be offering an amendment to the bill if it were in perfect form. So why not the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]? Why not perfect his amendment? There is nothing wrong with that.

We want all the possible safeguards in this legislation that we can get, and I, for one, prefer control of education back home rather than in the hands of a Mr. Howe.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7819, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor brings before the Committee today H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, which extends existing laws, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and impacted areas legislation through fiscal year 1969.

On the other hand, we have legislation which will be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota—legislation in the form of the so-called Quie amendment or Quie substitute. We have the first substitute, H.R. 7477, which was introduced on March 20, 1967, at a time when we had commenced the markup of the legislation, and this was our first knowledge of his proposal. Then we have a second substitute, printed on page 91 of the committee report this year, in the minority views. Then we have the Quie 3 substitute, H.R. 8983; then we have Quie 4, which appears in the RECORD under date of April 26, 1967, on page 10828.

It has been most difficult to keep up with the so-called Quie substitutes. It is more or less like boxing with one's shadow. One takes aim, and about the time he feels he is going to make contact with substance, he strikes firmly, but another substitute appears in its place.

The committee bill that we have brought before the House today deserves the support, in my judgment, of every Member of this body. It took us a long time to work out the elementary and secondary education bill. This is not a "Johnny come lately" matter of legislation. It has not been whipped up on short notice.

This is the result of long years of patient work by Members of the Congress lay group, educators, and educational organizations. We tried for many years the general aid approach, or the so-called block grant approach, in the committee and in bills we brought to the floor of the House. For nearly a generation we tried the so-called block grant approach and failed. Our Republican colleagues were always critical of our efforts. In their carefully written reports objecting to our efforts, they contended we were trying to scatter the funds in such a way that they would be wasted.

They said we were not selecting the specific target areas of our country which were most in need of financial support from the Federal Government. This was the argument they made against the school construction bill in 1960.

They made the same argument in 1961 against the emergency construction bill we brought on the floor. I quote:

> This bill aims at no emergency, provides no specific remedies, and it makes no attempt to define particular needs.

After a long series of defeats, and trials and errors, we decided to take the approach suggested by our Republican friends. We tried the categorical method that had been used in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the impacted aid program.

Using the categorical approach, with aid directed to specific needs, we were able to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Now listen to this: The minority report on that 1965 bill is most interesting. Signed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] among others, we were most vigorously criticized for trying to pass a "thinly veiled" general Federal aid to education bill.

I just want to read one paragraph. I refer Members to the report dated March 8, 1965, Report No. 143, page 78.

I quote:

> It is a complete misnomer, therefore, to label this bill as one for impoverished and neglected children. Whether the bill merits support or not is beside the point. The true purpose of this bill is to authorize general aid without regard to need * * *

That is what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], said in 1965 about the present bill that we are now considering.

The amendments of 1966 were opposed by some of our Republican colleagues, including the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], again on the basis that we were passing a general aid bill. I refer Members to that report.

I must admit that I was somewhat surprised during the hearings to hear the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] refer to the so-called block grant approach. Our hearings did reveal some sentiment for a general Federal aid bill, but the issue was discussed not in terms of general aid as a substitute for existing categorical aid, or in the context of a general aid bill this year or next, but rather as a hoped-for program, as something to be worked out in the future when world conditions have improved.

There is not one sentence in those two volumes of hearings where the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] ever indicated that he had such a substitute in his mind. There is no earthly evidence on that substitute.

We did discuss categorical versus general aid in general terms. I will put a lot of those excerpts in the RECORD with my remarks, to let the Members of this body make their own determinations on the hearings, that there were not any hearings on the Quie bill.

The record indicates that educators feel that by and large we should continue with our present program of concentrating on the needy school districts of this country. These are the disadvantaged areas which Congress has recognized as making up the greatest obstacle

to the growth and development of the Nation.

Unless we want to throw away the money we have already spent and ignore the disadvantaged areas of the Nation, we must get this job done and enact H.R. 7819 substantially as it was approved by the Committee on Education and Labor.

As I stated, we were marking up the committee bill when we first heard talk of the substitute. There is simply too much at stake here for us to go charging off in a new direction, even in a direction that many of us have been looking for for a long time.

Earlier this year the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman QUIE, and I discussed the general aid approach, and I firmly committed myself to hold hearings on that subject later in 1967. There was at that time no mention of a substitute for the pending bill, which is, by and large, a vehicle for extending the present aid program. When world conditions permit I, too, would like to see us move in that direction, but that must be a new program on top of and in addition to the categorical aid program on which we embarked in 1965. To abandon categorical aid now and abruptly switch to general aid would be the height of recklessness.

This substitute which bears the name of Congressman QUIE would dilute, cut back, and in many instances provide no funds at all for the needy school districts. This I submit would be not only unwise but wasteful. It writes off all of the investment we have made heretofore in laying foundations for the present program, which is only now becoming operational. This is waste which this Congress ought not to countenance. I would like to think that our first concern would be to concentrate in the area of the educationally deprived and get this job done so that we can eliminate the need for compensatory education.

The feeling among school people—and I want to repeat this—the feeling among school people on the record as reflected in their testimony before the committee seems to be that with the limited amount of money now being appropriated for education in this country we should continue to zero in on the targets of real need. I want to put the statements of the leading educators in the RECORD that will verify this fact. I know a lot of witnesses came in with prepared statements supporting general aid, but with six or eight school administrators around the table, when you asked them if the funds were being utilized wisely and if they felt that this was the best course to take with the limited amount of funds, they invariably and, so far as I know, without exception approved the categorical approach. However, you will be the judges of it. I want to put a lot of those statements in the RECORD here from leading educators throughout this Nation today.

We know that there is a real need and an expenditure of more than $5 billion would be necessary from the Federal level, that is, from the general aid approach, to reach the disadvantaged through the so-called block grant approach to the same extent that educationally deprived school districts are now being funded. We need today in the intercity and rural areas where adequate resources are lacking 100,000 classrooms at a cost of more than $5 billion to eliminate firetraps and poor buildings. This is the testimony of many of the educators who would like to see us, when world conditions permit, build on top of their present categorical approach and go to general aid but who with limited funds urge we stay with the limited approach at the present time:

DIGEST OF TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR RELATING TO AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

MR. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, AFL–CIO

Summary: Categorical approach is wisest.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Would you feel if we undertook to substitute the general aid approach and get away from the categorical approach in this legislation that we would have real problems in getting the bill enacted?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the Congress having tried or rather I should say the education committees of both Houses and having tried general aid bills for many years and having them defeated for a combination of reasons which were quite understandable when you analyze the voting habits and the backgrounds of the Members of the Congress, that the Congress has been very wise indeed to have turned to the categorical approach. (P. 1353.)

MR. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

Summary: General aid would not pass the Congress.

Testimony

Mr. BIEMILLER. I stated earlier in answer to a question from the chairman that for whatever my opinion is worth, I still think the Congress is devoted to categorical aid, to the types of statement that you are speaking of, and I do not believe that you would have much success in passing a general aid bill at this time. (P. 1362.)

MR. FRED BREIT, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SEATTLE, WASH.

Summary: Title I is an effective tool with which to deal with our most pressing problems.

Testimony

Mr. HATHAWAY. There is one question I would like all of you to comment on. That is on categorical versus general aid to education. I would be interested in having your observations on it.

Mr. BREIT. I think in the long run general aid is the preferable direction to go. However, in the use of categorical funds you are in a position to emphasize particular problems in the district that are critical and in need of massive kinds of support.

To that extent, certainly, this has been a wonderful help to us. (Pp. 887–888.)

MR. FRED BREIT

Summary: General aid would result in a diffusion of effort in dealing with the disadvantaged child.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. I would like to ask Dr. Breit, and have the comment of you other two gentlemen, whether you feel that if you had a general Federal aid program, as a complete substitute for the categorical approach, that we now have under title I, involving the same amount of money, do you feel that the disadvantaged would reap the benefits to the extent they are now receiving benefits under title I of ESEA?

Mr. BREIT. Yes. I think my own reaction would be no, that under categorical aid, where it is specified for specific uses, then you do apply it to those critical areas and you use it there. If the same amount of money that is now going into title I came as general aid, I doubt that you would get the same degree of concentration.

It probably would be spread over a wider area. (P. 898.)

MR. FRED BREIT

Summary: Title I money is correctly placed and spent in most advantageous manner.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Now a couple of other questions. Do you feel that we are placing this money under title I of ESEA to the greatest possible advantage at the present time, considering the needs at the elementary-secondary level?

Mr. BREIT. Yes, I think the direction of this categorical aid to the low-income-family youngsters, those of limited cultural backgrounds is well placed. I think it is money well spent. (P. 898.)

DR. PAUL BRIGGS, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Summary: General aid would not reach the disadvantaged child to anywhere near the same degree categorical aid has.

Testimony

Mr. BRIGGS. I am afraid that if title I moneys in Ohio has been given merely to the State to distribute, according to a formula that they might have devised, that the people who live in poverty and the children from poverty would not have profited from these moneys to the extent that they have.

I am sorry, but I am sure that this is the case.

Mr. QUIE. Why is that?

Mr. BRIGGS. Because the State program, which the State established, approved by the State board of education, where they established their own criteria of need, is quite different than what was established under title I by the Congress....

What I am trying to say is that if you had distributed title I moneys the way you did title II moneys, the children in the poverty areas, in the ghetto, would not have profited the way they did. There is no question in my mind about that in the State of Ohio. (P. 788.)

Chairman PERKINS. Well, what worries me in following that procedure, and in taking that risk, is the fact the most needy will not benefit because the States have never directed maximum resources in that direction before we enacted the general Federal aid bill....

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to think that if the Federal aid came to Cleveland as general aid, that we would do exactly with it what should be done with it, and perhaps what is being done now. I am afraid we would not, because with the pressures across town, where there are those groups they say it is totally unfair to give this kind of supplementary assistance to those in the poverty areas when those of us in a middle-class neighborhood yet in the city should have the same kinds of programs for our children.

I am sure that there would be great pressures exerted for us to take this Federal money and to use it generally across the city. There would be heavy pressures.

At the present time, we are unable to withstand many of these pressures by saying that this money is earmarked specifically for inner city, it is earmarked for specific programs in the public areas, and, therefore, we cannot use it across the city.

You see, in our cities, we are so poor, as far as the amount of money we have to spend on children, that we have got to make every dollar stretch. What you have done with your Federal moneys, under title I, you have told us the kind of child. You have identified the child that we can spend it on, and,

therefore, we have spent the money on that child. You talk about giving it to the States, and allowing the States to distribute it to us. The wealthiest school districts in the State of Ohio get more money per child from the State foundation program than does Cleveland per child. (P. 791.)

Chairman PERKINS. Now, before you leave title I, Dr. Briggs, before you received this Federal assistance, under State laws, in your city, did you reach this disadvantaged group that you are now reaching on this, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

Mr. BRIGGS. No, sir, we did not.

Chairman PERKINS. I think that is proof of the pudding. (P. 792.)

Mr. BRIGGS. True, that what we have gotten from the Federal Government was properly earmarked for the real inner city problem, and if it had not been, the pressures for us to have spread that across our 154,000 children would have been so great that we could not have withstood it, despite the fact that the decision would have been ours. (P. 793.)

DR. PAUL BRIGGS

Summary: If money came through State, hard pressed (Cleveland) schools would not benefit as much.

Testimony

Mrs. GREEN. Dr. Briggs, I was under the impression that this morning you said that you would prefer general aid to categorical.

Mr. BRIGGS. Oh, I think that all of us would, but the question this afternoon, I think, came about to the point that could we guarantee that we would be doing the same things with the money, if it became general aid. My answer was twofold: if it came through the State of the State that I am talking about, the State of Ohio, we would not get it in the first place. We would not have it to do these things with.

No. 2, the local pressures would be such that we would not be able locally to do exactly with it what we might. (P. 798.)

Mr. BRIGGS. I am afraid that the money that is now going 100 percent into poverty areas, if we got exactly that same amount of money in general aid, that it would not all go into poverty areas. . . .

The point I am trying to make is if the national purpose was to attack poverty, and to attack the inner city problem, by giving us money that we could only use for that, we budgeted it only for that, but the problems of the city of Cleveland are so great that even the best judgment of the city of Cleveland and the board of education and the superintendent of the city of Cleveland would not have allowed us to have made the concentrated effort on the inner city that we have made. (P. 799.)

DR. PAUL BRIGGS

Summary: Favors specific targets as long as money is limited.

Testimony

Mr. FORD. This does not mean then, I take it, that your testimony would in any way be construed that you are forever more against general aid or forever committed to categorical aid but merely in the terms of the kind of money we are spending and the problems we are now facing.

Dr. BRIGGS. At this point with the limited amount of money that is appropriated for education in this country, it seems to me that there is wisdom in using the target approach in zeroing in on what you feel would be great national needs.

When the time comes that this partnership between local, State, and Federal Government is such that there will be massive large amounts available, then the target approach may not be too important. (P. 818.)

Mr. BELL. I understand that one of you gentlemen stated that you would prefer a general aid than categorical. Is that correct?

Dr. BRIGGS. Yes. Let me say this: At this moment in history when the amount of money coming from Congress is so small and you seem to have some targets you want us to hit, maybe the only way you can do it is to give us a rifle and a shot.

We would like to have more freedom with that money. However, we have expressed an honest opinion that maybe it would not always be used for purposes that you might want it used for. So that is the argument for the categorical aid. (Pp. 824–825.)

MR. HUGH CALKINS, MEMBER, CLEVELAND BOARD OF EDUCATION

Summary: Categorical approach is best.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. With that idea in mind, do you feel that the categorical approach that we now have under title I or a general Federal aid approach will better serve these disadvantaged areas at this time?

Mr. CALKINS. In the immediate future with the limitations which exist on the Federal budget I am very sure that the categorical approach is essential if we are going to improve the quality of education in the inner-city. (P. 1445.)

DR. RALPH DAILARD, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Summary: General aid would not be spent in the same way and would not benefit the disadvantaged child as much.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Assuming that you only had sufficient funds for the disadvantaged groups, would you spend those funds in the exact way that you are now spending them? . . . I would like to hear the comments of all the gentlemen on that one. Would it change if you had only sufficient funds in a general Federal aid bill for the disadvantaged groups from Congress? (P. 794.)

Mr. DAILARD. I don't believe I could give you the firm assurance of being permitted from public pressure to continue the use of the funds if this were suddenly shifted to general aid. I would become aware within just a couple of weeks of requests from some of the most favored areas of our community to add certain kinds of services there, using the argument that this is what you are doing in the southeast areas, which happens to be our area, and I am sure those pressures would mount to spread this to get the reduced class size.

We have a class size in our target area now of seven pupils per teacher below the city average. The other areas would ask for that, so it is my feeling, so far as we are concerned, if there were any sudden turnover from this, we would not be permitted within the city to use them in the same way.

The third point that I question is whether this is an either/or proposition. I think the present programs have been very productive. We are developing a new framework of Federal-local cooperation and effort that is useful. I think it would be catastrophic if this were suddenly upset and we moved to an altogether different base. I think we will move to the time that the Congress will find it appropriate to build the Federal aid, but in watching our building a general Federal aid program, in watching California State programs, we have had a strong foundation program, but we still have built into that a number of categorical aids to give emphasis for the teaching of the handicapped; to give emphasis even in this area, we had it. I cannot convince myself that there will not always be occasion and necessity for earmarking certain funds to accomplish certain purposes, even when we move in with Federal aid. (Pp. 796–797.)

DR. RALPH DAILARD

Summary: If aid were general, money would not be spent as well according to present citeria because of external pressures.

Testimony

Dr. DAILARD. When we come to the specific question, if the same money that is now coming through title I were distributed to the cities, I do not think it would be spent as well by any of us on the criteria that you set up because there would be the pressures from other parts of the city to put some of the money into lesser priorities that I don't think the boards of education could resist.

If you are talking about enough additional general aid, yes, now I think it would be spent well. I think it would be spent for good purposes. But, in terms of the priorities that now exists, there is little question that the most critical problem is that of dealing with some 20 percent of the population that is an economic drag on the whole Nation.

If that is the No. 1 priority, if the same money we are now getting were given to us unrestricted, I think it would be pulled away from that purpose. (P. 811.)

DR. RALPH DAILARD

Summary: Favors specific targets where money is limited.

Testimony

Dr. DAILARD. As long as the amount of money is limited it would better be aimed at the No. 1 priority.

That gives us the protection we need. Each community has the same kind of political pressures that you work in among the States. (P. 816.)

DR. BERNARD DONOVAN, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, NEW YORK CITY

Summary: Funds are being used in best possible way.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. You can think of no better way that we can utilize the funds than you are now utilizing the funds?

Mr. DONOVAN. I don't know of any better way that we could utilize the funds we have now. If additional funds come, we have another way of utilizing them.

Chairman PERKINS. Is that the consensus among you gentlemen? (Greater Cities School Superintendents).

Mr. DAILARD. (Superintendent, San Diego). Yes. (P. 767.)

DR. JAMES HAZLETT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Summary: Title I has had a beneficial effect.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. You are prepared to evaluate at this moment that the special programs offer considerable value, though, to your city?

Mr. HAZLETT. I don't think there is any question but what the recognition on the part of the people being served and the entire city that this attempt to uplift the community through education is considered to be positive and helpful. (P. 835.)

DR. JAMES HAZLETT

Summary: Categorical aid has focused attention on the disadvantaged child.

Testimony

Mr. HATHAWAY. There is one question I would like all of you to comment on. That is on categorical versus general aid to education. I would be interested in having your observations on it.

Mr. HAZLETT. I believe in both the categorical and general aid. Categorical aid has the advantage of stimulating, I think, school systems on a national basis in terms of meeting certain national goals which might not otherwise be crystallized as being in the apparent need that they are.

But I think also the school systems across the country need a general uplift of meeting the ordinary demands of financing public schools. There is great need everywhere, I think, for restructuring the entire tax system

that supports schools, traditionally on local real estate to a large extent.

I would subscribe to both. (Pp. 887–888.)

DR. JAMES HAZLETT

Summary: General aid would result in a diffusion of effort in dealing with the disadvantaged child.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. I would like to ask Dr. Breit, and have the comment of you other two gentlemen, whether you feel that if you had a general Federal aid program, as a complete substitute for the categorical approach, that we now have under title I, involving the same amount of money, do you feel that the disadvantaged would reap the benefits to the extent they are now receiving benefits under title I of ESEA?

Mr. HAZLETT. I would agree that there would not be the emphasis on educating the disadvantaged under a general Federal aid program. It is radical concept that is causing many of us to re-examine some of our basic philosophies, really, with respect to the possibilities of education.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you feel that if we had this same amount of money going into the States from the Federal level, as complete substitute, that the State authorities would not reach the disadvantaged children to the extent they are now being reached under ESEA, and that they would spend their funds for teachers' salaries and other State obligations and they would not emphasize the disadvantaged as they are now being emphasized under ESEA?

Mr. HAZLETT. I believe that we would not get the same kind of emphasis on the disadvantaged. There would be some diffusion.

Chairman PERKINS. Now a couple of other questions. Do you feel that we are placing this money under title I of ESEA to the greatest possible advantage at the present time, considering the needs at the elementary-secondary level?

Mr. HAZLETT. Well, under the objective of the elimination of poverty, and providing education for these disadvantaged, I think it is being placed correctly. (P. 898.)

MR. CHARLES HOLT, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, SOUTH BEND, IND.

Summary: Title I is an effective tool with which to deal with our most pressing problems.

Testimony

Mr. HATHAWAY. There is one question I would like all of you to comment on. That is on categorical aid versus general aid to education. I would be interested in having your observations on it.

Mr. HOLT. I tend to agree with Mr. Hazlett in that I might support in certain areas both (categorical and general aid). I certainly think in the case of title I it is sufficiently general to deal with a problem that we must deal with at this moment.

Perhaps there are some areas generally that are not covered that I would like to see covered. But the Teacher Corps, again, the vocational, particularly the handicapped, those things that we want to do, I very much favor. (Pp. 887–888.)

MR. CARROLL JOHNSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.

Summary: Present Title I formula is best approach.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. And you consider then it is proper to recognize poverty whenever it exists, regardless of the income level of Westchester County.

Am I correct in that assumption? You feel that the formula we have adopted, putting the funds wherever they have these spots of poverty over and above a certain number is proper, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON. My understanding is completely consistent with the objectives of the Congress: That you educate the youngster where he is, that you provide it whether he is in an affluent community or whether he is in other places. I think it is particularly wise also that you have permitted us, who have completely desegregated our schools, and have a quota, that this program may go into each one of our schools, and not be restricted to simply geographic area where poverty does exist. (Pp. 886–887.)

MRS. ELIZABETH D. KOONTZ, PRESIDENT, DEPARTMENT OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Summary: Need for control in order for funds to reach disadvantaged child.

Testimony

This is the kind of program that must allow for diversity and yet there must be some control and some criteria, to be sure that funds made available reach the people for whom those funds are intended.

So as much as I clamor for a lack of controls, I must insist that until conditions become such that we believe they will be used generally, that there be some control. (P. 386.)

MR. JOHN M. LUMLEY, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FEDERAL RELATIONS NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Summary: Categorical approach is best for zeroing in on most disadvantaged areas.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. I know all of us support a general Federal aid program, but from your studies (tell us) if we did not strive in the right direction when we came up with the categorical approach, insofar as zeroing in on the most disadvantaged areas that needed specialized educational programs the worst.

Mr. LUMLEY. The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman, because as you know the National Education Association has been an advocate of general Federal aid for many years, but at the same time to accomplish something for the districts we moved into, support of this program and we believe, therefore, that H.R. 6230 as proposed generally should be continued. I think the main thing that I would like to say to you is that the program should be extended for 5 years, not for 1 year. Let's get authorization so that we don't have to come back each year and talk about this. We can talk about the improvements, but generally, let's extend Public Law 89–10 for a 5-year period. (P. 1061.)

MR. JOHN M. LUMLEY

Summary: Program is reaching the areas of greatest need.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Do your studies reveal or disclose that the effects of the program, the way it is being administered at the local educational areas, are reaching those areas of the greatest need as was originally contemplated by this act, particularly the title I?

Mr. LUMLEY. Yes, generally this is true. (P. 1061.)

MR. JOHN M. LUMLEY

Summary: Supports extension of Act in present form.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. You are recommending to this committee as a national organization that we extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a period of 5 years, is that correct?

Mr. LUMLEY. That is right.

Chairman PERKINS. In its present form?

Mr. LUMLEY. That is right. (P. 1062.)

MR. JOHN M. LUMLEY

Summary: Favors continuation of categorical approach.

Testimony

Mr. LUMLEY. We are taking the position, and have taken the position since Public Law 89–10 started, that the categorical aids should be increased and improved and you should add school construction to it. We will eventually get to a general aid bill. The Federal Government has to provide the funds to do these things that are of prime importance to the school districts.

I am in hearty agreement with the program that we have will eventually evolve into a general aid program where the Federal Government provides a reasonable share of the operating costs of the school districts to do the things than you normally do in the school. But the Federal Government has not moved into that position yet. Until then we have to continue these programs.

Mr. BELL. Still, right now you favor the categorical approach and a greater increase in the categorical approach; is that correct?

Mr. LUMLEY. I am just being realistic, Mr. Bell. I want to get all the programs we can get and the most money we can get. (P. 1063.)

MR. JOHN M. LUMLEY

Summary: Results have equalled expectations.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Have the effects and results obtained been as great as your organization anticipated from your best evaluations?

Mr. LUMLEY. The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman. As I said this morning, our evaluation has to be quite subjective at this time but on the basis of the reports that we have we believe that it has had a tremendous impact on education in the country. We believe it has done the thing that the committee wanted it to do when it was enacted and of course, as you know, we congratulated this committee a number of times for taking this great forward step. (P. 1071.)

MR. W. R. M'NEILL, SUPERINTENDENT OF BOWLING GREEN INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, BOWLING GREEN, KY.

Summary: Title I permits schools to do things they wouldn't otherwise have done.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. You know, before we came forth with the categorical approach, we were doing very little toward assisting the disadvantaged child in the country. Do you feel that we have zeroed in in the right areas with the funds that we are expending?

Mr. MCNEILL. We are doing things now that we have wanted to do for years and felt that we could not deprive one part of the community at the expense of the other. We feel that by zeroing in, as you have just said, that you have given us this opportunity to—well, the Headstart is such a good example.

Take the youngster in his formative years and emphasize some experiences, and we would like to, and others are doing it, they are able to carry it through the years and we would like to follow it on through, when they are second graders and third graders, see to it that they have the experience that other children get normally but they don't.

Chairman PERKINS. That is why I emphasize the categorical approach. (P. 1006.)

DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Summary: Supports Public Law 89–10 in present form.

Testimony

In sum, we find the content and theory of Public Law 89–10 to be sound and wise.

No major changes are suggested at this time for the specific components of title I. With the exception of liberalizing the facilities-construction elements of the law, we urge its continued implementation in its present form.

For the present, we recommend vigorous pursuit of the course of action now in motion, with full funding, and with the funds delivered on time to the places where the chil-

dren of the poor desperately need them. (P. 323.)

DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND

Summary: Categorical approach should be maintained.

Testimony

Mr. QUIE. What if the requirement of income was removed from your administering of the funds, and you had the responsibility to see that the funds went to the areas where the greatest educational deprivation existed? (P. 351.)

Dr. MARLAND. Speaking now as a member of the Council (National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children) in replying to that question, ... they would tend to say that the present categorical restraints on ESEA are valid and are productive, and are efficient and should be retained.

I believe that as a superintendent of schools, if it were just I alone that were concerned with this, I would like to see a little more fluidity in the use of the funds, but not absolute freedom of general aid at this stage.

Mr. QUIE. It would not necessarily be general aid. You still have the category that it would have to be for the educationally deprived.

Dr. MARLAND. But you are saying that the judgment would rest at the local level as to how it would be used. That tends to be in the direction of general aid. I think that our Council would hold that at this stage of our evolution on this subject they would recommend Congress hold to the present restraints to assure that that money is spent where the law meant it to be and have universal guidelines that tell how to do it. (P. 352.)

DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND

Summary: Supports categorical approach in dealing with special problems.

Testimony

Dr. MARLAND. I suppose what I am saying, Mr. Goodell, is that this is, indeed, a problem that ought to be solved locally and in the State legislatures, but it is not being solved there. Therefore, the condition is so desperate that I call it to the attention of this committee as something that may have to be done on the basis of a categorical concern with the big cities of America who are not receiving equitable shares of State concern.

Mr. GOODELL. Would you like to suggest a formula of some type?

Dr. MARLAND. No. I am saying that you may have to get into some kind of categorical assistance to cities. (P. 389.)

DR. SIDNEY P. MARLAND

Summary: Sufficient flexibility in Title I.

Testimony

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would we do better to shift very swiftly from a categorical aid to a broad-scale aid where the individual administering this could determine where those funds should be concentrated and used in the area of greatest need?

Dr. MARLAND. No, I don't think so. I think there is already sufficient flexibility already in title I for each community to contrive their own programs for their peculiar needs. There is great flexibility in developing a program and submitting it for approval.

So, so long as the target is the deprived child, the disadvantaged child, there is great freedom. I am not suggesting a move toward general aid on that subject. The deprived child is the great concern of this country, of the Congress and of our schools.

It is still important to concentrate our energies on him.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you feel that flexibility within the area of the deprived child is sufficiently great to permit this concentration to which Dr. Kirst was just speaking?

Dr. MARLAND. I do. (Pp. 373–374).

DR. DUANE MATTHEIS, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Summary: An effective State plan would be essentially the same as the one in the Act.

Testimony

Mr. O'HARA. Then you would not envision this State plan would involve any different distribution or any different activities than are presently carried on, is that right?

Dr. MATTHEIS. That is just about correct in its entirety. I think there would be some things where we had a difficulty in the first year where we would have provided for in a State plan and that would have been the redistribution of funds.

I would think under any State plan we would want to provide for the distribution of funds not used by the school districts within the States.

As I understand it this will not be completely cleared up and taken up in this fiscal year either where the distribution of funds that are not used in a State are not made immediately available to other districts in the State.

I think this could be very easily provided for in a State plan but basically the mission of the act would not change it as I see it.

Mr. O'HARA. Nor the kinds of activities carried on or the redistribution of funds accepted.

Dr. MATTHEIS. I think this is a basically correct idea; yes, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. We could take care of that objection by putting a redistribution formula right in there.

Dr. MATTHEIS. Yes. (P. 1111.)

DR. SAMUEL V. NOE, SUPERINTENDENT OF LOUISVILLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Summary: Title I permits schools to do things they wouldn't otherwise have done.

Testimony

Mr. NOE. Mr. Chairman, you were asking about categorical aid against general aid, and all that has been said certainly is correct, that we have been able to do lots of things that we couldn't have done otherwise. (P. 1006.)

MR. RAY PAGE, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, ILLINOIS

Summary: Present formula cannot be improved on.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a question. From your experience as a State school superintendent, as long as we have this categorical program, how could you more equitably, on the basis of need, reach the needy youngster than we are reaching the needy youngster at the present time, as long as we have this categorical approach?

Mr. PAGE. I am afraid that I could not give you a formula at this moment that would do that. (P. 485.)

MR. HARRY SPARKS, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, KENTUCKY

Summary: Present formula works well.

Testimony

Mr. GOODELL. How would you feel about a provision that gave the States the authority to allocate within the State itself, to the school districts?

Mr. SPARKS. We can do it more effectively on the basis of need. But we would have to follow a formula similar to what has been applied.

We haven't objected to the formula that you have applied at the national level, but we could, we might be able to meet need to some extent but as far as we are concerned it has worked very satisfactorily. (P. 484.)

MR. ERNEST STAPLETON, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, ALBUQUERQUE, N.M.

Summary: Categorical aid has focused attention on the disadvantaged child.

Testimony

Mr. HATHAWAY. There is one question I would like all of you to comment on. That is on categorical versus general aid to education. I would be interested in having your observations on it.

Mr. STAPLETON. I will make this general observation, that we have discussed this question and our feeling is somewhat that the categorical has given us some target areas to focus on and that some of the programs we have developed, reading programs, what have you, all of the programs that again have been indicated here today, have been brought about to a certain extent by categorical aid.

I recognize that many people would not agree with this, but this is, as I say, something we discussed and felt was a plus for categorical aid.

We would want to show that as a point. (P. 887.)

MR. ERNEST STAPLETON

Summary: General aid would result in a diffusion of effort in dealing with the disadvantaged child.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. I would like to ask Dr. Breit, and have the comment of you other two gentlemen, whether you feel that if you had a general Federal aid program, as a complete substitute for the categorical approach, that we now have under title I, involving the same amount of money, do you feel that the disadvantaged would reap the benefits to the extent they are now receiving benefits under title I of ESEA?

Mr. STAPLETON. I would agree with my colleagues here. We obviously would still face, under general aid, the decision of priorities, and I have a feeling that there might be a different ranking of priorities, a diffusion of participation of them, which I think the majority . . . (pp. 897–898.)

MR. ERNEST STAPLETON

Summary: Title I money is correctly placed and spent in most advantageous manner.

Testimony

Chairman PERKINS. Now a couple of other questions. Do you feel that we are placing this money under title I of ESEA to the greatest possible advantage at the present time, considering the needs at the elementary-secondary level?

Mr. STAPLETON. I believe that it is being placed correctly. I am made mindful of the fact that perhaps our district, other districts, perhaps, should view the research available today, and do a little more in terms of saturating at the earlier grades.

We have heard comments to the effect that we have had patchwork, remedial work, at later stages, in secondary, and while I believe that these programs are necessary, and that we need to continue them, and have good programs at other levels, I believe there needs to be a concern for saturation of services for the disadvantaged, under this program, at the earlier grades. (P. 898.)

Mr. Chairman, in 1965, we in the Congress made the determination of priority. We said that our educational aid shall go where it is most needed. The program is working well. All of this taken into consideration, I contend this is not the time to back off before it has shown what it can do. This is no time to leave the deserving school districts of the country holding an empty bag. And, Mr. Chairman, the Quie substitute would jerk the rug out from under thousands of school districts in this Nation and especially in the rural areas where the money is most urgently needed and where in many areas they have just be-

gun to transport their children in jeeps and other means of vehicular transportation, over rough roads, in order to get them to a school building for the first time.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is a good example of the inequitable distribution of funds from the standpoint of need under the Quie proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will argue that the District of Columbia has, perhaps, the highest per capita income in the Nation. But this bill zeroes in where a real need exists.

Mr. Chairman, the formula written into the Quie proposal is inequitable to the areas of the greatest need. If adopted, it would bring about a cutback in the funds for the District of Columbia, which illustration goes to show how the Quie substitute would disrupt successfully innovated programs and practices throughout the entire program in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the principal factor involved in the formula which has been proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] stems from the so-called Hill-Burton formula, which approach was put into effect in the NDEA at a time after the first sputnik went up and at a time when we needed scientists and engineers. This was done at a time when we wanted to obtain scientists and engineers from every section of the country from which we could possibly obtain them.

Mr. Chairman, the Quie formula is based on school-age population and the average income per child in that State, as compared to these same factors in all the States. At this point I would like to provide the following analysis of the Quie and the committee formulas:

COMPARISON OF FORMULAE COMPONENTS AND EFFECTS UNDER H.R. 7819 AND H.R. 8983, FISCAL YEAR 1969

H.R. 8983 (QUIE AMENDMENT)

The formula for distribution of funds under H.R. 8983 uses the per capita income per child and the total number of school age children in each State as the basic variables on which to compute each State's allocation. Using the per capita income per child figure, the inverse ratio for each State to all other States is determined, thus giving more to those States which have the lowest per capita income per child. Outer limits of .3333 and .6666 are established; States whose ratio falls below the lower figure are brought up to the minimum, and States whose ratio is higher than .6666 are brought down to that number. The ratio factor is then used in conjunction with the number of school age children to determine each State's share of available funds.

If the formula were allowed to operate freely (that is, with no outer limits), it would indeed put larger amounts per school age child in those States with lowest per child incomes. However, when minimum and maximum ratio limits are imposed, variations among States are obscured. Thus, when we compare allocations under this formula with those under the ESEA formulae, we find that ESEA is more successful in getting funds into the States with lower per child incomes, even though it does not use that factor at all for computation purposes. For instance, the Quie formula puts significantly lower amounts into the sixteen Southern and border States, even though fourteen of these States fall in the lower half of the Nation in per child income and account for nine out of the bottom ten States. We also discover that of the seventeen States whose per child income is above the national average, eleven receive *more* under the Quie formula than under ESEA.

The Quie formula also does not take into account the anomaly caused by an area with a high per child income which also has great need because of concentrations of poverty. The District of Columbia, for instance, has the highest per child income in the Nation; it also is among the Nation's leaders in delinquency, poverty, and lack of educational achievement among its youngsters.

H.R. 7819 (COMMITTEE BILL)

The bulk (80%) of the funds to be distributed under this bill in FY 1969 are contained in Title I. The Title I formula is based on two primary factors: first, the sum of the numbers of children from low-income families and those in other categories of deprived children (children on welfare, migrants, neglected, delinquent, and handicapped) and second, on one-half of a per-pupil expenditure figure for each State, which is derived from the higher of the State or national per pupil average expenditure. The product of these two factors established a maximum allocation for each county in the United States. Funds made available on this basis are to be used in those schools which have the highest concentrations of economically deprived children.

Unlike the Quie formula, which established a general State-wide index, the Title I method pinpoints funds into those areas in each State which have the highest concentrations of poverty. The inclusion of children in families on welfare, for instance, assures that the major cities in the North, in which there are intense concentrations of poverty in spite of a high per child income, receive extra funds to educate these children. The use of whichever is higher of the national or State per-pupil expenditure assures that States which fall below the average national per-pupil expenditure get credited for at least the national average, while those who fall above it get credit for what they are already spending. If half the State per pupil expenditure alone is used, as it is now under Title I, Mississippi gets only half the amount per child ($136) that California does ($273). Using half the State or national average, however, Mississippi would get $250 per child to California's $273.

The Title I formula also has some equalizing effect within States, because districts with concentrations of poverty and low per-pupil expenditure benefit from the fact that the State or national average is used in computing their allotments.

The formulae for Titles II, III, and V use a more general index. Allotments under Title II are based on the school enrollment in each State. The Title III formula is based on a combination of the number of school age children and the total State population. The Title V formula is a combination of an identical flat grant to each State plus a relative grant based on school-age population. None of these formulae take into account any index based on financial need within the State.

Mr. Chairman, under the Quie substitute new and elaborate forms of the reporting procedures will be required. Considering the manner in which the various categories have been narrowed, much more bookkeeping will be necessary than at present, in my judgment; and, depending upon which substitute you read. If one reads the last one with a number, he should read sections 701 or 702 through about section 706.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that all of us should understand that if we accept the Quie proposal we are embarking upon a path that will surely lead to the destruction of all the impacted aid-to-education programs. We worked for years before we were able to get the impacted aid formula pegged to one-half the national average per pupil expenditure. We were not able to attain that goal until 1957 or 1958. I remember when the State of Mississippi received the payment of $35 per pupil, whereas the State of New York received a payment of $250 per pupil.

Mr. Chairman, Federal aid must be granted upon the basis of need, if we are going to justify this program, in my judgment. This is the formula which we wrote into the committee bill, when it is fully funded.

Mr. Chairman, if we shelve that formula in this pending bill, that the Quie substitute proposes, would there not be a similar drive to do the same thing in impact aid legislation?

Mr. Chairman, we crossed that bridge last year. Many of us were against the recommendation by the administration which had followed the report of the Stanford research people, because we felt that those recommendations were not correct in substantially cutting funds in this program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the important aspects of the committee bill is the fact that it permits school administrators to plan a little farther ahead than the present school term.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is important that we extend this aid bill through fiscal year 1969.

You know, Mr. Chairman, one of the most amazing things is this: When one looks at these Quie bills, particularly the last one at which I looked, we find that it purports to be a continuing program with an open end authorization—with a $3 billion authorization—through fiscal 1969.

It would appear to me with all these reports existing to the categorical approach it is most difficult for me to understand just what has brought about that change of heart. But I am sure this body is not going to let an alert, astute salesman and one of the great legislators in this body sell this body a pig in a poke. And that would be just what the Quie substitute would be if we bought that.

Mr. Chairman, I have not yet mentioned the great anxiety that is seeping through the educational community today in this great debate which threatens through the Quie proposal to destroy the church-state harmony which has developed in connection with ESEA. But you and I know the church versus state issue is lurking, ready to destroy the Federal aid program just as it helped frustrate all of our efforts for 20 years.

In many States the present program involving private school pupils would in most cases simply end right then and there. These are States in which the funds are required to be separate, and are not to be commingled, and which some attorneys general have so ruled. But would it not be better to call educators and different lawyers throughout the country before the committee and let them tell whether or not the State laws

would be applicable, even though the funds were not commingled with State funds?

There is much of solid opinion among good lawyers in this country that through the block grant approach the State laws would be applicable, and if that be the case utter chaos would develop, and certainly we should explore situations of that type before the committee.

About 33 State constitutions prohibit school officials from spending public money for nonpublic purposes. The harmony which has been so carefully developed over the past few years as to enable us to give additional assistance to children, not States, but children, is in serious jeopardy if we accept too hastily this action.

Let us not delude ourselves by embracing the general aid principle at this time and abandoning our target approach.

The gentleman from Minnesota claims he is not abandoning the target approach. His bill and the State plans and the Federal plans would require that 50 percent which is sent from the State to the commissioners be spent in the education of the disadvantaged. How much of that money would reach to the disadvantaged areas as we define the disadvantaged areas? I would say not 5 percent, in my honest judgment, would ever get there. So that it just disrupts the whole present program.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I will yield in just a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, who can fail to remember how many times in nearly 20 years how close we moved toward having a Federal school aid bill concluded, and we always lost out because of the church-state issue, primarily.

The principle we followed was that the Federal Government money was to be spent on the individual child in working out the elementary school bill provisions. It was not to be spent to help a church. It was not to be spent to help a parish or a State or a school district. It was, I repeat, to be spent to help a child. It was thus that we have been able to help those pupils. If we want to continue to meet these urgent needs we are going to have to continue for a time, at least, with the categorical approach in providing Federal financial aid to elementary and secondary schools.

At this point let me stress the Teacher Corps authorization in the committee bill although it will be treated more comprehensively by others later. The Teacher Corps is intended to improve the same schools that are being benefited under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Corps members are to be used in the schools which are the target areas of need in title I. In other words, this amendment adds a new part (b) to title I, extending authorizations for the Corps and strengthening the local agency role in the utilization of teaching teams from the Corps.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965, the Congress voted a 1-year authorization for its program.

Last year we were able to extend the program through fiscal year 1968. But the witnesses from all parts of the country were concerned, more than by any other factor, by the untimely authorizations and the untimely appropriations. It was for that reason we propose here to extend the Elementary and Secondary Act through fiscal year 1969.

School officials across the country have testified to the difficulties they face in adjusting their educational planning to Federal authorization and appropriations schedules. The school year runs from September to June. Unless in the early spring school authorities know how much money is going to be available to them for the next school year they are unable to hire the best teachers and plan the best programs. Although this extension will not guarantee the amounts to be available for the next 2 fiscal years, it will act as a Federal commitment to the program's continuation and will provide our school districts with some basis on which to plan.

Programs conducted under this act have made a substantial favorable impact on our Nation's educational systems. The strides made toward the achievement of quality education for all children, in my opinion, thoroughly justify the continuation of this Federal promise to the schoolchildren of our country.

Briefly let me describe the purpose of each title of the act which we propose to amend, and why it must be continued in the coming years.

Title I of the act provides for grants to local educational agencies, through State departments of education, to establish programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children, the children of the urban slum and the remote rural area. Last year an estimated 8.3 million deprived children benefited from these programs, conducted by more than 17,000 school districts in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

The programs conducted by local schools across the country recognized the close link between poverty and educational failure. Almost 5 percent of title I funds were spent on food and health services for children whose prior efforts to learn had been hampered by hunger and poor health. Past learning gaps were also met, as two-thirds of the funds spent the first year for instruction were spent on language, arts, and remedial reading.

For the second year, school districts experienced some difficulty in hiring the specialists necessary for the successful conduct of some programs for the disadvantaged. It is my hope that Teacher Corps members, specially trained in education of deprived children, may alleviate this personnel shortage to some degree. Many school districts utilized teacher aides in their programs, thus freeing highly trained teachers for more professional duties. In our report, the committee applauded this use of subprofessionals and urged their increased utilization. In a time of manpower shortage in the education professions, special training for professional staff, use of subprofessional teacher aides, and new recruitment methods are absolutely essential.

Past accomplishments fully justify extension of the title through fiscal year 1969. However, the committee was greatly concerned that budget estimates and appropriations were inadequate to enable the distribution formula to operate equitably. The title I formula authorizes $1,363,962,696 for fiscal year 1967; only $1,053,410,000 was appropriated. For fiscal year 1968, the act provides for a substantial increase in payments to local educational agencies, principally because the low-income factor increases from $2,000 to $3,000 and because half the national average per pupil expenditure will be used in formula computation for those States whose per pupil expenditures are below the national average.

Therefore, if the formula were fully funded for fiscal year 1968, $2,442,337,720 would need to be appropriated; the budget estimate for the fiscal year is $1.2 billion, or about half. If the 1966 amendments were to go into effect in fiscal year 1968, many local school districts would suffer severe cutbacks in funds. Since one of the unique aspects of title I is its local educational agency eligibility for funds, which assures program continuity from year to year, implementation of the amended formula would be self-defeating. For this reason, the committee recommends an amendment which would prevent the use of the $3,000 low-income factor and national average expenditure unless funds are appropriated to fully fund and implement the formula, including those specific changes.

The second part of the law—title II—provides funds for textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials. There can be no doubt that many of our Nation's schools have desperate need for such books. When title II was passed, more than two out of three public elementary schools had no libraries at all, and more than eight out of 10 lacked trained librarians. Public schools spent an average of $2.28 per pupil per year on books, well below the recommended professional standards of $4 to $6.

Title II has gone far to meet these needs. State plans indicate that 49 million students and 1.9 million teachers in public and nonpublic elementary schools now have access to books and materials acquired with Federal assistance.

Since title II is operated on a State plan basis, 5 percent, or a minimum of $50,000, of each State's allotment is available to cover administrative expenses. State educational agencies are making imaginative use of these funds, using them to conduct workshops, to provide consultant services, and to prepare publications for inservice teacher education in selecting and utilizing instructional materials. In addition, 13 States are developing instructional materials centers for demonstration and evaluation, and 19 States have added school library supervisors to their staffs.

Last year the Congress added two new groups of children—Indian children in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior and children in overseas dependent schools operated by the Department of Defense. These provisions received only a 1-year authorization. Therefore, we rec-

ommend that they be extended through fiscal year 1969, consistent with the rest of the act.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides for Supplementary Educational Centers and Services. This title has two purposes: First, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not otherwise available in a district's schools in sufficient quantity and quality; and second, to develop exemplary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Since the title's enactment, in 1965, more than 4,000 proposals have been submitted by 9,000 school districts. The Commissioner of Education, acting upon recommendations of the States and educational experts, approved 1,202 proposals costing $89 million. These programs have reached nearly 10 million public and nonpublic school pupils, 93,000 preschool children, 250,000 out-of-school youth, 255,000 classroom teachers, and 131,000 parents and other adults.

The State educational agencies are to be commended for the outstanding job they have done in reviewing and recommending project approvals. Testimony heard before the committee provided convincing evidence that the Office of Education gives major consideration to their recommendations. Indeed, several States with strong State education agencies have developed comprehensive State plans for title III centers and services, and in these States such plans were given prime consideration in project approval. It is my earnest hope that eventually, partially through the assistance of title V, all State educational agencies will be able to undertake this responsibility.

Only one amendment to title III is proposed. Last year we again amended the title to provide for participation of Indian children in BIA schools and of children in DOD overseas schools. Like the provision in title II, this received only a 1-year authorization. We recommend the provision's extension through fiscal year 1969, consistent with the authorization for the rest of the title.

Title V of the act—designed to strengthen the capabilities of State educational agencies—may eventually prove to be the act's most important title. When the title was passed in 1965, the committee heard repeated testimony concerning the woeful inadequacies of many State departments of education. Years of Federal programs of assistance to elementary and secondary education, with funds made available for staffing at the State level, had thrown the staffing patterns of many State agencies badly out of balance. The States responded eagerly to the challenge of title V—a challenge to assess their own weaknesses and to develop programs to strengthen themselves. During the first year, they attempted to fill 1,800 positions in State departments of education. Unfortunately, the lack of trained personnel which plagues all our education programs again proved the bottleneck; only 1,000 persons were hired, 522 of them professional.

We are proposing an amendment to the formula by which 85 percent of title V funds are presently distributed. The current formula discriminates against smaller and more sparsely populated States, which may be among the neediest, since it is based strictly on public school enrollment. To correct this inequity, the committee recommends a change in the allotment formula: of the funds available for allocation among the States, 40 percent will be allotted equally and the remaining 60 percent will be allotted on the basis of public school enrollment.

The committee is also recommending a new part B to title V, which will allow States to conduct systematic, comprehensive, long-range planning. The States indicated that they wanted to use title V funds to plan educational programs; however, other needs were seen to be more pressing, and the amount of money available was insufficient to plan effectively. Therefore, we have added a new part to title V specifically for such long-range planning. States will be able to use their allocation to set educational goals, establish priorities, and to plan means of achieving goals. Seventy-five percent of the funds under this part would be allocated according to the following formula: 40 percent would be allocated equally among the States and 60 percent would be allocated on the basis of the State's population. The remaining 25 percent would be reserved to the Commissioner of Education for special projects grants and contracts, in most instances of a multi-State or regional nature.

Since a new part has been added to title V, the committee recommends a change in the authorization, making $65 million available for fiscal year 1968 and $80 million for fiscal year 1969. Of the total authorization, 70 percent would be spent for programs designed to strengthen State educational agencies—the present title V—and 30 percent would be available for the new program of comprehensive educational planning.

Title VI of the act—providing special program for the education of handicapped children—was added last year. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] headed, heard testimony from numerous witnesses on the pressing needs for personnel recruitment, training, and program support, and research in the area of education of the handicapped. The Congress added title VI specifically to meet these needs.

It is estimated that 300,000 teachers and other professional personnel specifically trained for work with handicapped children will be needed within the next decade; at present there are only 70,000. Therefore, we propose a nationwide recruitment and information dissemination effort designed to attract people into the profession. An authorization of $1 million is proposed to support such activities during fiscal year 1968.

Another major problem in the area of education of the handicapped is the identification of handicapping conditions. All too many children needlessly fail to learn because of unidentified physical or mental handicaps. Therefore, the committee recommends establishment of regional resource centers, designed to test and evaluate the needs of handicapped children and to develop educational programs to meet these needs, with an authorization of $7.5 million for fiscal year 1968.

One of the most successful existing Federal programs in the area of special education is the captioned films for the deaf program. This program has four major components: research, production of films, dissemination, and training. We propose expansion of this highly successful program for all handicapping conditions, with an additional authorization of $1 million for the expanded program for fiscal year 1968.

The committee has also proposed a change in Public Law 88–164, to allow the Commissioner of Education to contract with private educational or research agencies and organizations. This change would allow the research program to take advantage of the expertise of private as well as public educational and research agencies and organizations.

The committee also recommends that the National Teacher Corps program become a special part of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It would be extended through fiscal year 1969, with authority to enable a teacher-intern who began his practical and academic training during fiscal year 1969 to continue his program for 1 more year. The authorizations for recruitment, enrollment, and training of Teacher Corps members will be contained in separate legislation dealing with the Higher Education Amendments of 1967.

The committee heard repeated testimony emphasizing the great successes the Teacher Corps has enjoyed during the past year. School official after school official bore witness to the efficacy of Teacher Corpsmen employed in his school. Today, 1,213 Teacher Corps members, experienced teachers and teacher-interns, are engaged in service in 275 schools in 111 school systems. They spend part of each week working in a school which has requested their services, and part of the week at a nearby university working toward their master's degrees. The training they receive will make them specialists in the education of disadvantaged children, a new curriculum for many of our Nation's teacher training institutions. Repeatedly, the committee heard evidence from deans of education that they now look to their Teacher Corps programs as a means of testing new concepts of teacher training.

Since members of the Teacher Corps work in elementary and secondary schools across the country, the committee made their legislative authority for such work part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a new part B to title I. In addition, several amendments to the existing Teacher Corps authority were adopted:

Teacher-interns are now paid at the lowest rate for a full-time teacher paid by the school system in which they teach. To assure that no corpsman will receive a financial windfall, the committee proposes that they be paid at such rate, or at the rate of $75 per week plus $15 per dependent, whichever is lower.

State educational agency approval of

the local educational agency's request for Corps members would be required.

Teacher Corps members could be assigned to a migrant group not in a regular school, if the number of children made it feasible and if the children were being taught by a public or other nonprofit agency. This will allow Corps members to serve some of our country's most disadvantaged children, children they were formerly unable to teach because they were not regularly enrolled in a school.

Corps members would be permitted, under a committee amendment, to teach in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Again, these children suffer extreme educational deprivation and could well benefit from the specialized services provided by Teacher Corps members.

We also recommend that the "local control" section be amended to make clear what has always been Teacher Corps practice—that no corpsman may be assigned to a local educational agency unless the agency finds the corpsman acceptable.

To support the portion of Teacher Corps activity which is part B of title I—the making of grants to local educational agencies to enable such agencies to utilize teaching teams in the elementary and secondary school systems—the committee recommends an authorization of $21 million for fiscal year 1968 and $25 million for fiscal year 1969.

In addition, the committee proposes several technical amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874—assistance to federally impacted areas. The definition of "Federal property" used in both laws is amended to make it clear that property taxes paid on any interest in Federal property are also to be deducted from a local educational agency's entitlement. The disaster provisions authorized by Public Law 89-313, providing special relief to school districts experiencing major disasters, would be extended through fiscal year 1972. Relief would also be authorized in cases where construction of public school facilities is made necessary because of the destruction of private school facilities which will not be replaced. Other technical amendments would modify present requirements for eligibility for disaster relief with respect to the amount of local effort required and the minimum damage involved; the amendments would change the level of restoration to the level of education provided during the disaster, thereby taking into account a district's improvement of its educational system. Disaster relief would be extended to technical, vocational, and other special schools operated by public agencies other than local educational agencies; these schools currently are not eligible for assistance if destroyed or damaged by a major disaster.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the progress made under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is only a beginning of efforts to provide quality educational opportunities to all. As President Johnson said in his recent message on health and education, we have quite a job ahead of us—"to solve old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potential of each individual in our land." The programs we discuss today will do much to achieve these goals.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Kentucky has made a very excellent statement in support of the bill. The gentleman raised the issue of whether or not private school children would be able to participate under the Quie amendment. Does the gentleman have any figures at all from the Office of Education to indicate how many dollars have gone and are now going into private and parochial schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as it is presently written?

Mr. PERKINS. No funds are going into private or parochial schools as such. About 12 or 13 percent of the funds are going for special services and special programs that serve the so-called parochial school children, about one-half million of them under title I, alone.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. So 12 to 13 percent of the total funding is going to help private school children; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. It is going to help the children—and not the schools. It is helping the children in special programs whether it be a school breakfast or remedial reading course or whatever it may be—it is to provide something special for the students over and beyond the general programs available in their school system.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine discussion of the committee reported bill and of the valuable provisions in it.

In my judgment, many of the provisions would be endangered by the Quie substitute. I would like to ask the gentleman for clarification with reference to the difference between the two bills with regard to education for Indian children.

I have heard from several quarters, and I think the Secretary of the Interior stated the other day, that the Quie bill neglected to provide for Indian children not in Indian schools.

Mr. PERKINS. Some of the Quie substitutes did not include or take care of the Indian children.

The committee bill takes care of the Indian children in title I, II, and III—and not only in the schools that are operated by the Department of the Interior but in other schools in the community—that is, all the Indians that are counted under the committee bill. That was the result of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am very pleased to hear the gentleman say that and I want to compliment the gentleman from Washington for making this contribution.

I have been concerned about the language in the bill as it appeared to restrict aid for Indian children to those children in Indian schools or to those on reservations.

Mr. PERKINS. That is the trouble with the Quie substitute. The gentleman from Wisconsin evidently was trying to reach out and cover so many things, and omitted some things and then he thought maybe it would be helpful and then he would introduce another substitute. It has been really difficult to keep up with the situation.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I think we ought to clear up this one thing. That is—there was no Quie substitute and there will be no Quie substitute.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, call it the Quie amendment or Quie amendments—it does not matter whether it is a substitute—it is something that serves the same purpose.

Mr. QUIE. I made it clear in the committee that in the bill you provide for assistance to Indian children, children overseas, and you provide for migrant children and handicapped children and that will remain intact.

My amendment does one thing—it puts the general purposes of title I, II, III, and V together under one grant of money—to be administered through one State grant and the money is to be received under one formula. That is what was done and to bring up these side issues is clearly irrelevant.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I recognize the good will of the gentleman from Minnestota [Mr. QUIE] in making the point that his amendment or substitute or whatever name he chooses to call it would do no disservice to migrants, Indians, and the handicapped. But the record is not correct on that as he states it. In the administration bill three new programs for the handicapped are enumerated and authorized in the bill. I will name them. They are: First, regional resource centers for improvement of the education of handicapped children, recruitment of personnel information on education of the handicapped, and additional programs for occupational help for the handicapped.

None of these are spelled out in the gentleman's amendment, and these new steps would be lost. This is typical. The gentleman attempts to amend every time a defect is noted by the committee.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. To clarify the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma raised, I would like to point out that what the gentleman has said is precisely correct. Under the amendments to the bill now before us, the Bureau of Indian Affairs could only put money into schools on

Indian reservations. Under the committee bill those funds would also be available for private and public schools.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am for Federal aid to education. Our States, counties, and communities have spent themselves dry in the attempt to raise their standards of education. Those parents who have chosen to send their children to private schools are faced with tuition costs beyond their ability to pay.

Equality of opportunity through education is a "must" in any democracy.

Why then, one might ask, did 88 Congresses fail to act in providing this aid? Why then did the children of our Nation fail to demand this Federal assistance?

The late Senator Robert A. Taft, realizing the great need in our less affluent States, made an all-out effort to enact such legislation. He failed.

The Congress of that time, supported by the people, turned down the legislation because of their fear of Federal bureaucratic dominance over the programs by which their children would receive their education.

As a firm believer in Federal aid to education, I would hope that it would prevail. I want the people of our Nation to accept it. I believe that they have done so and will continue to do so only as long as they feel that the Congress will provide those safeguards that will prevent some Federal bureaucrat from encroaching on the field that properly belongs to our local school officials.

I believe that the people and the school administrators would have more confidence in this legislation had it originated in this body. The bill before us is the Howe bill. It has been marked "sacrosanct"—not to be touched by unholy congressional hands.

Yes, Commissioner Howe is still with us. They took him out of the kitchen when the heat got too high, but I would remind you that the red-hot stove is still there. Mr. Howe has moved into cooler kitchens, but I do predict that his future guidelines will raise their temperatures, as well.

Commissioner Howe is more of an educational theorist rather than an administrator. His background in this field is decidedly limited.

We have had some sad experiences with these bureaucratic-drawn bills in the past few years. Without exception, they have had well-sounding, vote-getting titles. They, too, came down to us with a "mustn't touch" label.

Those of us who would have amended them so that they might have lived up to the promise of their titles were labeled as "irresponsible"—a pet White House epithet for those who question any administration proclamation.

Many of my good friends of the same political party as the administration had these same doubts about the effectiveness of the legislation that was being steamrollered through the Congress. Against their better judgment, they "went along." They knew that much of this legislation would come back to haunt them—and that it did in the 1966 elections.

The "credibility gap" reached down and engulfed them. They found that the proferred "White House mantle of protection" was but a heavy weight that foundered them.

If those men were able to be with us today, I feel certain that they would agree to the statements that I have made. Unfortunately for them, they were found to be expendable.

I mention these things because the legislation that is before us pursues this same course. The full force of the long familiar administration blast has been directed at Congressman QUIE because he dared to offer those very safeguards that the people thought essential in any Federal act affecting the education of our children.

Vice President HUMPHREY has taken the leadership in this attack. He did not attack the proposed Quie amendments. Instead, he chose to raise a smokescreen of church-state envolvement that simply does not exist.

This is not the first time that the Vice President has locked horns with his fellow Minnesotan. Such a confrontation took place last fall in Minnesota and the Vice President suffered a double defeat.

The Vice President took to national television to make his attack in impugning the motives of Congressman QUIE. Those of us in this body know that ALBERT QUIE is dedicated to the principle of equality of education for all. He would not deny the benefits of Federal aid to any schoolchild.

He played a leading role in developing the national defense student loan program as a part of NDEA. He led the fight to include grants in President Kennedy's proposal for loans for college facilities construction, without which the great progress made by our colleges and universities since 1963 would have been impossible. He played a major part in shaping the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and in centering that act on training for gainful employment. It was his amendment to the Elementary-Secondary Act which, if not suspended by this year's bill, raised the payments per child in every State at least to one-half the national average expenditure per pupil.

Congressman QUIE was a champion of Federal aid for preschool programs for poor children before there was any such program as Headstart. He also helped save the national defense student loans last year.

Congressman QUIE helped steer the administration's program for aid for international education through the Congress in 1966.

These actions were certainly not those of one who did not accept the responsibility of his duty as a Member of Congress. Partisanship had no place in his decisions. I will say that the administration has benefited by the amendments that he has drawn. Certainly none of them have been disavowed by the people.

I would not have mentioned these things if Vice President HUMPHREY had not attempted to make Minnesota political hay by personally ascribing false motivations to the gentleman from Minnesota. [Mr. QUIE].

Just a few days ago, we disavowed, to the best of our ability, two Great Society programs that failed to live up to their promise.

Let us make the legislation before us so sound in principle and so capable of effective administration that it will live on through time. There can be no victory here if one child is deprived of his opportunity to receive a fine education.

The real issue, in the final analysis, which we shall vote on is whether we have confidence in the local school administrators to properly allocate and spend the money to assist in providing better education. If we do not trust them, then we want to turn it over to a large Federal bureaucracy. As for me, I have confidence in my neighbors at home that they will do a job in this field, given the funds.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I should like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentutcky [Mr. PERKINS] who assumed the chairmanship of our committee at a somewhat controversial point in the life of the House and has taken on this new task of great importance in Congress and has worked with diligence, with integrity and with dedication.

The bill which we begin to consider this afternoon is in large measure a product of the gentleman's diligence and dedication.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word of tribute to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], whom I have helped give a lot of free advertising over the past month. The gentleman from Minnesota and I have agreed on some legislative issues, and on other issues we are in disagreement, as on the bill presently before us. As I think the gentleman is aware, my respect for him and my admiration for him are in no way diminished by my disagreement with him or by the fact that we propose to defeat his substitute, his amendment, his bill, or whatever he may wish to call it this week.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third time in as many years that we have debated this legislation on the floor of the House. What we discuss here today is basically an extention of the Federal commitment to improving the quality and the equality of elementary and secondary education which our country offers to its children.

I am sure that most Members are familiar with the major provisions of the existing Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Title I provides a massive program of assistance to school districts which have a high concentration of students from low income families.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] was exactly right in at least one sentence of his remarks; he said—if I quote him correctly:

The issue here is whether we are going to continue to have confidence in our local school administrators.

Title I of ESEA is a perfect example of the vote of confidence which the Congress of the United States has given to local school administrators, because the program works by channeling Federal funds into local public school districts, unlike the proposal which the gentleman from Minnesota seeks to offer, which does not channel the funds to local school districts.

Title II makes $125 million available to States for the provision of textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and nonpublic schools.

Title III provides a stimulus to educators to innovation at supplementary centers which may serve as models for regular school programs.

Title IV, which we do not amend in this bill, presently provides support for research in the field of education and the training of researchers in education.

Title V, a very important part of this bill, authorizes grants to strengthen State departments of education.

Last year, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], a new title VI was added to this impressive list; it provides for expanded programs for the education of handicapped children and creates a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped within the Office of Education.

In past years we have talked about what the Elementary and Secondary Education Act could do for the schoolchildren of America. Now we can talk about what it has done, why it is of importance, and point to many of the achievements under this milestone legislation.

The ESEA has made possible special programs of remediation, health and nutritional services, and specialized instruction, all specifically designed under title I to reach the needs of the educationally disadvantaged. About 8.3 million children enrolled in public and private schools have benefited under these programs.

This bill has given access to books and materials purchased with Federal support to nearly 50 million students and 2 million teachers and has made possible the development of innovative programs which have funded 10 million public and nonpublic school children.

The ESEA has created 1,000 new positions, 522 of them professional, in our State departments of education, thereby helping the States to meet their responsibilities to provide leadership and technical assistance to local schools.

Translated into human terms, these statistics mean that the schoolchildren of this country are today being offered education of a significantly higher caliber than that available to them 2 years ago. Consider several concrete examples of the ESEA at work.

Children in eight counties of West Virginia's "eastern panhandle," a rural area of limited resources, now benefit from the services of a curriculum improvement center which has already studied the potential value of a centralized film library, developed a language arts curriculum guide for grades one to six, conducted an inservice workshop for teachers of remedial reading programs, and planned summer enrichment programs.

Cochise County, Ariz., an area larger than Connecticut and Rhode Island combined, has been able to establish an itinerant psychological service center to counsel and refer "problem students" among the county's school population, which ranges from Mexican immigrants to recently arrived military dependents.

For the poor students of Swifton, Ark., improved educational achievement may depend on the hot breakfast provided by their school or on the dental and optometric services finally available to children who had never received medical treatment.

Sixty fifth, sixth, and seventh graders from Tulare City, Calif., will not while away their summer hours on the streets. Instead, they will visit places in that great State which will help them learn—places such as Sutter's Fort, the State capitol, and the cyclotron at the University of California at Berkeley. Two weeks before their departure on their educational odyssey will be spent in planning, study, and research; after the children return, an additional 2 weeks will be devoted to evaluation, discussion, and study of the trip, thus augmenting their research, study, and language skills.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to some of the amendments which are offered to H.R. 7819. I may say for the most part that they propose no major changes in existing authority, although they do add significantly in some instances.

First, the committee recommends that the various titles of the act be extended through fiscal year 1969. This extension would serve as a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to the school officials of the country that the programs will continue. We are all agreed, I think, that a commitment of this nature is desirable and necessary to give local school administrators sufficient leadtime to plan programs and hire personnel. This proposal has been made in response to the unanimous request of the educators for enough leadtime to plan and prepare in order to use this legislation most effectively.

The committee also recommends, as the chairman noted, extension through fiscal year 1969 of the provisions that allow Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools to participate in programs under titles I, II, and III, as well as recommending an extension of participation by children in Defense Department overseas dependent schools in title II and III programs. This authority is scheduled to expire at the end of this fiscal year.

The authority is scheduled to expire at the end of this fiscal year.

Two new provisions of H.R. 7819 are of special interest and importance. First, part of what is known as the Teacher Corps program—authority to contract with local schools for provision of Teacher Corps teams—becomes part B of title I. The committee took this step because of the close relationship between the Teacher Corps and the purposes of title I of ESEA. Both are dedicated to overcoming the crippling effects of poverty through education. Teacher Corps members, especially trained by university programs in education of the disadvantaged, teach in the same kind of schools—those with a high concentration of youngsters from low-income families—as title I attempts to reach with specialized educational services. To the committee, the close links between the two programs justifies their linkage in legislation.

The second provision is a new part B of the title V assistance to the States, it is for comprehensive educational planning. Although the language of title V makes long-range educational planning technically eligible for Federal support, experience has shown that State departments of education have such pressing personnel needs that they have by and large been unable to develop programs of statewide planning.

But educational planning is absolutely necessary if education is to adopt to the requirements of a rapidly changing world. Therefore, the committee proposes a new part B to title V specifically for such planning. The State educational agency would be designated the planning agency for elementary and secondary education. If a State wished to include higher education in its comprehensive planning program, it could designate a separate, coordinate agency. Funds used under this part would be used, according to a State plan, to enumerate educational goals, arrive at means of achieving such goals, and implement plans. This new part promises to be of prime importance to our State educational agencies and, indeed, to school systems across the Nation.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] will be addressing himself to the title V amendments during the debate.

I might add that members of the committee feel very strongly about the importance of strengthening State educational agencies. I, in particular, feel strongly about this. Back in 1965 when we first wrote this bill and the administration suggested an authorization of $10 million for title V programs, I moved that the figure be raised to $25 million because I felt it so significant and so important to provide greater resources to our State departments of education, and my amendment was adopted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to turn to what seem to me to be some of the threats to this existing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in the past few weeks, well after our committee had concluded its deliberations and had favorably reported H.R. 7819, several substitutes and major modifying amendments were proposed. For the most part, the committee was not given the opportunity to consider the substance of these proposals and in no case was the committee given the benefit of a specific proposal for consideration during the hearings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as we are all aware, Federal aid to our country's elementary and secondary schools was almost as long in coming as it has proved to be necessary. Legislating in this crucial area requires careful consideration and careful study and continuing dia-

log with leading educators throughout the country in an effort to come up with a basic program which will strengthen the quality of education across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the traditional method under our congressional system for the development of such significant and delicate legislation by the Congress is that of presenting alternative proposals, proposals which are studied carefully by the committee under whose jurisdiction the matters come, in open hearings, committee consideration and review, and finally presented for consideration by this House of Representatives. But, Mr. Chairman, this time-honored procedure has not been followed by those who would replace the pioneering 1965 act with a substitute or who would change it radically with major amendments.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should not condone bypassing the entire committee procedure in such a critical legislative area as the education of the Nation's children. I can see no reason why the proposed substitutes and major amendments, if they are as clearly necessary as their proponents claim, could not have been presented to the committee for public questioning, consideration, and discussion.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's educators have time and again testified before our committee on the need for more lead-time and advanced planning on major legislative matters.

Mr. Chairman, for us now to legislate major changes in the present program of Federal aid to our schools, without affording both educators and legislators as well as other interested groups, the opportunity to raise questions and to make clarifying points in connection with the drastic and major changes proposed in the extension of this legislation, would represent a tragic mistake in the consideration of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I am not alone in expressing this concern.

Mr. Chairman, school superintendents, educational associations, religious groups, and others, all have expressed great consternation over the possibility that fundamental changes in the painfully, carefully woven fabric of the present program might be made without their having had an opportunity to understand, publicly, the meaning and the nature of these proposed alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is especially significant, for example, that the highly respected American Council on Education has taken strong exception to the manner in which the opponents of the bill and of the present pending legislation have proceeded.

Mr. Chairman, the ACE is mainly interested in higher education and has no vested interest in the ongoing ESEA nor in a particular form of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools. Yet the ACE has expressed vigorous opposition to the method by which the radical alterations in the present program have been proposed.

Here, Mr. Chairman, for example, is what the president of the ACE, Logan Wilson, said:

> Our concern is both immediate and long-range. We have been and will again be called to testify on legislation directly affecting higher education. If acts as important as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the product of years of effort on the part of dedicated legislators, public officials, and private citizens of both parties—can be subjected to the possibility of undergoing radical change by offering an amendment on the floor of the House after hearings have been concluded, then those who believe in the value of congressional hearings as the way of developing sound legislation can never be confident that the legislation on which they are testifying is the legislation with which they will live. We believe strongly that if members of the congressional committees are considering substitute legislation, that legislation should be introduced prior to the opening of hearings so that witnesses may have an opportunity to testify on the merits and demerits of both the legislation before the committee and any proposed substitute. When our Congress acts, its actions should be informed.

Mr. Chairman, I note also that a few days ago the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, a group which has not always been easy with the approach to aid to schools that is represented by this legislation, said:

> There should be public hearings on such an important measure as this. No one, Congressmen included, has had a chance to ask publicly for the meaning of important phrases found in the proposed substitutes. Objections and questions—

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs continues—

> have had to be stated and asked only over the phone or, for some, in closed-door conferences.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in my view this valid objection applies not only to the proposed substitutes which, as Mr. PERKINS has indicated, have been altered, modified, and reintroduced in a most confusing and haphazard manner amended, rather than in the most appropriate manner, but may also be applied to major amendments which have just been proposed.

Mr. Chairman, there is one last issue to which I wish to address myself, for it goes to the very heart of the carefully conceived and painstakingly woven fabric of accommodation and understanding which permitted the establishment of the program of Federal assistance to the schools in the first place.

The proposed substitutes and alterations of the ESEA once again raise the specter of divisive conflict of church-state problems. And let us not try to say that there is no problem, and I think it is significant to note that practically all major religious groups have professed their greatest concern over the Quie amendment, and the modifications, the alterations, which it proposed, and have urged passage of H.R. 7891.

For, Mr. Chairman, in more than 30 States the substantial involvement of the State educational agencies in the administration of programs under the proposed substitutes and major modifications, would raise the most serious State constitutional questions with regard to aid to church-related schools.

The likelihood under either the substitute or major amendments is that some States would be able to participate in this major program of Federal assistance to the schools and others would not. Such an inequitable result not only jeopardizes the delicate balance of support for Federal aid to the schools, but it would mean that children in some States—those with flexible constitutional provisions—would have a chance for a better education plan than their young friends in other States.

Mr. Chairman, let me insert at this point in the RECORD a telegram signed by spokesmen for three major religious faiths, and I here note that the signatory is Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower. Mr. Flemming is president of the National Council of Churches:

> Elementary and Secondary Education Act should not be abandoned before it has had time to prove its great promise for undergirding American education.
>
> We oppose any amendments which would dilute Federal responsibility for desegregation, diminish benefits to educationally deprived children or reintroduce the church-state controversy.
>
> ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
> *President, National Council of Churches.*
> Msgr. JAMES DONAHUE,
> *Director, Department of Education, U.S. Catholic Conference.*
> Rabbi SEYMOUR J. COHEN,
> *President, Synagogue Council of America.*

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded.

Mr. Chairman, such an unequal opportunity to participate in the benefits of Federal aid is unwise, unsound, and unfair.

I believe it significant to note that practically all major religious groups—among them the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Citizens for Educational Freedom, the Board of Christian Education of the Evangelical Brethren Church, the Department of Christian Education of the Episcopal Church, the Division of Parish Education of the United Presbyterian Church, and the Division of Christian Education of the United Church of Christ, oppose alteration of the ESEA and they support its extension by the passage of the bill H.R. 7819.

Learned legal counsel for many of these groups, with years of experience in the field of church-state relations, have considered the alleged safeguards for the participation by children in parochial schools in the prepared amendments and have found the so-called safeguards insufficient to assure that all children will benefit from Federal aid to schools.

Mr. Chairman, a document prepared by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs summarizes many of the concerns that church groups have and helps explain the opposition of the Quie measure on the part of so many religious groups. I here quote relevant excerpts from the conclusions set forth in this report:

> SOME CONCLUSIONS TO DATE
>
> First, a general aid bill which would simply grant money to states for whatever use they see fit is today as in the past politically impossible.
>
> Second, the hope of Representative Quie "to achieve the advantages of general aid through block grants for a broad range of

educational programs" is not very well realized by the present substitute bill. Fifty per cent of its funds are required to go into one category. Seven per cent of its funds go into another. And beyond that the state must give priority to programs designed for the educationally and culturally deprived, for areas experiencing rapid growth, and for areas limited by economic depression and geographic isolation.

True, the Quie bill lists more categories and broader categories than ESEA, but in adding the requirements just listed, it takes back a large part of the freedom it originally proposed.

Third, the Quie bill is designed to shift some control of the operation of federal education programs from Washington to the states. We think that this is a desirable shift if done within broad national policy, but we are not sure it can be done without causing major problems in matters of church-state relations. In requiring that federal funds not be commingled with state funds, the supporters of the substitute bill hope that state constitutions which forbid state support of private education can be leapfrogged. There is much learned legal opinion to the contrary. In many states the attorney general could rule against it. Quie's effort to handle this possibility by letting the federal government operate those educational resource programs which the states cannot operate, applies to only a part of the bill, and this effort gives back to the federal government some of the control that Quie's supporters object to in ESEA. We note that there may be no plan that can escape these dilemmas successfully.

We believe that if most of the states cannot benefit pupils in private schools under the Quie bill as much as is presently the case under ESEA, private school supporters will move to amend or destroy it. This will open all the issues again.

Fourth, we think that at the point of church-state issues raised by federal aid, the Quie bill is not an improvement over ESEA. Beyond the above-mentioned uncertainty regarding commingling, we note that in the new proposal the aids which are designed to go to pupils in private schools are more loosely defined than in ESEA.

Fifth, we feel that we must make a procedural objection to those responsible for this and any other substitute bill that is likely to appear now. *There should be public Hearings on such an important measure as this.* This procedural matter relates to substance. No one, Congressmen included, has had a chance to ask public for the meaning of such phrases as those found in sub-section 8. Objections and questions have had to be stated and asked only over the phone or, for some, in closed-door conferences. Our reaction is the same as the reaction of Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education.

"Our concern is both immediate and long-range. We have been and will again be called to testify on legislation directly affecting higher education. If acts as important as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the product of years of effort on the part of dedicated legislators, public officials, and private citizens of both parties—can be subjected to the possibility of undergoing radical change by offering an amendment on the floor of the House after hearings have been concluded, then those who believe in the value of Congressional hearings as the way of developing sound legislation can never be confident that the legislation on which they are testifying is the legislation with which they will live. We believe strongly that if members of the Congressional committees are considering substitute legislation, that legislation should be introduced prior to the opening of hearings so that witnesses may have an opportunity to testify on the merits and demerits of both the legislation before the committee and any proposed substitute. When our Congress acts, its actions should be informed." (*Higher Education and National Affairs*, May 6, 1967, p. 3)

And the need for Hearings goes beyond the need for information. On the kind of bill that necessarily uses broad terms, Hearings clarify the meaning of those terms. The Report of the Hearings gives substantial aid to the courts and administrators as they try to understand the meaning of the measure they must interpret and administer. Without Hearings the only record is that of floor debate. In the House, this must be very brief.

While we share the minority's conviction that federal authority in education should be minimized, and while we realize that the political art is the art of the possible, we feel that the values aimed at by the supporters of the substitute are not certainly and clearly achieved and the problems it creates are potentially substantial. We cannot conclude that it helps promote the education of the American youth in ways which, on balance, are advantageous when compared to what is done under ESEA.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important to note, in connection with the very significant remarks the gentleman is making, that there is mischief in this bill, or in the amendments, or in the series of amendments as proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota, in the way in which the gentleman says the interests of the nonpublic school child will be protected.

The gentleman indicates that if there is a State barrier—if there is a State barrier to providing direct aid to the parochial schools to carry out the program in general aid—then by reason of the gentleman's device in his proposed measure the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make this program available.

Mr. Chairman, here we would have a three-way contest. The nonpublic schools would be required to go to the Commissioner, if they felt they could best serve their interest there, or if they could best be served by law, then through the Attorney General or the State legislature. Then it would be the Commissioner of Education who would be the one to give leave to go ahead, and this to me would set up a holy war. It would set up a holy war between the opposing factions in this matter that would make the current difficulty in the Suez Canal look like an old school picnic. And when it comes to a holy war, Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be a terrible thing because it will set forces to play again when for the last year we have had nothing but a wholesome intercourse of discussion between the religious and educational groups. And if we inject this kind of vandalism into our politics, we will set this war on fire again.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

I want to observe that in the 2 weeks of hearings or more that we had on this legislation, I think it is fair to say that not once was any serious question raised with respect to the church-state accommodation.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to compliment the distinguished author of this bill, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] who has worked untiringly and diligently and has rendered a great service to the whole country in his efforts to bring before this body a bill that everybody, in my judgment, should support.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the distinguished chairman.

I am quite aware that my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day a document that he had had prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

But there is a sentence in that document that is quite revealing and it says this:

> At this time, the answer to the fundamental church-state question put by the critics of the (substitute) proposal, can only take the form of speculation.

My colleagues of the House, I do not believe it is wise or sound to legislate in an area where there are such delicate feelings, in an area which has on the record proved susceptible to working out accommodations clear across a country with nearly 200 million people, in an area where we have had support from both Republicans and Democrats—I do not see that it is wise or sound—or conservative—I may say, to tear up that kind of fabric and try to put in its place something that has already proved to be as divisive as the substitute proposals of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

I know that many of us on our side of the aisle are described as liberals. I have never been quite sure what the difference between "liberal" and "conservative" is.

But in one respect I know I am very conservative—and I think my colleague from Minnesota would agree to this—and that is that when something is working, I believe that you do not tear it apart; you do not explode it. For if you follow such a cause, you know not what you do.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that this House will give very careful consideration as we move ahead in this debate, which I hope will be a thoughtful debate and which I hope will not be acrimonious and which I hope will be conducted with respect on both sides. Then I hope that this House in its wisdom will give renewed strength to the structure of Federal assistance to our schools that we erected just 2 years ago and for which we fought for many years and with the support of Members on both sides.

Then I hope also that this House will in its wisdom oppose those substitutes and those amendments which may bring that painfully erected structure crashing down and halt the flow of Federal funds to the local schools in our country for who knows how many years to come.

Mr. Chairman, this is a landmark bill that we are considering this week in the House of Representatives. I hope very much that we shall have in mind as we consider it not so much the interest of a particular party—not so much the interest of a school district—not so much

the interest of any church group or the interest of a State agency or local agency or of the Office of Education. But let us keep our minds on the target—for what we are talking about is the education of the young people of our country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it has been quite interesting to listen to the debate so far, and I find particularly interesting the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]. When you read his comments tomorrow, you will find also that he chose his words well, causing us to gain impressions about my amendment which are not accurate. For instance, he mentioned "general aid." Now you know my amendment is not any more "general aid" than the present law despite all the misinformation passed out by the administration and the other side of the aisle. My amendment would put titles I, II, III, and V together in one grant.

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

Mr. QUIE. I do not recall that the gentleman from Indiana yielded to me, though my name was used a great deal. But I believe it is ridiculous not to yield to another Member for debate, so I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have great respect for him, and I am almost too timid to ask him to yield, knowing the effectiveness he has in argument. But let me suggest to you that I am referring to the promises and proposals that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota made and that were reinforced and that were reendorsed by the minority leader on the other side when the question arose as to how the interest of children in nonpublic schools would be served.

I have in my possession documents and letters in which assurances were given to such groups as the Citizens for Educational Freedom that not only would the children in nonpublic schools be given the same kind of aid that they were accustomed to receive under the administration proposal, but that the program would be expanded to include special programs for educationally deprived children.

These are not my constructions. These are assurances that were given when I asked how this was to be done. It was then indicated that if by reason of constitutional limitations States could not make these programs available, then the Commissioner of Education in a State would make the programs available to nonpublic schools. So the promises were given. Assurances were given. These are not my promises or assurances. When you add them, and since the bill now calls for only special programs, when you add up the assurances and the blandishments, I might say, given by the gentleman from Minnesota, the list must add up to general aid. I do not think that historically the gentleman has been against general aid.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further if you cannot bring yourself to the point, for we have limited time.

Mr. CAREY. I am saying this. If you will spell out for the Committee of the Whole today the same kind of assurances that you have given to groups who have given to groups who have been contending for the same aid in nonpublic schools, and you spell those out carefully and precisely, you might find the gentleman from New York sitting beside you and joining you in the debate to give this new general aid to nonpublic schools. I want to see it in writing and in the RECORD as I have seen the private assurances that you have given to groups around the country.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from New York is a clever debater. To the previous speaker he attempted to give the impression that my amendment would eliminate the possibility of private schools benefiting from the bill. Now he says he fears that this is general aid, and private school people will get so much money that perhaps the public school people ought to be fearful of the amendment. We have been engaged in this tactic for about a month.

As I have been listening to Members on the other side talk about my amendment, I have felt that we should look at my amendment and see what it really does. My amendment is not general aid. It puts together four titles in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It provides as the present law does that if textbooks, library resources, and printed instructional material cannot be made available to the private schools by the public schools in any State, then there can be a bypass. This bypass is in my amendment. It is exactly identical to the present act. There is no bypass for services because there is no bypass for services in the present act. I use the same principle in the present Act for educational services for the private school children. They will be able to benefit. The amendment would require the local school system and the State to provide that private school children participate in all education programs.

Anyone who will read my amendment—take the last version of it, if you will, but what I say is the same in all of them—you will see that that same principle is involved in my amendment as is embodied in the present act, but it is different to the extent that the principle is expanded to its fullest.

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

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will allow me to take a little time to explain the amendment, as he took a long time to explain his point of view on my time, I will then be glad to yield a little bit later. It extends the opportunity for private school children to the fullest extent under the principles already adopted in the Elementary and Secondary School Act, that is, it is not limited to textbooks and library resources, but it also extends to laboratory, audiovisual, and other instructional equipment.

It also provides that in any program—not just programs for the educationally deprived, but any program—which would be funded under my amendment, which would mean the combination of four titles of ESEA, that private school children would be able to benefit from the program. That is exactly what my amendment does.

I might add also that I placed the changes in the RECORD so that people might know the process of change. There has also been change in the existing act. The administration sent it up in 1965; the committee changed it. There were substantive amendments made on the floor. Then there was an extension in 1966. We had some more changes proposed by the administration last year. There were the changes made in the committee. Some more changes were made on the floor of the House. Then this year the administration sent up amendments for 1968. We changed them in the committee, and I have a feeling that there are going to be a few other changes made here on the floor. So my changes and amendments are not unique and peculiar.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will agree that a great deal of the confusion that has been generated about his meaning and intent, about what is proper and righteous legislation, has been created by the successive series of amendments which he has printed in the RECORD and which we have had to study to see what each development meant. Now, I ask a question: Have we read the last Quie amendment, or is there something new and different coming tomorrow?

Mr. QUIE. Tomorrow I will be offering an amendment as it fits into the bill. Heretofore I have been showing exactly what it would do to combine titles I, II, III and V. Tomorrow, of course, it will be in the form of the amendment as it is being offered. It will have been one of the most discussed amendments ever to have been offered on this floor. In April I put it in the form of a bill in order that it could be printed and the Members and others could be able to look at it. But when I offer it, it will be for the same purposes as have already been seen.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. I welcome the additional item which the gentleman says will be proffered to non-public-school children specifically, that will allow or authorize the laboratory equipment and such supplies and audiovisual equipment which will be placed in the other than public schools.

I am sure the gentleman is aware that the carefully constructed compromise, which we worked out in 1965 in the committee and on the floor of the House and in conference, will be most precisely spelled out as to exactly how the materials and equipment and textbooks and audiovisual equipment, and so forth, will be placed on loan in non-public-school premises. No such qualifications

have been placed in this. Therefore, I must look at this as something of a Trojan horse. It is well to give them something in the bill which they cannot obtain under State law. This is where I expect the controversy in the States. It is one thing to own a textbook for a given course. It is one thing to put audio-visual items in for the tenure of that time. But it is quite another thing to move in the more sophisticated and highly technical laboratory equipment, which has to be installed in place, with materials therefor, and additional audio-visual equipment without precise guidelines as to how this equipment is going to be used.

I suggest that since the States cannot draw these guidelines, we are placing in the hands of the Commissioner of Education new and additional responsibility for spelling out those guidelines. These will not obtain in the public schools. We all have been saying we should restrict the Commissioner, but we are going to make him, in a sense, the "Vicar General" of the nonpublic schools, who will decide exactly what they should get, whether the State wants them to receive it or not.

This is where I see the beginning of the "holy war" starting all over. I want equal treatment for the children in nonpublic schools, where they need special materials, equipment, and programs, just as they are receiving them in the public schools. What the gentleman is doing is setting up something not tried in hearings, not tried in public debate, not discussed by the religious and educational groups. This is the pig-in-the-poke that is going to set off the worst hue and cry as to what we are going to get in this new bonanza, which the gentleman originates in his bill, but which may turn out to be a hot nugget when it gets down to the school district.

Mr. QUIE. I recall those same arguments in 1965, that were raised by some individuals in this body about the great "holy war" this was going to start, and instead of having the "war" debated in the Congress on the Federal level it would all occur on the local level. It seems as though the gentleman from New York must have picked up the arguments used at that time as an argument against providing laboratory and other instructional equipment to private schools on a loan basis. It is interesting that they did not turn out to be true, and I cannot see any distinction between a microscope loaned for a private school laboratory and a set of encyclopedias loaned for a private school library under the existing act.

At the local level, when educators in the public and private schools began to sit down to talk together they found out that they did not have, on either side, horns, and they learned how to work together.

That was not true in all communities, but in the communities that have made great progress.

I have no doubt that the same kind of cooperation can develop on the State level, when it is a requirement of each State to develop a State plan which will include the same safeguards for private-school children which the present law carries for the Elementary and Secondary School Act, and that would be a real advantage growing out of my amendment.

I do not want to change those same principles which have been tried. I want to continue and extend them.

I believe we have made a significant breakthrough as to the constitutional prohibition which once prohibited us from providing assistance to private-school children. Therefore, I do not want to have those changed.

Let us look at my amendment and the reason why it is now before us.

Earlier this year I realized that we would be moving to the new years of the Elementary and Secondary School Act and its administration, and eventually the administration would send up legislation for extension to 1969 and beyond.

Earlier this year I began drafting a proposal, H.R. 7477, which put together a number of the categorical elementary and secondary school aid programs which the Federal Government is assisting in, into one block grant. It included not only ESEA but NDEA as well.

I introduced it in the expectation that when hearings were held by the committee on the extension to 1969 and beyond educators would be able to see what my bill was and would be able to study it and make comments on it when the hearings were held. However, we were prevented from having such hearings because on the last day in the markup of the bill the committee decided to extend the act into 1969 as a part of this bill. This precluded any hearings from being held on that question.

I informed my colleagues that the only alternative I had then was to offer an amendment for 1969 which would put together titles I, II, III and V, into one block grant, one State plan, and one formula. This is what we have before us today.

I would have preferred to wait with the extension for 1969, in order that we might hold hearings on it. That was not done. Instead, we have here my only alternative, which is to argue it out here on the floor.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman will admit that there is nothing in the committee hearing record concerning the so-called Quie amendments, that no testimony has been directed to the Quie amendments as such. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. QUIE. There were recommendations in the committee by educators that we extend to 1969, and also the record is replete with answers to questions which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and I asked about moving to block grants and moving this direction, with substantial support for that from the witnesses, as well as for the extension to 1969.

Mr. PERKINS. But the gentleman has admitted that we discussed general aid hearings and it was agreed that we would conduct such hearings later this year, but after I suggested or some Member of the committee suggested that we extend the bill until fiscal year 1969 then it was, on March 20, after the hearings had ceased, that the gentleman decided he would offer his amendment. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. QUIE. The correct statement is that the bill was introduced on March 20. I wanted to have the benefit of all the hearings before I introduced my substitute. That is why the date came at that time. I expected March 20 would be at least 2 months before hearings would be held on the extension of ESEA to 1969 and beyond.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. If the committee had withheld the extension until 1969, we would have known one thing, that there would have to be hearings held this year, because there is a feeling that we ought to extend a year in advance. However, by extending this to 1969, as the committee bill proposes, if it were to be enacted, then there would have been no pressure on the committee to hold hearings this year.

If we go into next year, you can imagine, in an election year, the possibility of Congress adopting something new, controversial, and different. If we put it off until next year, as the chairman recognizes—and this is in the area of reality and possibility—it would be early 1969 before there would be an extension, which would be a straight extension for another year, because we could not bring in something new without giving the schools a full year of leadtime. My amendment gives the schools 1 year of leadtime to develop State plans.

The first time that we could ever look toward the possibility of unifying some of these programs into one grant would be 1971. So now is the time that we have to move, or it will be put off until 1971, and I say that in the interests of education we cannot wait that long.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUIE. I yield for one short comment, and then I want to yield to my colleagues on my side of the aisle.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman will agree that the testimony indicated we should extend the bill to fiscal year 1969 and that the extension was reasonable in order to give the local school districts timely authorizations and give the Appropriations Committee lead time so that the school districts could get along with their business. Now here you come in with a continuing program and an open-end authorization after fiscal year 1969 with $3 billion for fiscal year 1969 without any hearings at all. Do you not think it would have been much better for us after we extended the present bill to fiscal year 1969 to have worked out some other bridge that we could cross toward a general grant approach?

Mr. QUIE. I tell the chairman that if the Republican amendment extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to 1969 and beyond with block grants is enacted, there would be such strong pressure from your side of the aisle to hold hearings that I am confi-

dent hearings would be held. If my amendment is knocked down here, we will not see any hearings this year. However, if it is adopted, I know one thing for certain, and that is we will have consideration.

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

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I hesitate to ask these questions at this time because the gentleman from Minnesota has had so very little time for debating his proposal because he has been yielding to others.

The chairman makes a point that no hearings were held on your amendment that would change the course of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota is it not likewise just as true that no hearings were held on the extension of the authorization for fiscal year 1969, which is a matter completely in the control of the chairman, and no hearings whatsoever were held on that extension.

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. ERLENBORN. And it was because of that you were unable to have hearings on the authorization for 1969?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. This point about no hearings is getting to the stage of being a little ridiculous. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there have been no hearings on H.R. 7819, the Brademas bill, as it comes to the floor. We enacted a number of amendments as the bill came to the committee, and the bill in final form, as changed by our committee, has not had hearings under the normal procedure; and we had full hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We probed expert witnesses and asked for suggestions on how this act should be changed. As a result of those suggestions and our own experience, we got together in the committee and enacted a number of amendments to the administration's proposal. We have not had hearings on those amendments any more than we have had hearings on the amendments the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] put together in a very simple, straightforward way to combine four titles of the present act.

It is a little ridiculous to keep saying that we have not had hearings. We enacted the manpower retraining program in 1962 as a complete substitute on this floor. You, the gentleman from Kentucky, were active in completely rewriting the Vocational Education Act, and we never held hearings on that bill as it came out of the committee, because, as the gentleman knows, on a bipartisan basis we completely rewrote the administration's proposal on which we held hearings. Let us face the fact that we have the right and the prerogative and the obligation in this House to enact amendments in Committee on the floor based upon general hearings on the subject matter.

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

Mr. QUIE. I would like to add one other comment to the statement made by the gentleman from New York.

Then I read Dr. Logan Chilson's letter from the American Council on Education condemning the tactics used in my amendment. This is the same as I used on a bill they were especially pleased about.

You recall the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act when it was first introduced. There were hearings held on the bill and I offered an amendment to completely change it, and it did not prevail in subcommittee.

In the full committee, however, a majority sided with me and we did substantially change the bill and my substitute was adopted. At that time we put in grants to all institutions of higher learning, public and private. There were never any hearings held on that before it was brought to the floor. We do this as usual practice.

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

Mr. QUIE. Yes, I yield once more to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the full committee, and then I had better get on to the balance of my statement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] that all the hearings that were conducted this year, were conducted on a bill identical, except with a few amendments that were adopted to the Brademas bill.

Mr. GOODELL. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky that that is not true. Already amendments have been adopted in committee to change administration proposals for title V of the act and the Teacher Corps. Also a number of other amendments were adopted. H.R. 7819 itself is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky that my amendments are pretty much proposals that have been made before. As the gentleman from Kentucky knows, I have offered in previous years amendments designed to change title III to a State plan and that was never referred to as being "radical," and I proposed changes to title I to provide for a State plan for that title. This is exactly the same thing I am recommending here, that State plans be inaugurated for titles I and III. We presently have a State plan for title II, and already most of the money goes to the State in title V. But, instead of requiring four State plans, I propose that those four titles be administered by a single State plan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a noncontroversial question?

Mr. QUIE. There is nothing new about this; the State plan is used in the NDEA and in title II of the ESEA as well as in a number of other areas such as vocational education, that provide such assistance. The formula is not new. It has been in use for 9 years in the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. Chairman, one can look at the vocational education programs and observe the same type of formula in operation. So, this is nothing new or unique in any way.

On the other hand, our committee inserted the inequitable AFDC formula in title I of this act in 1965 against administration advice without ever having held a hearing on it.

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

Mr. QUIE. Yes; I yield once more to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, under the impacted area program at the present time we count the children and one knows the amount of funds that will go into every school district throughout the country under the ESEA, based upon census data, data which is devised to direct Federal funds to certain localities where the problems of poverty and deprivation are concentrated. In other words, we know the amount of funds that go into every county in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under this so-called grant block approach, can the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] tell this Committee what funds will go into any school district in this Nation under the so-called grant block approach? Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Kentucky has brought up that question. It is my opinion that this is a very significant point about which the gentleman has inquired.

However, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the State of New York now which has 405,584 eligible students, according to this report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, concerning the administration of title I ESEA programs, which committee print was published in May of 1967. So, Mr. Chairman, one can see that this is very recent information. The State of New York actually had eligible——

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota misunderstood me.

Mr. QUIE. No; I will say to the gentleman that I have the time and I will get around to answering the gentleman's question.

Mr. PERKINS. I am not talking about the States or——

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, regular order.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] refuses to yield. The chairman of the committee should respect the gentleman's refusal to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I respect the gentleman's refusal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota refuses to yield.

The gentleman from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the gentleman's question, but I want to show how unfair the present formula is. The State of New York with 405,584 eligible pupils receives $111,091,000. Each school district of each State receives its entitlement and, of course, that is true.

But the formula is not equitable. But, for instance, Mr. Chairman, let us take four Southern States, Georgia, South

Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama. States which have over twice as many eligible students—952,097—and they receive only $109 million, while the State of New York receives $111 million for 405,584 students. In other words, those four Southern States receive only $109 million, States with more than twice as many eligible students. The 174,840 of New York's 405,584 pupils were from families with incomes over $2,000 on AFDC. No children were counted from families with income over $2,000 in the four Southern States.

Well, Mr. Chairman, some certain people say that it costs less to educate an educationally deprived child in the South than it does in the North. This may be true but I doubt it takes twice as much in the North.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, let us look at two non-Southern States, Pennsylvania and Ohio, States in which training educationally deprived children must be as expensive as New York.

But those two States together have 449,647 pupils, as compared to the 405,584 in New York. They receive only $80,897,000, while New York, as I stated before, receives $111 million.

Why is it that these two States are short-suited?

Take three neighboring States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Connecticut together, the total they received is only $77 million, and they have 403,524 pupils who are eligible as compared to $111 million for 405,000 in New York.

So you see that the present formula is inequitable across the entire Nation. And within each State the school districts receive an entitlement for programs to train educationally deprived children, based on the number of poor children who lived there in 1959 plus those on AFDC. And that same formula will be used until 1972 when the 1970 census is available—thus becoming more obsolete every year. And I might add in 1972 if that formula went into effect it would still be 3 years behind the times. That is the formula we are operating under. There is no way the State can zero in on the areas of greatest need despite the fact that the legislation says it is to concentrate on the areas where there is a large concentration of educationally deprived children. They cannot possibly do it under the entitlement of the present law which distributes it to 94 percent of the school districts of the country.

What would my amendment do? It would give the responsibility to the State to determine which elementary and secondary schools have students who are educationally and economically deprived, and also so that if there is a big influx of students without financial resources they can take care of them, and where there is economic deprivation in the area. So that the State can use this money to zero in on those areas and provide assistance. We know in the rural parts of the United States these people exist, and we know in the center core areas of our cities that these people exist, and it would give the State the responsibility to develop the State's own plan to meet the need. They are the only ones who have the sensitivity to understand it, not the Federal Government, not the United States Commissioner of Education—no matter how brilliant he is. He does not understand the situation of all of the counties in every State in the United States. It is impossible for him to know their educational needs. Only the States can understand that and plan to meet these needs within the State.

That is why we need a State plan. We cannot be spreading this money all over the country unless through the States because they know the situation and can actually meet the situation in the areas of their State which have the greatest need.

I know some areas that had a drought in 1959. They have had some good years since then, and now they are receiving a great deal more money than other areas because at that time—1959—they happened to have low incomes.

We need to make certain that the schools which are educating the poor and the educationally deprived children receive the money. We have done this in other programs. The Hill-Burton program does it in the hospitals now. The State Public Health Department determines which areas are in greatest need for the construction of hospitals. We have done this in a number of situations, and other Federal programs.

I would say if we give the States this responsibility they will meet this responsibility, they will rise to it. It is just like raising a child. If the child is unable to assume responsibility do we wait until the child is 21 before we give him any responsibility? No, we give him some responsibility and we work with him. That is what my plan does, plus the fact that the Commissioner of Education must approve the State plan. He works with the States, and the States which have the most difficulty in meeting their responsibilities, will be the ones that he will have to work with more closely. In other States the Commissioner will have an easy job, because they are prepared to handle a State plan right now. The State of Minnesota, I know, would have no difficulty in administering my amendment.

I might say the same thing is true as to the State of New York. But some of these States need more help, and that is really what my program would provide. And that is the question which you will have to decide in your own minds tomorrow—do you want the United States Commissioner of Education to take more and more responsibility in determining educational decisions that heretofore have been the responsibility of the States and local communities, or do you want to make certain that the State Departments of Education play their role as a partner in providing Federal assistance, and in determining the priorities and needs of the communities in their own State?

I believe that when you reach that conclusion you will want to vote to give the States the added responsibility that my amendment gives to them, because that is the only way you will have a strong educational system, in which diversification can prevail in meeting more equitably the needs of the children in Mississippi, the needs of the children in New York, the needs of the children in Minnesota, in California, and in Washington.

In answer to the gentleman from Kentucky's question. Each school district will have to make its needs known to the State which will have to set priorities in its State plan, which in turn must be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education as meeting Federal statutes and guidelines, in order to show further the inequity of the present law.

Let us turn to a county-by-county comparison of inequities. The city of Alexandria, Va., has 1,181 eligible pupils and receives $155,740. In the neighboring State of Maryland, in Garrett County, the totals are 1,118 pupils and the amount received was $195,369.

Here is a comparison of two counties in New Jersey and New York. Essex County, N.J., received $5,858,000 for 27,868 pupils, while Queens County, N.Y., with about the same number of pupils—27,149—received a good deal more, $7,436,000.

Here is another comparison between counties in New York and Pennsylvania, which further highlights the inequities. Philadelphia County, Pa., with 64,796 pupils, received $11,848,000, while Bronx County, N.Y., with about a third less pupils—48,777—received more, $13,360,000.

The sixth richest county in the Nation, Westchester, in New York, with 10,387 pupils, received $2,845,000. This was considerably more than New Haven County, Conn., with about the same number of pupils—10,671—which received only $2,143,000.

Monroe County in New York and Summit County in Ohio have about the same number of pupils—8,500. Yet the New York county received $2,341,000, while the Ohio county received only $1,498,000.

The inequities in the present law are so glaring, that when the various States realize the result, I am confident the system will be changed. I have long pointed this out. Most unfortunately, the U.S. Office of Education has done nothing to correct the inequities.

I now submit a State-by-State breakdown of what the States received under title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for fiscal 1967. The source is the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate, published in May of 1967:

State	Ratably reduced amount	Maximum amount authorized	Eligible total pupils
Alabama	$30,462,526	$35,789,118	244,311
Alaska	1,805,503	2,591,398	6,974
Arizona	8,422,776	11,260,936	46,633
Arkansas	20,375,839	21,041,914	149,658
California	71,558,472	102,727,688	396,632
Colorado	7,798,580	11,196,941	45,989
Connecticut	7,907,261	11,350,137	39,361
Delaware	1,884,356	2,705,303	10,082
District of Columbia	5,397,367	6,471,554	22,896
Florida	26,445,029	30,921,571	145,719
Georgia	34,437,083	39,804,797	243,261
Hawaii	2,168,762	2,671,922	12,460
Idaho	2,475,984	2,655,834	14,902
Illinois	46,230,999	66,355,954	254,140
Indiana	14,580,136	20,927,985	88,233
Iowa	15,153,804	19,863,965	85,169

State	Ratably reduced amount	Maximum amount authorized	Eligible total pupils
Kansas	$9,608,706	$11,969,717	49,671
Kentucky	27,150,913	31,461,905	196,465
Louisiana	28,669,931	41,151,207	205,962
Maine	3,403,277	4,225,994	22,456
Maryland	14,197,635	20,378,934	81,246
Massachusetts	14,067,878	20,192,090	77,492
Michigan	30,670,217	41,660,405	167,661
Minnesota	18,867,365	27,080,682	102,145
Mississippi	23,139,525	33,213,249	256,196
Missouri	23,086,158	32,189,185	144,612
Montana	2,993,356	4,180,153	16,978
Nebraska	5,294,692	7,600,284	37,346
Nevada	879,759	1,262,994	4,688
New Hampshire	1,267,759	1,819,628	8,385
New Jersey	22,865,209	32,822,617	108,767
New Mexico	9,629,504	10,795,304	45,737
New York	111,091,007	159,451,293	405,584
North Carolina	45,081,410	53,571,153	334,527
North Dakota	3,891,214	5,586,954	26,325
Ohio	34,197,997	43,354,880	194,251
Oklahoma	16,819,413	19,142,232	101,346
Oregon	6,982,937	9,310,228	33,832
Pennsylvania	46,699,583	63,974,144	255,396
Rhode Island	3,481,096	4,996,630	18,883
South Carolina	21,052,884	29,645,216	208,329
South Dakota	5,330,191	7,650,330	34,890
Tennessee	29,251,987	33,497,360	222,959
Texas	65,260,201	79,767,795	403,275
Utah	2,724,300	3,275,286	15,395
Vermont	1,484,141	2,073,898	8,945
Virginia	23,658,931	33,958,535	179,409
Washington	9,840,169	12,462,401	49,358
West Virginia	14,658,391	17,568,907	109,083
Wisconsin	14,357,585	20,609,442	78,593
Wyoming	1,235,793	1,775,052	6,585
United States	989,935,591	1,312,013,124	6,019,192

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman agrees that his amendment requires the highest priority for concentrating the funds for needy children for 100 percent of the money, for all the money that is covered under the Quie amendment.

There has been a lot of talk about 50 percent. You have required at least 50 percent, under the old title I type of formula to help poor children, but the three priorities that the gentleman in the well has just mentioned, apply to all the money covered in the Quie amendment; namely, that it be concentrated in areas of culturally and economically deprived children and where there has been an immigration, putting a special burden on the school officials and the tax sources there in the rural deprived areas; is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. Every bit of the money will go according to the requirement that priority will be given to the neediest districts. Under the present act there is a scattering of these funds among over 90 percent of the Nation's school districts, including the very wealthiest with beautiful schools, well-financed programs and very few deprived children.

Mr. GOODELL. Titles II and III in the present ESEA do not have any need formula; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. Your amendment would place priority on giving aid to the needy children throughout the whole act, with the highest priority for help for the children in the areas of high concentrations of economic and educational deprivation.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Let me just finish this one part of my statement before yielding to the gentleman from Michigan.

The question has been brought up of the alleged church-state issue. But the same principles of treatment for private school children exists in my amendment as in the present act, only the amendment gives them added protection. As far as some States getting less money, my amendment provides that no State is to receive less in 1969 than it did in 1968 under this act. None of the special groups, the Indian children or migratory children or the overseas children or the handicapped children will be cut out of the act by my amendment. They will be treated exactly the same in my amendment as in the present act.

Some have said that my amendment will weaken the civil rights provisions. Some say it will strengthen it. But enforcement of civil rights is under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and my amendment does not change that in any way. Since State plans are a major part of almost all Federal legislation affecting elementary and secondary schools, the State plan approach of my amendment presents no new or different problem in terms of civil rights enforcement.

The charge that it will delay funds is not true because it provides an entire year in which the States can prepare and be made ready for this program.

I believe that as you read my amendment through clearly, you will come to the conclusion that this is a wise and important step which we should take now for the betterment of the education of our young people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, here is my amendment exactly as it will be offered tomorrow:

Amendment to H.R. 7819 offered by Mr. QUIE: Page 44, after line 11, insert the following:

"PART A—BLOCK GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

"SEC. 101. (a) Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is redesignated as title VIII, and sections 701 through 706 are redesignated as sections 801 through 806, respectively, and all references to any such section in that or any other law, or in any rule, regulation, order, or agreement of the United States are amended so as to refer to such section as so designated.

"(b) Such Act is further amended by inserting after title VI a new title VII as follows:

"'TITLE VII—BLOCK GRANTS TO THE STATES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

"'AUTHORIZATION ON CONTINUING BASIS

"'SEC. 701. (a) To the end of enhancing the fundamental capability of the several States to make effective progress in meeting educational needs, to carry forward the type of programs initiated under titles I, II, III, and V of this Act without the administrative difficulties inherent in a proliferation of categorical Federal grants, the Commissioner is authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each succeeding fiscal year, to make grants to the States for the purposes of titles I, II, III, and V of this Act as set forth in this title.

"'(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $3,000,000,000, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to assure continued educational progress. In addition, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, such sums as may be necessary (1) to make payments, under section 103(a)(1)(B) of the Act of September 30, 1950, of the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior and of other Indian children on reservations, (2) to make grants for programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers under section 103(a)(6) of such Act, and for such purpose the Federal percentage shall be 50 per centum, (3) to make grants for programs for handicapped children in State-supported institutions under section 203(a)(5) of such Act, and (4) to make the grants provided for in section 202(a) and 302(a)(1) for the benefit of Indian children and children in the overseas dependent schools of the Department of Defense.

"'ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

"'SEC. 702. (a)(1) From the funds appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 3 per centum thereof, as he may determine and, first, shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for assistance under this title, and then may use reserved funds for the purpose of making grants and contracts for special projects and educational planning as provided in section 707. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State (other than those listed in the first sentence) an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

"'(A) the school-age population of the State, and

"'(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)), bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"'(2) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum or more than 33⅔ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be computed by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him from the Department of Commerce.

"'(3) For the purposes of this title—

"'(A) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"'(B) The term "United States" means the fifty States and the District of Columbia.

"'(C) The term "income per child of school age" for any State or for the United States means the total personal income for the State and the United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the United States, respectively.

"'(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reallotment, from time to time and on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions

shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were 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 that year.

"'(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall not be less than the aggregate amount of its allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, under titles I, II, III, and V of this Act.

"'USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"'SEC. 703. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 704, for—

"'(1) programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children, and which give the highest priority to school attendance areas having high concentrations of such children;

"'(2) the provision of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools of the State;

"'(3) the establishment and operation of supplementary educational centers to serve broad educational needs by consulting with and involving the public and private educational, cultural, and artistic resources of communities and by conducting experimental and innovative programs related to regional and national programs of educational research and development, and which are operated as authorized by section 303 of this Act so that (A) the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunties in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) to the extent consistent with the number of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type which the supplementary educational activities and services provided under the program are to meet, provision is made for participation of such children;

"'(4) the strengthening of State leadership and supervision provided through the State educational agencies, and the initiation of comprehensive educational planning to identify and attack educational problems on a continuing basis, as authorized by sections 501(a) and 503(a) of this Act; and

"'(5) programs designed to improve educational opportunities for children in institutions for the handicapped, or for neglected or delinquent children.

"'STATE PLANS

"'SEC. 704. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

"'(1) sets forth a program for expending funds under this part for the purposes described in section 703 and indicates the probable allocation of funds for these general purposes;

"'(2) provides that (A) not less than 50 per centum of the funds allotted or reallotted under section 702 for any fiscal year shall be used to fund programs and projects to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children (as provided by section 703(1)), and (B) not less than 7 per centum of the funds allotted or reallotted under section 702 for any fiscal year shall be used for the provision of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment (as provided by section 703(2));

"'(3) provides that, to the extent consistent with the number of children attending private elementary and secondary schools in school districts of local educational agencies conducting programs under section 703, provision will be made on an equitable basis for including special educational services and arrangements (such as, but not limited to, dual enrollment, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment, and other special educational arrangements) in which such children can participate;

"'(4) provides that arrangements (whether through the State educational agency or some other State or local public agency) for the distribution of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment and materials for the use of teachers and pupils shall include provisions for the loan of such resources, textbooks, equipment, and materials on an equitable basis for the use of teachers and pupils in nonpublic schools;

"'(5) contains assurances that the highest priority in the use of funds under this title will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as: (A) heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, (B) rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and (C) geographic isolation and economic depression in particular areas of the States;

"'(6) provides that any local educational agency or other applicant for assistance under this title which is denied such assistance may have an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency;

"'(7) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year (A) will not be commingled with State funds and (B) will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private school funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment and other printed and published instructional materials, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private school funds;

"'(8) contains assurances that no payments will be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for the purpose for the second preceding fiscal year;

"'(9) sets forth 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 (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this title; and

"'(10) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"'(b) The Commissioners shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"'PAYMENTS TO STATES

"'SEC. 705. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 702 the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"'(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 704(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to conduct educational testing or to provide library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for such testing and for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials and equipment for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year out of that State's allotment.

"'PUBLIC CONTROL OF LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, LABORATORY AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT, AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL AND TYPES WHICH MAY BE MADE AVAILABLE

"'SEC. 706. (a) Title to library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished pursuant to this title, and control and administration of their use, shall vest only in a public agency.

"'(b) The library resources, textbooks, laboratory, and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, and other printed and published instructional materials made available pursuant to this title for use of children and teachers in any school in any State shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority or agency for use, or are used, in a public elementary or secondary school of that State.

"'Special Project Grants

"'SEC. 707. (a) From the funds reserved in accordance with the provisions of section 702, the Commissioner is authorized (1) to make grants to State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States, (2) to arrange for interchanges of personnel between the United States Office of Education and the several States (as provided by section 507 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), and (3) after consultation with and approval of the appropriate State educational agency or agencies, to make grants to or contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for projects for the improvement or expansion of educational planning on a regional interstate, or metropolitan area basis.

"'(b) Payments under this section may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine, except that payments to a private agency, institution, or organization conducted for profit shall be in accordance with a contract for specified services.

"'LEGISLATIVE INTENT

"'SEC. 708. It is the intent of Congress in enacting this title that the States shall have utmost freedom, consistent with requirements of section 704, to use the appropriated funds for the improvement and strengthening of elementary and secondary education within each State by meeting educational needs which the State determines are most urgent. Accordingly, the Commissioner is directed to administer the program in such a manner as to reduce the amount

of paperwork, justifications and negotiation required of applicants and to expedite the transmission of funds to the States. To that end, questions of the intent of the legislation are to be resolved by broad, rather than narrow, interpretations and, whenever possible, in favor of the programs proposed by the State.

"'ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"'SEC. 709. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under section 704, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"'(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a program under a plan approved under this title, finds—

"'(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 704(a), or

"'(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"'(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of any project under this title 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 the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"'JUDICIAL REVIEW

"'SEC. 710. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of a State plan, submitted under section 704(a) or with his final action under section 709(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by a clerk of the court to the Commissioner. 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.

"'(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, 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 certify to the court the record of the further proceedings.

"'(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be 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.'"

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked an historic beginning of our effort to insure that every schoolchild in this country is offered an opportunity to develop his learning abilities and potential to the fullest possible degree. It recognized the fact—after long years of frustration and delay—that education is a national, as well as a local responsibility; that expanding the educational opportunities for all of our children is a responsibility of all of the people of this country.

The results of this pioneering program, as documented by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the first annual report on title I of ESEA, are rewarding and encouraging.

For millions of children, title I meant, for the first time, individual instruction in reading, writing, mathematics, and other fundamental aspects of learning. For some it was a hot meal every day. For others it was eyeglasses, medical care, or psychiatric assistance.

For many teachers it meant a smaller class, a teacher's aide, new materials and equipment, and often the discovery of new, hopeful attitudes on the part of their students.

For many parents it was a new awareness of the school and its relationship to the community and to the lives of their children.

For many school administrators it meant additional resources to reach the goal of providing quality education with equality of opportunity.

The goal of title I was to provide "compensatory education" for the millions of children across our land whose crippling background of poverty offered them little hope for successful schooling. It is certainly true that we have made only a beginning in attaining this goal, but it has been an important and an encouraging beginning that, more than anything else, needs to be expanded and continued.

I am pleased that the Committee on Education and Labor has recognized the necessity of extending this authorization through fiscal year 1969. School years traditionally run from September through June. It is absolutely essential that we give these local school officials the tools that will enable them to look ahead, the continuity that will enable them to undertake the necessary local planning.

Along with the committee, I am disappointed that the administration did not include sufficient funds in its budget for the next fiscal year to implement the authorized figure. The effort of underfunding the authorized amount by nearly half leaves no alternative, I believe, but to suspend the changes recommended in the income distribution formula.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse the committee's recommendation to bring the National Teacher Corps under title I of the act and to extend it through fiscal year 1969.

Despite inadequate funding on the part of Congress, this program has already proved its worth. Last fall, this country faced an unprecedented shortage of nearly 170,000 qualified teachers. This shortage was particularly acute in the areas where these teachers were needed most—in the blighted schools of our urban slums and in our depressed rural areas. Today 1,213 Teacher Corps members are at work, but we clearly need more. This legislation would help to make that possible.

The Quie proposal to make "block" educational grants to the States poses a serious threat to the future and effectiveness of our efforts to aid the disadvantaged elementary and secondary school children of this Nation. Desirable as this "block" grant concept might be in some other cases, it would work a severe and crippling disservice at this time and place to the cause of educational advancement in the United States.

As one of my own local school superintendents, Dr. Neil Sullivan, of Berkeley, has commented:

> The Quie amendment does not provide enough money to play a significant role as "general aid," and yet it would take away enough from existing programs to have a crippling effect.

Among other serious shortcomings, the Quie amendment would cause many of our States with the largest concentrations of disadvantaged school-age children to lose authorized funds as soon as it took effect. California, New York, and Illinois alone would lose a total of approximately $133 million in the first year. My own State of California would lose $2,736,454. Overall, 24 of our States would lose nearly $300 million in authorized funds.

But the problem goes far beyond a net loss in Federal assistance. Under the Quie amendment there is absolutely no guarantee that an adequate share of the funds would be channeled where they are needed most—to the large cities where the problem of teaching the disadvantaged is most acute. The cities, simply, would have no entitlements or guarantees under this plan.

This substitute proposal, which is being offered without the benefit of any committee hearings, and against the advice of most professional and lay groups, also would fail to extend the special programs for children of migratory farmworkers or the children enrolled in Indian schools. These are two groups of our country's neediest children. We have just launched efforts to overcome the grave educational deficiencies many of these children face. And yet this proposal jeopardizes even these initial efforts.

The children of our migrant farmworkers, for example, face particularly difficult problems in acquiring the education and training that would enable them to build a better and brighter future. The loss of these special education programs would only condemn them to the standard of poverty that has so commonly afflicted their parents.

This block grant approach is fraught with other defects. It would reduce the emphasis which the present law properly places on the education of those American children who are least able to

cope with or benefit from our present overcrowded classroom conditions. It would diminish the Federal Government's efforts to insure that all schoolchildren are given equal opportunity without regard to race. These and other problems are spelled out in a statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council which I call to my colleagues' attention and which I include with my remarks.

These is no question that the present ESEA can be improved. The procedures required of local school districts need to be simplified. But this proposed amendment—this meat-ax approach—would not benefit either the local school districts or the children in greatest need of this program. It would, simply, fail to put our aid where it is needed most.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the committee's bill be approved without amendment. Education remains the foundation of our democratic society. It remains the key ingredient in our economic and social progress, both as individuals and as a Nation. A second-rate system of education is no more tolerable than a second-rate system of defense.

This measure, as reported, offers us the best vehicle available to meet the pressing needs of our schools. It offers us the best chance to broaden the horizons of thousands of children who are not being educated to their capacity. It would be a national tragedy if we should fail to follow through on this promise of greater educational opportunity for the underprivileged and disadvantaged youth of this country.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL IN SUPPORT OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1967

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been hailed widely and correctly as historic legislation providing a breakthrough in the area of federal aid to education.

Today, this legislation is in serious jeopardy. The AFL–CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress shall not be destroyed.

Despite support for the continuation of ESEA from every major educational organization, the vast majority of state school superintendents, local school districts, and the non-public school organizations, the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has chosen to make this vital legislation a partisan political issue.

Waving the banner of "federal control," this Republican leadership is seeking to wipe out ESEA and substitute a form of financial block grants to the states. In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice.

Over eight million educationally deprived children in virtually all of the country's 23,000 school districts already have received direct benefits under ESEA. This far-reaching law has established a national policy directed at meeting the special needs of the educationally poor.

As proposed by Rep. Albert Quie (R., Minn.), the Republican substitute would permit the states to ignore this national policy. It would, instead, permit the individual states to practice economic discrimination.

Block grants can only intensify the present financial conflicts between the large cities and respective state governments. Programs developed at the state level can provide no federal guarantee that funds will go where they are most needed—to help the children of the slums and the rural depressed areas.

The block grant approach also threatens to rekindle the flames of controversy over the state-church issue that frustrated enactment of federal aid to education for over 20 years. Private school organizations are deeply concerned that their students will no longer be able to participate in many federal programs if these programs are administered by state departments of education.

But there is much more that is wrong with the Quie substitute.

The substitute was never considered by any Congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819.

The allocation formula as now spelled-out in the Quie substitute provides half the states with less funds than they would receive under H.R. 7819. These are the states most in need: those with low per pupil expenditures and those with the largest number of youths living in poverty.

The original Quie proposal has now been amended four times in an effort to gain new political support. Rep. Quie has modified his block grant approach to provide that at least 50 percent of a state's grant be used for the educationally disadvantaged. Under H.R. 7819, however, 80 percent of the federal funds must be used for this purpose.

The Quie substitute also prohibits the use of such funds for general classroom construction and improved teacher salaries, while—at the same time—eliminating provisions for such successfully operating programs as the Teacher Corps, aid for the children of migrant workers, foster children, and many others.

The Quie substitute also has a detrimental effect on civil rights. The elimination of "federal control" will not make it easier to enforce desegregation guidelines. A cutback in funds to the cities will punish severely the economically poor children of minority groups.

The Quie substitute would reduce by $281 million fiscal 1969 authorizations provided in H.R. 7819. No such reduction is justified.

H.R. 7819, in direct contrast to the Quie substitute, continues the popular programs born in 1965 that have earned wide public and Congressional support. The bill includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens ESEA, instead of destroying it as proposed by Quie.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council is convinced that the education of our youth is too important to be dragged into the partisan, political arena. We are confident that many Republican members of the House of Representatives share these views.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council, therefore, urges the members of both parties in the House to join together in rejecting the Quie substitute and giving bipartisan support to H.R. 7819—a continuation of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, first, may I congratulate the chairman of this committee and other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, for the work that they have done on one of the most important education bills that has come before this Congress, and one of the most important bills that has helped to provide equality of educational opportunities during the last couple of years. I shall have some amendments which I believe will strengthen this legislation. I have never yet come to the well of this House and offered an amendment to any education bill which I thought would weaken the bill or detract from the educational opportunities that youngsters around this Nation might derive from it.

Every amendment which I will offer—and those amendments have been sent to the offices of all Members—every amendment which I intend to offer has been the subject of hearings and testimony before the committee. In fact, some of the amendments go back several years, and discussions are continuing and have been continuing for a period of time. So the charge cannot be made that these amendments are new, revolutionary, or that no one has had an opportunity to consider them. They are not new in any sense of the word.

May I also say that I agree completely with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], when he was discussing the rule. He made the statement that he wished we had done years ago what we have done in the last few years in terms of education. I also have the same wish. If we had had the foresight 10 or 15 or 20 years ago to pass the historical legislation that has been passed in the last 6 years, we would not perhaps have had the millions of dropouts and all the problems that we have had in the big cities and in the migration from the rural areas.

Years ago Luther Burbank said:

If we paid no more attention to our plants than we do to our children, we would be living in a jungle of weeds.

So in the last 6 years, certainly, important legislation has been passed, and I do not want to minimize for one moment the effect of this legislation and other legislation that has been passed during the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations.

If we are going to do the job, it is going to take a massive program of education, and that means a larger social investment in teachers, teacher aides, schools, and equipment, and we need to invest in them the same way we have invested in dams and reclamation projects on a cost-benefit ratio. If we did so, the benefits to the world would be tremendous in proportion to the dollars spent.

Let me give two brief quotations, because I think they reflect my views. It was President Kennedy who said:

Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Liberty without learning is in peril, and learning without liberty is in vain.

A short time ago President Johnson made a particularly significant statement, especially when we think of the costs of the Vietnam war and the cut in appropriations in the field of health, education, and welfare. President Johnson's statement has real meaning for each one of us, for he said—

Nothing matters more to the future of our country—not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain-power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

As my subcommittee toured some of the slum schools in New York a few weeks ago, reference was made to the dropouts and the youngsters who are not trained and cannot work. President

Johnson's statement kept coming back to my mind—"freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

Through the years I have supported every education bill that has come to this Congress, and I will support larger appropriations than apparently we are going to have in this session of Congress. But let me now, if I may, turn to some of the amendments and briefly discuss title III and title V, and the amendments to those two titles.

Again may I remind you that there has been ample testimony and discussions during the hearings on these subjects.

Under title III, the legislation is administered by the Office of Education, and completely bypasses the State departments of education. In title V we say that we want to strengthen the State departments of education and appropriate funds for that purpose.

It does seem to me that it is not very logical in another part of the bill to say that we will bypass the State departments and give them no voice in how those programs are planned or how those funds are spent.

Charges are made that we are going to get into a church-state issue. I have a letter from the Office of Education, that states that the only applicants who are entitled to funds under title III are public educational agencies. And I have a statement from a man in the Office of Education who says that up to this date, not one single grant has been made to any private agency of any kind.

So when we hear charges we are going suddenly to revive the church-state issue, this is not true. The church-state issue does not even come into title III of the bill.

May I also say, in the amendment I have to title III, I do not change by one dollar the allocation of funds among the several States. There will not be any change in what any State will receive. Neither do I change by one dollar the distributions of funds within a State. The formula is identical to the committee bill. The purposes for which the money can be spent are almost identical to the bill. I have placed the word "expand," so if a school district has an exceedingly good program that they need money for, they could use it there. But the formula and the purposes are otherwise identical.

The only thing I attempt to do is what we say in title V we want to do, and that is strengthen the State departments of education and not bypass them.

May I say to those who argue that this authority should rest in the Commissioner of Education in Washington, it seems to me it requires an amazing amount of arrogance to assume that all good judgment and wisdom reside in Washington. I happen to believe that the people in my State and city know a great deal more about Oregon's problems than the Office of Education in Washington. Even though I live there, and I have sat on the Education and Labor Committee for more than 12 years, I still am convinced that the people there who live and work every day, intimately, with these problems are the ones best qualified to make the decisions. I do not want to say in this Congress that the people here—even my colleagues whom I respect and admire—sitting as a Committee, have the judgment to say what should be done in every State. The problems are different in Oregon than in New York, the problems are different in Illinois than they are in California, and the problems are different in Mississippi than they are in New Jersey. Each State should be able to determine its own priorities.

On title V of the bill, the amendment which I have to title V does one thing only: It tries to strengthen the State departments of education. At the present time the committee bill reserves a certain percentage of funds for the Office of Education. I have a list of all funds that the Office of Education has. I can assure this body they have plenty of money at the present time to carry out the things they need to do. I simply take out the percentage of funds reserved for the Commissioner of Education's Office and say all funds under title V will go indeed to the State departments of education, so that they can do the job we are asking them to do.

Let me spend, if I may, the rest of the time on the amendment which apparently is causing a great deal of discussion, and I spend this time because I believe charges are being made, and, yes, charges have been made, I must say in all honesty, during the last few weeks that are not based on fact, have been made that my amendment to require uniform enforcement of the guidelines is done to destroy the Civil Rights Act.

I guess it is more in sorrow than in anger that I hear this charge. I do not think there has been any civil rights bill that has ever been before the Congress—I cross out "I do not think," because I know there has never been any civil rights bill before this Congress that I have not supported. I have always supported civil rights legislation, both as a public official and as a private citizen. I believe that discrimination is harmful to our society. I believe it is degrading to the individual, and I believe it does something to our democratic form of government. I would not stand here in the well of the House and offer any amendment which would in any way weaken the Civil Rights Act.

I offer as an amendment, language which would do two things. One, it would simply say that when the Office of Education or any agency in HEW draws up a rule or regulation or guideline or order, they must cite the statute. What is wrong with that? Does that destroy the civil rights bill because after the rule or regulation or order they must cite public law so and so, subparagraph (b)?

The second part of the amendment simply says that rules, regulations, and guidelines and so on will be administered uniformly throughout the 50 States. I did not offer this amendment in the committee, though guidelines were the matter of hearings and discussion in the committee.

Let me tell the Members why I did not. It has been only within the past 2 weeks there has been brought to my attention the public statement by the Office of Education.

These are the words in the February 1967 publication of the Office of Education:

> To begin at the beginning, the guidelines apply only to school districts in the 17 border and southern States.

I did not know that. I should have known, and I apologize, as a member sitting on that committee, but I did not know that the guidelines only applied to the 17 States and not to the 50 States.

I do not know what the Members thought they were voting for in the civil rights bill, but when I voted for it I did not think there would be guidelines drawn up which would apply to Kansas City, Mo., and that across the way, in the same metropolitan area, those guidelines would not apply to Kansas City, Kans.

I did not think I was voting for a bill that would give the Office of Education authority to draw up guidelines that would be applicable to Louisville, Ky., but would not be applicable to Jeffersonville, Ind., which is across the way and part of the same metropolitan area.

Certain guidelines are applicable in Wheeling, W. Va., but there is a different set of guidelines across the way in Bridgeport, Ohio.

There is one set of guidelines for Cincinnati, Ohio, but a different set of guidelines applicable in Covington, Ky.

I could give many more instances than this:

Let me read what Senator PASTORE stated, when the civil rights bill was before the Senate. Senator PASTORE said this:

> Frankly, I do not see how we could have gone any further.

He had prefaced this by saying:

> In this bill we do not want to be vindictive. We do not wish to punish. We do not wish to be unreasonable.

Then he said:

> Frankly, I do not see how we could have gone any further, to be fair. Without title VI, accepting the fact that the President himself, under presidential powers, has the right to issue directives, which he already has—such directives are much more stringent than the proposed title VI. Section 602 of title VI not only requires the agency to promulgate rules and regulations, but all procedures must be in accord with these rules and regulations. They must have broad scope. They must be national. They must apply to all 50 States. We could not draw one rule to apply to the State of Mississippi, another rule to apply to the State of Alabama and another rule to the State of Rhode Island. There must be one rule to apply to every State.

In the debate in the House on January 31, 1964, Congressman CELLER, in discussing title VI said:

> The bill would require that each Federal agency which extends financial assistance of the type covered by Title VI must establish non-discriminatory standards of *general application*. This means that it cannot apply one standard of conduct to one person and a different standard of conduct to another . . . Title VI directs all appropriate Federal agencies to adopt rules, regulations, or orders of *general applicability* to effectuate this *national* policy of non-discrimination. It would require each Federal agency administering Federal assistance by grant, contract, or loan, to reexamine its assistance programs to make sure that adequate action has been taken to preclude such discrimination.

That is what the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said. I could quote the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], who said:

To aid school districts throughout the country.

The Vice President also said something, in 1964.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. In recent weeks, much discussion has centered around the decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. I have gone very carefully through this document. In fact, I have spent several hours on it. In several places in this decision, the court has indicated that the guidelines were adopted for the entire country. At one point they say:

The act establishes a policy for all of the country and for the courts as well as for the agency required to administer the law.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Let me finish this and then I will yield if I can get more time.

And so, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the original congressional intent with Senators and Congressmen saying that this act was "national in scope"; and finally on the basis of justice and equity, I suggest that any guidelines drawn up be fair and administered uniformly in all 50 States, and not just 17. Are there Members of the House who are going to tell me that it is less repugnant to have discrimination in Harlem than it is in Alabama? Is discrimination because of race less demeaning to the individual in Detroit or Cleveland than it is to the individual in Mississippi? Is discrimination not a denial of the fundamental concept of the brotherhood of man whether it occurs in Watts or central Harlem or Georgia or Louisiana? Are there people who are going to say that it is all right to discriminate in the North and West but the Office of Education is to draw up guidelines that apply only in the 17 Southern States? This, Mr. Speaker, does not seem to me to be the intent of the law nor a law that is based on equity and fairness and justice.

Let me conclude by quoting President Kennedy. This statement reflects my views, and I believe it has meaning for this House in this debate. President Kennedy said this:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I have 2 more minutes, please?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 1 minute. Our time is running out.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. President Kennedy said:

This is not a sectional problem—it is nationwide. It is not a partisan problem. The proposals set forth above are based on a careful consideration of the views of leaders of both parties in both Houses of Congress. In 1957 and 1960, members of both parties rallied behind the civil right measures of my predecessor; and I am certain that this tradition can be continued, as it has in the case of the world crisis. A national domestic crisis also calls for bi-partisan unity and solutions.

We will not solve these problems by blaming any group or section for the legacy which has been handed down by past generations. But neither will these problems be solved by clinging to the patterns of the past. Nor, finally, can they be solved in the streets, by lawless acts on either side, or by physical actions or presence of any private group or public official, however appealing such melodramatic devices may seem to some. . . .

I therefore ask every Member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties, and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts, not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension, but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice . . .

This is the basis on which I offer these amendments.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentlewoman makes a good point that this law applies to all States and to all areas. I would like to remind the gentlewoman that the first withholding of funds under this act, title VI, was in the city of Chicago. What bill or law does the gentlewoman think the Commission was operating under if it did not apply to all of the States of the Union?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I go by the statements that have been made by the Office of Education, I say to my friend from Illinois. The Office of Education says that the guidelines only apply in 17 States.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point, a brief summary of the purpose of the amendments I intend to offer:

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed for the purpose of strengthening the State Departments of Education. This amendment would provide that all of the funds authorized under Title V be given to the State Departments of Education to accomplish the purpose stated. It would eliminate all funds reserved for the Office of Education in Title V. The amount of money and the formula for distribution in the various states would remain the same. Permissive language is added to allow the state educational agency to provide grants to local educational agencies in metropolitan areas to enable them to engage in comprehensive planning to meet their particular needs either alone or in cooperation with other such agencies.

The Amendment on Page 53 of the bill, Line 2, would simply delete the words "developed according to criteria established by the Commissioner." The effect of this is to allow the local educational agency and the cooperating institution of higher education the flexibility to develop their own teacher training program.

There are two amendments related to rules, regulations, guidelines, or other published interpretations or orders issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the United States Office of Education. The first amendment would require the citation of the statutory authority upon which such rules, regulations, guidelines, etc., are based. The second part of this requires that all such rules, regulations, and guidelines be uniformly applied and enforced throughout the fifty states. It does not seem to me educationally sound to have certain guidelines enforceable in Kansas City, Kansas and other guidelines enforceable in Kansas City, Missouri, nor does it seem appropriate to have certain guidelines applied to the schools in Northern Kentucky, for example, and other guidelines applied across the state boundary in Ohio.

The Amendment to establish an Advisory Committee would consist of three Members of the House and two members from each of the following groups:

Chief State school officials, State Boards of Education, Local School Superintendents, Local school boards, Private schools, Classroom teachers, Professors from Departments of Education.

This Advisory Committee would report back to the House of Representatives on or before January 1, 1968 after having given their particular attention to (1) the relative effectiveness of categorical assistance as compared to general assistance in the elementary and secondary education programs and (2) the feasibility of one state plan combining the various categorical aid programs.

The Amendment of Title III of the bill is based on testimony during the hearings by various educational leaders. The National Education Association, school board members and state school superintendents have repeatedly asked that State Departments of Education not be by-passed in the administration of the Title III program. The purpose for which the funds can be spent in the Amendment are almost identical to the purposes for which the money can be spent under the Committee bill. The formula for the distribution of funds is exactly the same in the Amendment as it is in the Committee bill. The Amendment provides for a state plan which is to be approved by the Commissioner. This Amendment becomes effective on June 30, 1968 and it is so worded that if a state wishes to send in a plan during Fiscal Year 1968 it may do so. In other words the Amendment is permissive in 1968 and mandatory in 1969. The Amendment also specifically provides in Section 304 sub-paragraph 1 "that for the first Fiscal Year for which the plan is in effect it must provide that no local educational agency will receive less than the amount it could reasonably anticipate receiving had the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 not been enacted as determined by the state educational agencies after consultation with the Commissioner."

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment discussed by the gentlewoman from Oregon with respect to this effort to legislate on an education bill in connection with a matter dealing with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

Let me observe at the outset that as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee who attended and participated actively in hearings and meetings of the committee on the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act during the last session and during this session, this is the first time that such an amendment has been proposed although only a few days ago there appeared a story in the Washington Post

under the headline "United States Reported Softening on Dixie Schools," in which some indication was given that this amendment was under consideration.

The new story, which attributed the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative JOHN WAGGONNER, as the source of information, outlined a number of demands being made for amendments for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One of such was described as "Federal guidelines must cite statutory authority for every desegregation demand in detail rather than standing on the 1964 Civil Rights Act in general. Enforcement must apply to all 50 States and not concentrate on the South."

On the surface, the proposal seems innocuous enough but I deplore the fact that no committee of the Congress has been given an opportunity in hearings to ascertain the meaning and implications behind the amendment. During the course of our hearings this year, the committee received extensive testimony from the Office of Civil Rights Compliance in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding civil rights enforcement matters and particularly on the guidelines. It was not suggested at that time nor was it suggested at any time in committee that such an amendment was needed.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much confusion generated by the charge that the guidelines are applicable only in the South. Let me make absolutely clear at this point that title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 applies in all the States and in all the school districts of the Nation. All the evidence before the committee is to the effect that title VI is being applied throughout the Nation. What then of the charge of the limited application of the guidelines?

Any school district in the Nation, whether it be in the North, in the South, East, or West, is presumed to be in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act upon filing with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a very short form indicating that they operate a single school district in which pupil assignments are made to schools without regard to race. There are 3,067 school districts in the 17 southern and border States which have given such assurance and are currently employing geographic attendance zones without regard to the race of the enrollee.

Mr. Chairman, the guidelines do not apply to any of these 3,067 school districts. The guidelines only have applicability to the estimated 1,815 southern and border States school districts which have not filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such assurance. These school districts in an effort to avoid the cutoff of funds required under title VI of the Civil Rights Act indicated that although they are maintaining their present dual school systems, they have adopted so-called voluntary "freedom of choice" plans under which pupil assignments are made to schools not on the basis of the geographical location of the school and the residence of the enrollee but rather upon the election of the enrollee or his or her parents to attend the school within the district of such enrollee's choice.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, in the school district where such "freedom of choice" plans exist, the practice of the school system is to maintain the structure of schools for Negroes and schools for white children but at the same time permitting the child to enroll in any school of his or her choice. Under such circumstances, the guidelines become operative to ascertain only if such "freedom of choice" plans operate to eliminate a dual school system. It, therefore, becomes quite obvious that the election to be relieved from the so-called odious burden of the application of the guidelines rests entirely with the local school system. By the simple expediency of declaring that it operates a single neighborhood school system assigning pupils to schools on a geographic pattern without regard to race, a school system may immediately be deemed to be in compliance with title VI. The resulting change by the local school system from the operation of a dual school system to a single school system need not result in any prescribed percentage of integration.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the "freedom of choice" plan has been adopted by these school systems because they have no intention of in fact doing away with the dual school system. For this reason, I have been greatly concerned about those provisions of the guidelines which in recognizing as acceptable a "freedom of choice" plan give validity to a new device in education in the assignment of pupils which has as its clear objective the avoidance of title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

In spite of this obvious question concerning the validity of so-called "freedom of choice" plans, the "guidelines" have recently been upheld in a decision of the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

If the purpose of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon is to further weaken the guidelines in this respect, then I am unalterably opposed to it, and if it does not have this effect, then I am at a loss to account for its being offered. In any event, I think that the matter demands more careful attention by the appropriate committee of the Congress, and for this reason alone should be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [MRS. GREEN] that we have been doing our best in the Northern States, including the State of New York, to attempt to liberate our children from our ghettos. I further state to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon that we have given every assurance to the Government of the United States that we are following these guidelines and shall continue to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to indicate to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that I will not stand here and see my State and the city of New York placed under the stigma that we are not doing our best with reference to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, we have been operating neighborhood schools for all without discrimination and we have been meeting all criteria set forth by the Office of Education. This is an important point which has not been mentioned by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon in her statement.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, education will be a continuing concern of our people and of Congress.

Fifty years ago, 22,172,000 students were enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in this Nation.

Twenty-five years ago, 27,179,000 students were enrolled.

Last fall the figure was 49,800,000.

In 1975, 53.6 million students are expected.

This growth has placed pressure upon us.

In 1965 I did not agree with the majority of my party in dealing with such a clearly growing need.

In 1966 the education legislation picked up friends.

I am hopeful that a majority of us will support this bill this month.

I believe in a Federal program that serves the States by recognizing that there are problems over which the States have no control.

Mainly, these problems are the problems of stimulated growth and need combined with economic distress in sections of our land that do not acknowledge and are not necessarily contained within State borders.

I voted for the bill in 1965 and in 1966 because of my concern about these depressed areas.

I believe that Republicans who agreed with me responded as they did last year because of their growing concern about this problem.

It is a completely legitimate position for us to take.

It is a position we have often taken together in other areas of legislation.

It is in keeping with our traditional view about the responsible role of Federal Government.

It is the reason I stand now to endorse the committee bill and it is basic to all that will be discussed in efforts to amend it.

Mr. Chairman, as Members we must at all times be guided by the principle of responsibility in matters involving the expenditure of public funds.

A part of that responsibility is to assure that funds are spent on pressing national priorities, on the central issues of our times.

Another part of that responsiblity is to make certain that they are spent wisely, and with a minimum of waste.

With regard to the aid to education legislation which is before the House, I believe that our responsibility gives us no other choice but to vote for the committee bill.

I base this conviction on several factors.

First, it is a principle of sound management not to begin a venture which cannot be carried out to a successful conclusion.

In 1965, the Congress, in recognition of the fact that the educational needs of the children of poverty were not being

met, enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The primary focus of this act was special help to the schools with the highest concentrations of deprived children.

It was recognized at the time we could not revolutionize the schools overnight, nor could we rehabilitate disadvantaged children over a short period of time.

It is clear, based on statistics cited in the committee report of H.R. 7819, that much has been accomplished.

Under title I, 22,000 projects were conducted by over 17,000 local educational agencies reaching an estimated 8.3 million educationally deprived youngsters.

Over half the funds spent under title I went directly for teaching.

About 20 percent was spent on educational equipment.

And about 10 percent on construction.

Educators were able to use their own ingenuity to tailor programs to their particular local needs.

After-school remedial instruction courses were given in New York for children who were unable to keep up with their more privileged fellow pupils.

In Tennessee wireless auditory training units were used to assist deaf children unable to communicate without special help.

Mothers in Arkansas were given cooking classes to insure that their school-age children would receive well-balanced meals to maintain their ability to concentrate in school.

The committee heard hundreds of other examples of specially designed local programs to meet the educational needs of low-income families.

Under title II, 49 million students and 1.9 million teachers now have access to library books and materials hitherto unavailable to them.

Title V, designed to strengthen State educational agencies, awarded 85 percent of its funds in the form of basic grants with personnel needs receiving the highest priority.

Testimony indicated that the scarcity of trained personnel hindered many of the State programs under this title.

Title III has financially affected the lives and educations of nearly 10 million public and nonpublic elementary and secondary school children.

It has provided otherwise unavailable educational services for 93,000 preschool students, and 250,000 out-of-school youth.

Now 18 short months later it is suggested that we reduce our concentration on the children of poverty and throw out the legislative approach that was voted only 2 years ago.

Quie approach: 50 percent to deprived areas.

The committee bill: Rifles in with 80 percent of the money.

Just to make a correction, I believe you should understand that the Quie approach, the Quie amendment, provides that the States must assign no less than 50 percent of the funds to the deprived areas, but the States do not have to provide any more than the 50 percent.

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

Mr. BELL. I do not have sufficient time.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman would yield for just a moment, I would suggest that the gentleman did not state that in the manner it should be, and I think the gentleman should correct it.

Mr. BELL. As I understand it, the States are required to provide no more than 50 percent of the funds for the deprived areas; that is, under the proposed bill the State is only required to provide that amount.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is incorrect. The 50 percent is the floor, the State could use up to 90 percent.

Mr. BELL. I did not say they could not use more, but I say they are required to use only 50 percent. Whereas, the committee bill rifles in on 80 percent. In other words, 80 percent must be used for the deprived areas.

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

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to commend the gentleman for his presentation and for bringing up this encouraging point. Both the gentleman and I represent metropolitan areas, and we know the problems these areas face in attempting to get Federal aid for education for the deprived children, because of the historical reticence produced by largely rural State legislatures. Earlier we talked about the contest this could produce, and we all know what that could do, but we do know that under the committee bill the money is flowing into areas that have been designated as educationally deprived areas.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I would say that under the committee bill 80 percent of the money must go to those areas; it must go to the deprived areas.

Mr. CAREY. That is the point I am making, that a State might not be able to do this. The children of the slums in the cities have been getting short shrift in the States because of the historic formulas that work against their best interests.

Mr. BELL. Let me say to the gentleman that I understand, and this is a statistical fact, that before this committee bill came out in 1965, only two States of the Union had the interest and desire to provide a means of rifling their State funds in on the poverty school areas. Those two States were Connecticut and California.

To further indicate the past trend of States do not concentrate on the poor schoolchildren the gentleman may recall the State of New York provided that only 25 percent of State school funds should be spent in deprived areas of New York City. The ESEA committee bill funds on the other hand were rifled in to the extent of nearly 50 percent. Now this is what the record shows. It is important that Federal funds be rifled in to the deprived areas. The committee bill is designed to do this whereas the substitute is not.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman has made a very fine point and I hope that that will be brought out in debate because I do believe it destroys the theory advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota that his bill is just as good for the poor children as the present bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-five 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. 97]

Arends	Fraser	Resnick
Ashley	Gettys	Roberts
Bevill	Giaimo	Ronan
Bolling	Gibbons	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Halleck	Roudebush
Brown, Calif.	Henderson	Roybal
Burleson	Holifield	St. Onge
Burton, Utah	Holland	Shriver
Cabell	Ichord	Smith, N.Y.
Celler	Irwin	Smith, Okla.
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Stubblefield
Conyers	Kluczynski	Taylor
Cowger	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	May	Tiernan
Dickinson	Miller, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Montgomery	Whalley
Dorn	Moss	Willis
Downing	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles H.
Dulski	Myers	Wolff
Everett	Nedzi	Wyman
Evins, Tenn.	Passman	Younger
Fascell	Railsback	
Fino	Rees	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 7819, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 367 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 gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is recognized.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in order to obtain a fair appraisal of the two approaches—the approach of the committee bill and the approach of the Quie bill—it is my opinion that we must first ask ourselves this question: Why do we as a nation need Federal aid to education?

In 1965, Mr. Chairman, we recognized the fact that millions of children were being deprived of an adequate education. This was becoming a serious national problem. Public and private educational systems in the States, alone, were unable to do the job.

In many States like my State there have been protest marches on city hall objecting to high local school taxes. Yet in many poverty areas schools are still inadequate.

In California, where there are 400,000 people coming into our State every year, a large percentage of whom are poor people. These people cannot carry their own local tax load to make it possible to take care of their own share of school assessments. This means that the load must be carried somewhere else. States that cannot afford this, must rely on Federal funds. Some States and local governments through property taxes and bond issues are able to take care of this problem. But one serious question has been growing. How to upgrade education

in the large, so-called pockets of poverty that exist in nearly every one of our 50 States and territories. Federal aid is needed.

A number of methods were studied, including a general aid approach, but it became obvious that since the low-income pupils presented the recognized problems, they must be guaranteed the greatest share of the assistance. The guarantee was built into the carefully prepared categories of aid.

I believe a conservative position could be made on the basis or argument, that unless aid is to go to deprived areas, there should be no aid at all. Because a conservative could argue, that normally the States should take care of this themselves. A concluding conservative argument could be, therefore, that if the Federal money is not rifled in to the poverty pockets, there should be no Federal aid to schools at all. I do not believe that the Quie amendment adequately rifles in on this national priority problem of aid to the poverty school areas.

In conclusion, let me say, I think we must recognize the fact that the administration before it passed the 1965 act spent many years studying the problems that it would have to face, such as the church-state issue, the Federal control argument, and so forth. Many such hurdles and difficulties had to be overcome. Now all of a sudden, overnight, I think it would be a mistake to change and try a whole new approach that has not had the opportunity to be studied and analyzed and tested thoroughly.

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

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I personally wish to take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] who so ably served on the general subcommittee when we were in the process of writing the 1965 act. Congressman BELL has lived with this act ever since we first commenced hearings in 1965, and he has contributed immensely in the 1966 amendments, and again this year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California because I personally feel that he has made an accurate report to this committee.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] 5 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the debate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] said that 88 Congresses had failed to enact meaningful legislation for Federal aid to our school systems and it took the 89th Congress to do this Herculean task. There is a very good reason why. Because for all these years we have been trying to find an effective formula that would meet the test of constitutionality and the test of needs.

Finally, we came across a formula that is incorporated in the present bill—aid to areas of proven need—and that is the key to our entire concept of Federal aid to education.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Oregon have both indicated that they will offer substantial amendments to this bill. I advise the House, after having sat through many, many discussions and many hearings and taken part in many efforts through the 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses in trying to work out an acceptable formula, I advise the House to proceed with great caution on any substantial amendments to the bill reported by our committee.

This bill was put together after careful consideration of very complicated problems confronting the various States and after very thorough study of the various constitutional provisions of the States and the various other problems that are involved. This is a tremendously complex bill and I strongly advise against any major changes after the committee has carefully studied all aspects before coming before the House with this legislation.

It is working well and I would recommend very strongly to the House that we let this bill work for a while before starting to make any major overhauls. It is working so well, as a matter of fact, that we have had practically no testimony of any major criticism.

The superintendent of the Chicago public school system, Mr. James F. Redmond, has stated:

> The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a great help to the schools of this Nation. The application of these funds has enabled school groups to do the things that, for a long time, they have known how to do, but could not finance. The criticism of the Act, I think, is not well founded. The problems of administration should not be so emphasized as to bury the real worth that this needed money has made possible.

Any suggestion of transferring this legislation to the State superintendents at this time, in my judgment, would create a great deal of new problems at a time when the legislation is working exceptionally well in its present form.

May I remind the committee that 78 percent of the American population today live in the major urban areas of America, and certainly, it seems to me, these urban school administrators know their problems best and are best able to deal with those problems.

For the gentleman to suggest and for the gentlewoman to suggest that somehow or other we are going to bring in a new degree of efficiency by turning this over to the State school administrators just is not proven on the record before our committee.

There is also another very serious problem on the question of church-state relations.

The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Oregon say that their amendments will not in any way affect the formula incorporated in the existing act to bring meaningful aid to private and parochial schools such as books purchased by public schools and public school libraries and being lent to these private schools.

You gentlemen know, whatever part of the country you come from, that as you walk through the local communities, both your public school and private school administrators praise you for the fact that Congress has given very meaningful assistance within the framework of the Constitution to these schools, and this newly achieved help is very much appreciated by all concerned.

I am not going to go into a long discussion here as to whether or not the proposed amendments would change the bill. The fact is that Msgr. James C. Donohue, the director of the Department of Education of the U.S. Catholic Conference, has stated very clearly—and here is a man who has made a very careful study of this thing—that these amendments would eliminate help to private schools. Here is what he said:

> If the Federal funds under the proposal were to be commingled by the state agencies with local state funds, the operation of local laws or state constitutional provisions which bar state expenditures for anything but public school purposes potentially could exclude the participation of private school pupils altogether in approximately 33 states. This would be wholly unjust, educationally undesirable, incompatible with the common national aspirations for a better educated citizenry, and inconsistent with declared policies of both major political parties.

You want to change this bill with hastily drawn floor amendments after it has been carefully worked out in the cities and in the States?

I want to remind you of one thing, those of you who have been around here for a few years, when the House passed an amendment here very hastily on the minimum wage bill several years ago only to find out the next day that it had excluded 14 million people who were previously covered by minimum wage standards simply because the House did not know what the amendment really would do. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentlewoman from Oregon merely tell us that it will not make any difference. But here is an expert on the subject who has made a very careful study who says that it will make a difference and you are going to have to take the responsibility of deciding who is right.

These amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon have all been considered by the committee and the committee has rejected them simply because the present law is working well. We are going to continue studying legislation and see what we can do as we go on. I do not know which of the amendments the gentleman from Minnesota will offer, but if the language incorporated in H.R. 8983 is contained in his present amendments, I would say that this bill will be a windfall for the suburbs.

The gentleman talks about his great concern for the underprivileged youngsters of America. He says that up to 90 percent of the funds can be used for deprived children. But the language in his bill which sets up the criteria states, as the second criteria: "rapid increases in enrollment which overwhelm the educational resources of a local educational agency."

Gentlemen, that is just a long way of spelling "suburbs," the suburbs that are the wealthiest areas of this country. Certainly they have problems, but this bill was passed with the original intent of helping the areas of greatest need. So

we will shortchange the urban areas to help the suburbs, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted. Under the gentleman's amendment, if this language remains in the bill, a city like Chicago will lose $9 million a year to make help available to suburbs that have been overwhelmed by their growth. The gentleman's amendment is a windfall for the suburbs. I have no objection to helping the suburbs but if that is the case then let us pass a general aid bill and help everybody.

Finally, as to the civil rights amendment, I recommend that you reread sections 601, 602, and 603 of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

The city of Chicago was the first city in this country, so far as I recall, to have $34 million withheld by the Office of Education under title VI. We proved them wrong, of course, and the money was restored. I discussed this with the chairman of our committee, and if the House will let us work our way in the committee, as chairman of the subcommittee which has the responsibility of legislation affecting elementary and secondary school youngsters, it is my intention later this year to hold full-scale hearings on the administration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, not only as it applies to all titles, but also how the various communities are given an opportunity to work out their problems before funds are withheld by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the act as reported by our committee.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would not want the inference that has just been made to go unchallenged that if there is an amendment to title III of the act, we would become embroiled in the religious or the so-called church-state issue. We will be involved in that controversy only if those who will benefit by a distortion of the truth seek to start such a controversy. In a letter dated May 19 from Ralph Becker of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he states:

> Under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a legal applicant must be a local educational agency. A "local educational agency" is defined as a local public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision of a State.

Skipping four paragraphs of the letter—and later I shall ask to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD—Mr. Becker states:

> The U.S. Office of Education has adhered to the regulations in making grants under the title III, ESEA authority.
>
> No private school, college or university, or private corporation or company has received a grant under title III, ESEA since the inception of the program. Where such agencies have been used as subcontractors, the public agency has retained fiscal and administrative control.

Since the ruling has already been made that under the law, the grants may only be made to a local public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a state—it seems to me it is a disservice to the cause of education to try to intentionally raise the church-state issue for the purpose of creating controversy and avoiding a debate on the real issues.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I have only a limited amount of time; if I am able to later, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, for years we have had a great debate about Federal aid to education; if we should have any, what form it should take. This resulted in the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. At that time I recall the arguments were quite persuasive that we all—no matter where we live in this country—have a stake in the education of children and culturally disadvantaged.

But we have a stake in Illinois as to the kind of education that the children in Alabama or in Georgia or in any place in this country might have, because we are a mobile society and these people may move some day from that area to our area, or we may move from our particular location to where the education was not as good as it should have been.

Of course, the assumption here was that we were going to put funds into those areas where the greatest need existed. We have put some funds there. I believe it is obvious, after a year and a half or 2 years of operation under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that what we on the minority side pointed out 2 years ago has happened, and that is that the greatest amounts of funds have gone to the richer States.

The Appropriations Committee then even added to the inequity of the formula in the act, when they provided that the second year's appropriation "provide no less amount of funds to any one State" than they had received in the first year.

The first year of operation was funded very late in the school year. Some States, such as mine, decided they could not responsibly spend all the funds in just the few months they had left, so they did not spend all of the money that was allocated to the State of Illinois. Other States took this responsible attitude. Some States spent every penny of the allocation and authorization that was made to them. As the result of this and the action of the Appropriations Committee, we now are really rewarding those who overspent, who may have wasted a great deal of the money on equipment that still has not been used and programs that were not meaningful.

We have caused a disadvantage for those States that did practice some thrift.

One of the most pressing problems we have experienced with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was late funding. This is a problem in which I am most interested, the fact that we do not let States know until well after the beginning of the fiscal year and even after the beginning of the school year what funds they will have under these programs under ESEA. This is particularly difficult when we talk about these narrow category aid programs where such programs must be developed, and special teachers must be hired at the beginning of the school year in September or October. The school districts do not know what funds they are going to get. Sometimes, such as this year, the State of Illinois did not know until February or March of this year exactly what funds they were going to get under ESEA for the current fiscal year.

I pointed this out in the committee when this bill was first heard. This is a concern that is not unique to me, but a concern I have received and I have felt as a result of the testimony from educators across the country.

When Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee made their study of the Office of Education, everywhere they went they heard complaints about this late funding.

Yet the bill was brought before the committee this year by the administration; the administration bill had no authorization for the fiscal year 1969. The authorization for 1968 is already on the books. It was obvious it was not the intention of the administration to attack the problem of late funding. So we had hearings on a bill that had no authorization for the year 1969.

Later, after the hearings were completed and the amendment was adopted authorizing funds for the year 1965, at this point the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] felt he should offer his amendment to change the direction of our narrow aid program, to have it in the form of block grants with more flexibility within the States.

I emphasize the chronology to show it was not the fault of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] nor any committee member on this side, that we did not have hearings on funds for 1969 and did not have an opportunity to have hearings on the Quie amendment. It was a fact that it was not in the bill as introduced by the administration, and the authorization for 1969 was added without any hearings. The same objections can be leveled against the authorization for 1969 that have been leveled against Mr. QUIE's amendment.

Shortly after the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] proposed the amendment that would provide for block grants, we had the church-state issue raised. I believe this is a completely false issue. The amendment has been carefully directed to use the same devices that are now in the law to skirt the church-state issue. This was one of the stumbling blocks to getting any Federal aid to education, one that apparently combined with any lack of opportunity. This, combined with the lack of opportunity to have funds, made it impossible to get Federal aid to education. The church-state issue is completely false. I stand here as the product of parochial schools, having attended the first eight grades

and the high school grades in the parochial schools of my own hometown.

I tell the Members that I would not be for the Quie amendment, if I felt it were going to deny any funds to the private schools, to the parochial schools. I am convinced the Quie amendment will use the same device to get around the church-state issue, and the same funds—or, in fact, additional funds—will be available to the parochial schools.

I should like to touch on the Teacher Corps, which is a part of the bill. It has not been discussed much today. I am going to offer an amendment to strike from this bill the authorization for the Teacher Corps which is placed in the bill. I shall have an opportunity tomorrow, when I offer the amendment, to give my reasons for it.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman was here when we debated the original act. He will recall the only reason why we had the Commissioner dealing directly with these programs, in title II and title III, in the community, was to get around the provisions of the State constitutions.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California such time as he may consume.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman who just preceded me in the well. He certainly made an excellent statement.

I would like to take this opportunity today to announce my support of the so-called Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I do so because of my great interest in the development of our educational system and because I believe the Quie proposal offers the greatest opportunity to return a degree of flexibility to the States to meet their own particular needs.

I believe the Quie amendment is the first step toward providing a flexible program of educational enhancement. At the present time, under existing provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we have seen the growth of unnecessary and costly administrative burdens and of rigid regimentation in the regulations and standards of the Office of Education. The existing program of individual grants-in-aid for specific projects requires an extraordinary amount of time and money in the preparation and reporting of the proposed project. Such waste actually results in much of the available funding going to administration rather than to needy students.

In addition, school administrators must wait for approval at several levels in the Office of Education before they know if funds will be forthcoming. This causes a delay which makes it difficult for the administrator to plan his school's budget, as well as postponing the time at which assistance to the student can begin.

Finally, the educational needs of various localities and regions can differ greatly. Where a program is regulated by one central authority, standards must be set up and often are such that all needs cannot be met and valuable assistance might not be available.

Under the Quie amendments, the program of individual grants-in-aid under titles I, II, III, and V would be ended and block grants would be given to the States for distribution. In this manner, the money would be used in the most needed areas, rather than being spread thinly and to school districts where it is not necessarily needed. This is similar to using a rifle rather than a shotgun. This type of distribution would only be subject to the broad guidelines now contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides that half the available funds go to special programs for educationally deprived children in areas having a high concentration of such children, and that 7 percent of the funds must be used for providing textbooks and other instructional materials. Additionally, private school children will benefit at least as well from the Quie amendment as under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will not be affected in any way.

We are confronted today with a crisis in our educational system. The vast population growth, coupled with the tremendous explosion of human knowledge, requires vastly improved schools to serve more and more students. Merely keeping pace with population growth requires an overwhelming effort. Add to that the need to provide continually up-dated and improved curriculums, and all must realize the task before us. Creative and imaginative thinking is required to provide an approach to the problem that is sufficient for the need. Rigid centralization of control of Federal education funds is the exact opposite of what is required.

The Quie amendment offers an exciting proposal which has the necessary elements to meet the existing challenge. It provides a flexible approach. It is responsive to varying needs in different areas. It makes a greater proportion of the funds available to student assistance by eliminating unnecessary administrative time and expense. I hope it will have the support of this body.

At the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I said that the adoption of the Quie amendment would only be the first step toward enhancing our educational system, and in providing the financial assistance to do so. There are several other steps to be taken which would assure our youth of the finest possible education. I believe that a tax-sharing formula by which States would receive a proportion of personal and corporate income tax levied by the Federal Government would be an important improvement. This not only would return control of our educational system to the State and local governments, but would provide the needed revenue for problem solving by States and local communities without rigid and wasteful Federal control.

I further believe we must encourage our youth to obtain higher education by providing incentives—for example, an income tax credit for parents for expenses incurred in providing a college education for their children. I would also propose a further incentive for the student—an income tax credit for the repayment of student loans when such loans are used to further education. The repayment and the tax credit would take effect after the student graduates from college. With the college education, the student can anticipate a higher earning capability and therefore be in a better position to retire the loan. The tax credit approach would give him the extra incentive needed to commit himself to the loan. This student loan-tax credit—after graduation—concept is designed to provide the opportunity for any student, regardless of his family's financial status, to be able to acquire or advance his education. Also this approach treats the public and private school student equally and does not bring up the controversial church-state constitutional question.

I believe these three proposals will materially assist our students, the parents, and our educational system, and I am introducing legislation to implement them. It is my hope that these ideas will receive favorable consideration by the Congress. We must act now if we expect to be able to keep up with the rapidly growing requirements of our educational system.

I honestly believe that Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives can see the advantages of this approach. If carried forward properly, this will help the States and local units of government revise their tax structure and/or their revenue allocation formulas, with the singular objective of providing relief to the overburdened property taxpayer and at the same time give our educational systems the needed financial assistance—without concern for Federal control.

Much has been said and much will be said about the proper approach to providing the proper type of education for our children. There is one thing we can all agree on, that education is certainly one of the greatest needs of our Nation as well as the world.

The principal difference of opinion seems to center around just how the educational programs will be financed and administered.

Make no mistake about my own personal objectives. I am vigorous in my support of the proper type of financial assistance for improving our educational system but I am equally strong in my determination to avoid any Federal or central control of our educational system.

I believe all of us should be seeking ways and means of helping the people in our respective States meet their educational responsibilities. There are ways this can be accomplished. We can all unite toward a common effort to enhance the educational opportunities of young Americans.

I believe the Quie amendment will develop a very constructive trend to accomplish this.

There are basically three avenues open to provide assistance. First, continue to expand the general aid to education

which will lead to inevitable Federal control and further disrupt the relatively tranquil church-state relationship. If you expand public school assistance drastically, you make it difficult for private schools to provide the same quality and quantity of education, possibly forcing their closure and transferring this burden to the public school system, with the subsequent increase in the local taxpayers' burden.

In the interest of religious liberty and an improved educational system, both public and private schools should have the unrestricted opportunity to advance their programs free of control and without concern for raising constitutional questions. For this reason, I have constantly opposed the concept of expanded general Federal aid to education.

I have consistently supported those educational programs where I think the Federal Government has a clearly delineated area of responsibility such as impacted areas assistance, NDEA, vocational education, and so forth.

The second approach is to repeal some of the tax sources at the Federal level, thereby permitting the States to enact legislation to pick these tax sources for their own use and purposes. I believe this holds some possibilities for the future.

The third approach is the tax-sharing concept which seems to increase in acceptance and favor as the most logical and politically feasible approach because it tends to provide needed funds while at the same time developing a trend away from central Federal control of our educational system.

As a member of the Road Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, I have seen this Nation develop one of the finest interstate highway and road systems in the world. This has been accomplished because we developed a positive method of financing this system.

I believe a similar opportunity exists to develop an educational system that can be the world's greatest, providing we take into consideration the many variables in existence throughout this country and develop the type of tax structure revisions that will permit accentuation of the positive aspects of existing institutions and organizations.

The entire Federal system of Government, local, State, and Federal, must cooperate and participate in this tax revision but with two-thirds of the revenue being collected through the Federal tax collection system, we have the responsibility here in the Congress to start this revision, thereby permitting the States to follow suit.

I believe the Quie amendment is a start in the right direction. I hope it is passed so that we can get on with completing the job ahead.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7819. I believe very deeply that this bill represents in many respects the work of a generation. It enjoys a degree of bipartisan support, and always has had that support in the committee and on the floor.

I believe that that act has made possible significant assistance to some 8.3 million disadvantaged children in more than 17,000 school districts. It has helped, in terms of access to books and materials, some 49 million students and 1.9 million teachers.

We are all familiar with its various innovative programs.

In the current bill, I believe it is proper to extend this legislation through 1969, but I am concerned over the serious underfunding of title I. I would have wished, I believe along with Members on both sides of the aisle, that there had been full funding and a request from the administration for full funding of title I of $2.4 billion rather than $1.2 billion.

It is fine that this legislation deals with the Teacher Corps. I believe in this Corps, and I believe it is doing creative work.

To cite just two examples of the achievements of Teacher Corps teams, in New York City interns are conducting a special class for students with reading problems. Given the individual attention that the interns' small group instruction permitted, eight pupils increased their reading comprehension by 1½ grades in a period of only 4 months. In Milwaukee, Wis., a Teacher Corps team has assisted in putting 45 of the school's 250 multiple failures back on the "passing" list.

In the debate today, however, I should like to deal particularly with two areas.

The first concerns the question of the guidelines and of civil rights. It is important, I believe, that we do nothing to diminish the full force and effect of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the regulations and guidelines which the Office of Education has established to implement that law. In a word, there must be no retreat on enforcement and no backing down on our commitment.

In 1954 the Supreme Court established the clear proposition that maintenance of segregated dual school systems violates the U.S. Constitution. We in Congress, in enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964, established the machinery to assure full compliance with that constitutional mandate. We can afford no indication of faltering in our commitment to see to it that disadvantaged youth who have suffered so long under the blight of segregated schooling are now given the fullest opportunity to enjoy an equal education.

I would urge the Committee to accept no amendment which would weaken the impact of what we have already accomplished or break in any way our solemn commitment to educational opportunity for all.

Earlier in the debate there was some discussion of uniform application of enforcement policy. It is my understanding that title VI applies to all our States and that it reaches every American. However, to be explicit, recently there was action by the Office of Education in Cairo, Ill. Here I believe there was a Negro school and a school for whites. There was immediate action taken there to see that this condition no longer continued. There have been other instances where the Office of Education has taken action in the North where there have been gerrymandered attendance lines and where there have been transfer policies that are clearly discriminatory. The point very simply is that title VI of the Civil Rights Act applies to any discrimination in education arising out of State or local law or school policy wherever it might occur in these United States. In my judgment, the Office of Education has pursued, and gives every indication of continuing to pursue enforcement of the law against impermissible discrimination whether in the North or South.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the Quie amendment. AL QUIE, in my judgment, is one of the ablest and most sincere Members of this House. I do, however, have a basic disagreement with him on aspects of his particular amendment. I believe that the proposed substitute could be felt by educationally deprived children in individual States across the Nation with disadvantaged young people in my own State of New York suffering the heaviest loss of funds. In my view, and I believe in the view of Congressman BELL with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Education and Labor Committee, the following points are of serious concern.

First, the proposed amendment would substitute a less precise formula for the present clear and unmistakable Congressional intent to provide financial assistance to all—and I repeat "all"—disadvantaged children.

Second the proposed substitute would tend to deprive the large cities of substantial amounts of money, particularly New York City, which is already receiving less than adequate assistance.

Third, the proposed substitute would tend to take funds away from the poverty-stricken rural areas of the South which have the greatest need.

Fourth, by making local school district allotments a matter for State determination, the substitute could remove the assurance of the exact entitlement that the cities and local districts now enjoy. Indeed, there is no guarantee under the substitute amendment that cities and other areas in serious need would get any specific entitlement at all.

Fifth, the proposed substitute fails to take into account at all the cost of education, which varies widely from State to State.

Sixth, the national debate on the substitute threatens, in my judgment, to reopen serious questions as to the permissibility of greater State discretion in providing assistance for educationally deprived children who attend private schools.

I think it is very clear that those States in which a large percentage of children are disadvantaged get more than proportional amounts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and would get less money under the Quie substitute. Those States with only a small percentage of disadvantaged children would get more money than they would receive under ESEA.

I think that this table, which compares

in nine States the percentage of disadvantaged children eligible under title I and the difference between the State allotment under the committee bill and under the Quie formula is illustrative of this point. This table assumes the full authorization in the substitute of $3 billion and the "floor" provision, and the committee bill authorization prorated to $3 billion, using the $3,000 low-income factor for fiscal year 1969:

	Percentage of school-age population counted under low-income factor in title I formula	Difference between allotment under ESEA and under Quie formula
Alabama	36	−$22,497,050
Louisiana	31	−10,856,678
Mississippi	51	−38,825,811
North Carolina	37	−36,487,372
New York	12	−92,372,379
Ohio	10	−57,677,842
Minnesota	15	+7,431,917
Connecitcut	7	+3,495,378
Indiana	18	+24,751,592

Further, Mr. Chairman, by including one-half of the State per pupil expenditure in the formula, ESEA takes into account the fact that it costs more to educate children in high-income areas and in urban areas which have concentrations of low-income families that have an impact upon the ability of local educational agencies to support educational programs.

For example, the Office of Education estimates that the average annual salary of a classroom teacher in New York is $7,700 while that of a teacher in Mississippi is $4,190. On the basis of the number of disadvantaged children in each of the two States, New York would have to pay twice as much in teachers' salaries as Mississippi: some $160 million in New York and some $56 million in Mississippi.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I shall yield to the gentleman in just 1 second.

Mr. QUIE. All I would like to do is just to have the gentleman explain for the RECORD the tables with which the gentleman has tried to prove his point to the effect that these States will receive less, because I consider the point to be inaccurate.

Mr. REID of New York. I shall be happy to put them in the RECORD.

This table, which was prepared by the Office of Education, compares State allotments for fiscal year 1969, assuming the full authorization of $3 billion requested in the substitute amendments and the "floor" provision, under which no State would receive less money in years subsequent to fiscal year 1968 than it did in fiscal year 1968. That is column 1. The figures listed in column 2 are based on the committee bill authorization of $3.3 billion prorated down to $3 billion with a "floor" provision—so we are comparing equal authorizations—and the formula which utilizes a low-income factor of $3,000 and the State or National average per pupil expenditure, whichever is higher. Figures for fiscal year 1969 are used since that is the first year in which the "block grant" amendments of the substitute would take effect.

Comparison of amounts under H.R. 8983, as amended and Public Law 89-10, title I, II, III, and V, fiscal year 1969

[Public Law 89-10 authorization prorated to $3,000,000,000]

	Quie bill, H.R. 8983 [1]	Public Law 89-10 [2]	Net gain or loss (col. 2 minus col. 1)
United States and outlying areas	$3,000,000,000	$3,000,000,000	
50 States and the District of Columbia	2,910,178,424	2,924,208,181	
Alabama	74,835,472	97,332,522	−$22,497,050
Alaska	4,105,255	5,110,397	−1,005,142
Arizona	30,223,631	23,538,957	+6,684,674
Arkansas	39,010,766	60,038,077	−21,027,311
California	205,710,592	190,939,082	+14,772,510
Colorado	31,705,347	24,694,197	+7,011,150
Connecticut	28,043,253	24,547,775	+3,495,478
Delaware	6,377,716	6,422,093	−43,377
Florida	88,422,327	86,200,051	+2,222,276
Georgia	87,889,065	107,823,323	−19,934,258
Hawaii	11,648,807	7,715,697	+3,933,110
Idaho	14,066,153	9,580,495	+4,485,158
Illinois	119,238,436	116,733,381	+2,505,055
Indiana	75,928,924	51,177,332	+24,751,592
Iowa	44,103,870	40,986,002	+3,117,868
Kansas	35,064,616	27,595,918	+7,468,698
Kentucky	62,829,289	79,832,201	−17,002,912
Louisiana	78,379,838	89,236,606	−10,856,768
Maine	17,437,311	13,489,566	+3,947,745
Maryland	50,895,492	39,516,176	+11,379,000
Massachusetts	60,618,256	45,650,273	+14,967,983
Michigan	132,246,570	87,334,294	+44,912,276
Minnesota	61,257,823	53,825,906	+7,431,917
Mississippi	51,910,849	90,736,660	−38,825,811
Missouri	63,973,446	66,573,562	−2,600,116
50 States and the District of Columbia—Continued			
Montana	$13,251,163	$10,310,215	+$2,940,948
Nebraska	23,078,948	21,176,917	+1,902,031
Nevada	4,497,830	3,963,884	+533,946
New Hampshire	10,234,581	6,307,742	+3,926,839
New Jersey	69,913,128	64,802,067	+5,111,061
New Mexico	23,338,295	20,431,373	+2,906,922
New York	168,888,746	261,261,126	−92,372,380
North Carolina	100,597,755	137,085,127	−36,487,372
North Dakota	13,313,872	13,477,090	−163,218
Ohio	159,172,943	101,495,101	+57,677,842
Oklahoma	40,506,119	43,889,137	−3,383,018
Oregon	29,070,150	21,452,354	+7,617,796
Pennsylvania	157,460,903	129,410,048	+28,050,855
Rhode Island	11,189,677	10,260,193	+929,484
South Carolina	56,728,871	81,842,887	−25,114,016
South Dakota	14,094,710	15,178,334	−1,083,624
Tennessee	74,600,602	94,788,294	−20,187,692
Texas	197,898,252	203,295,006	−5,396,754
Utah	21,882,339	10,154,409	+11,727,930
Vermont	7,246,556	6,171,922	+1,074,634
Virginia	77,006,058	81,950,802	−4,944,744
Washington	42,943,629	29,896,644	+13,046,985
West Virginia	36,207,373	44,208,558	−8,001,185
Wisconsin	67,481,212	47,754,755	+19,726,457
Wyoming	5,887,929	5,035,150	+852,779
District of Columbia	7,763,679	11,978,504	−4,214,825
Outlying areas	89,821,576	75,791,819	+14,029,757

[1] $3,000,000,000 distributed with 3 percent withheld for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the State products of (1) NDEA allotment ratios, fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969 and (2) estimated 5-17 population, July 1, 1965, with "floor" of Public Law 89-10 fiscal year 1968 estimated allotments.

[2] Public Law 89-10 authorization of $3,299,467,883 for titles I, II, III, and V, fiscal year 1969 (col. 2 of table 1, April 4, 1967), prorated to $3,000,000,000, with "floor"; $3,000 low-income factor.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of New York State, the figures make clear that despite the fact that New York has a high incidence of poverty, and despite the high cost of education in New York, the Quie formula, if adopted, would penalize the State because its average personal income is above the national average.

The vastly reduced State allotment—given full authorization in both bills—could mean that New York City would be especially hard hit. On the basis of past ratios, the city stands to lose some $50 million to $55 million. Mayor John Lindsay has stated that:

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act makes possible programs directed at the special problems of the disadvantaged. Failure to extend present categories of financial aid in this area would be disruptive of current efforts which are beginning to bear fruit and of future progress as well.

He goes on to say:

From the point of view of total financial impact, both New York State and New York City are likely to lose a considerable amount of federal aid. Assuming that the substitute program and the existing program are funded at the same level of about $3 billion, New York State would receive $93 billion less under the substitute than it does under the present program.

Mayor Lindsay writes that:

This is a matter of grave concern to New York City, for it is obvious that when the State receives less money from the federal government, the City will also receive less.

Mr. Chairman, he continues:

While it is not clear how much of the reduction would be borne—

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REID of New York. Further quoting Mayor Lindsay, Mr. Chairman:

While it is unclear how much of the reduction would be borne by the city, on the basis of past ratios the city may well lose as much as $50–$55 million.

He concludes his letter by saying:

Under the circumstances, I should think that retention of the present law would be preferable.

Mr. Chairman, New York City's plight is illustrative on a large scale of the diffi-

culties and uncertainties the substitute amendment could impose on local school districts across the country. Cities such as Buffalo and Rochester, N.Y., could be seriously affected. In making local allotments a matter for State determination, the substitute affords no specific guarantee that funds will go to all local districts that serve disadvantaged children. The substitute fails to recognize both the high concentration of disadvantaged youth in our large cities and the high cost of education in certain States. Local districts now know not only if they will receive funds, but they also know their precise entitlement as soon as the appropriation act is passed. The proposed amendment would remove these assurances and might well substitute confusion and delay in educational planning.

Further, there is a serious question about the ability and initiative of many State school officials to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and to insure that the intent of the Congress, that all disadvantaged children—regardless of race, color, or national origin—receive equal assistance, will be carried into the local school districts.

In addition, more than half of our States have constitutional or statutory provisions prohibiting the expenditure of public funds for private schools. During the formulation and enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a sensitive and delicate balance was struck which has permitted disadvantaged youths attending private schools to share in the benefits of this program. The greater discretion afforded State education departments under the substitute might make these provisions applicable and result in court decisions holding such aid unconstitutional or unlawful. Moreover, the very uncertainty of this legal situation threatens to create discord and vitiate cooperative efforts which are now being undertaken.

Finally, I am deeply distressed that the education of our disadvantaged youth appears to have become a matter of intense partisan political activity on both sides. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was enacted substantially as a bipartisan effort; its drafting was the work of dedicated Members on both sides of the aisle. It is in this spirit that we should move ahead to assure the sound continuation of what we have already accomplished.

In my judgment, the Republican Party has an unparalleled opportunity in this session of Congress to establish a record in which we can all take pride.

Republican initiatives can provide meaningful alternatives to administration proposals. Greater flexibility in the allocation of education funds and some progress toward block grants should be considered, but these concepts must be thought through and approached cautiously on an experimental basis in the first instance. Our party should fight for full and early appropriations under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the reduction of 50 percent offered by the administration is clearly against the public interest and represents a step backwards. Our party should unite in support of the Teacher Corps and work toward its receiving its necessary appropriations, particularly in light of the halfhearted support the administration has given it.

In my view, however, this is neither the time nor the place to abandon the essential character of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in favor of a program which has not met the test of full hearings and committee consideration and which could undermine the concept of assuring full aid to all the disadvantaged. This, in my judgment, does not represent the best our party has to offer.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, this is an accurate comparison of State allotments under first, the existing act; second, the act as modified by the administration bill; and, third, the formula of the Quie amendment. It is accurate because it uses an identical amount—that of the budget for fiscal 1968 for titles I, II, III, and V of the act. It was prepared at my request by the U.S. Office of Education.

My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], has been comparing unlike authorizations, and moreover has not used the actual authorization of the committee bill, H.R. 7819.

This accurate comparison should set this matter right:

Comparison of amounts under existing ESEA, H.R. 7819, as approved by House Committee on Education and Labor, and proposed amendment by Representative Quie, fiscal year 1968

	ESEA, fiscal year 1968 [1]	Fiscal year 1968, H.R. 7819 as reported [2]	Proposed fiscal year 1968 amount, Quie amendment distribution [3]	Net gain or loss from Quie amendment compared to H.R. 7819 (col. 3 minus col. 2)
U.S. and outlying areas	$1,581,695,000	$1,581,695,000	$1,581,695,000	
50 States and the District of Columbia	1,543,293,592	1,543,313,845	1,534,244,150	$9,069,695
Alabama	50,803,205	37,773,016	39,534,006	1,760,990
Alaska	2,824,943	3,270,623	2,168,720	1,101,903
Arizona	12,524,604	14,202,418	15,966,509	1,764,091
Arkansas	31,335,705	22,278,585	20,608,576	1,670,018
California	101,382,743	126,654,043	108,672,580	17,981,463
Colorado	13,200,905	15,136,118	16,749,268	1,613,150
Connecticut	13,227,245	15,991,825	14,814,661	1,177,164
Delaware	3,543,245	4,130,296	3,369,213	761,083
Florida	45,346,736	41,420,039	46,711,657	5,291,618
Georgia	56,322,027	42,775,971	46,429,945	3,653,974
Hawaii	4,249,003	4,317,160	6,153,820	1,836,660
Idaho	5,200,502	4,621,683	7,430,853	2,809,170
Illinois	61,908,353	76,513,408	62,991,158	13,522,250
Indiana	27,293,672	28,234,817	40,111,654	11,876,837
Iowa	21,705,328	22,731,250	23,299,147	567,897
Kansas	14,706,855	15,387,836	18,523,899	3,136,063
Kentucky	41,708,270	33,150,932	33,191,393	40,461
Louisiana	46,677,288	42,869,661	41,406,421	1,463,240
Maine	7,258,679	6,059,508	9,211,765	3,152,257
Maryland	21,067,146	24,862,531	26,887,018	2,024,487
Massachusetts	24,484,192	27,968,801	32,023,350	4,054,549
Michigan	46,571,383	54,581,296	69,863,082	15,281,786
Minnesota	28,482,453	31,043,174	32,361,220	1,518,046
Mississippi	47,219,356	33,498,246	27,423,410	6,074,836
Missouri	35,120,947	36,686,756	33,795,826	2,890,930
50 States and the District of Columbia—Continued				
Montana	$5,579,747	$5,957,382	$7,000,311	$1,042,929
Nebraska	11,285,549	9,891,751	12,192,123	2,300,372
Nevada	2,265,633	2,520,463	2,376,109	144,354
New Hampshire	3,507,104	3,390,075	5,406,714	2,016,639
New Jersey	34,510,472	41,981,630	36,933,636	5,047,994
New Mexico	10,853,586	12,328,063	12,329,131	1,068
New York	137,139,320	169,961,011	86,629,283	8,331,728
North Carolina	71,442,843	56,024,766	53,143,679	2,881,087
North Dakota	7,195,927	6,998,285	7,033,439	35,154
Ohio	54,079,745	57,349,533	84,087,718	26,738,185
Oklahoma	23,125,328	21,729,919	21,398,531	331,388
Oregon	11,510,109	13,016,156	15,357,149	2,340,993
Pennsylvania	68,504,229	76,733,297	83,183,284	6,449,987
Rhode Island	5,568,721	6,462,490	5,911,271	551,219
South Carolina	42,678,163	0,925,333	29,968,670	956,663
South Dakota	8,087,434	38,425,951	7,445,939	980,012
Tennessee	49,491,085	36,073,629	39,409,930	3,336,301
Texas	106,458,391	96,583,023	104,545,485	7,962,462
Utah	5,568,510	5,687,677	11,559,980	5,872,303
Vermont	3,397,958	3,217,126	3,828,204	611,078
Virginia	42,979,418	37,751,370	40,680,681	2,929,311
Washington	16,046,310	18,046,806	22,686,216	4,639,410
West Virginia	23,173,957	18,784,299	19,127,594	343,295
Wisconsin	25,450,868	26,470,989	35,648,906	9,177,917
Wyoming	2,892,763	3,124,849	3,110,469	14,380
District of Columbia	6,425,637	7,717,979	3,550,556	4,167,423
Outlying areas	38,401,408	38,381,155	47,450,850	9,069,695

[1] Total of title I, $1,200,000,000 as reduced from authorization of $2,442,337,720 ($3,000 per annum, 50 percent estimated State or national average CE per ADA, 1965-66) without "floor"; title II, $105,000,000; title III, $240,000,000; title V total, $44,750,000, $36,695,000 distributed.

[2] Total of title I, $1,200,000,000 as reduced from authorization of $1,504,341,263 ($2,000 per annum, 50 percent estimated State CE per ADA, 1965-66) without "floor"; other titles as in footnote 1.

[3] Total estimated fiscal year 1968 amount distributed with 3 percent reserved for the outlying areas, and the balance distributed on the basis of (1) NDEA allotment ratios, fiscal year 1968-69 and (2) the 5 to 17 population, July 1, 1965, without "floor" provision.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a well-structured and delicately balanced instrument designed to rework the fabric of education in America, to broaden educational services and, most important, to improve them.

But how does this change take place? First, trained educational profession-

als, must perform the fundamental research into how children can best be taught, what elements of their environment need to be changed to make the learning process a more efficient and pleasant one for them, what approaches by teachers bring the best result in classrooms, what blends of curriculum have the most beneficial effects.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in title IV, provides for this fundamental research. How can we translate this research into action, how do we move findings out of the laboratories and into the classrooms of America?

The answer, and the flywheel in the delicately balanced instrument of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is title III. "Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," was designed to make this transition possible. Under title III local school districts are encouraged to use their imagination, to break out of the stultifying old ways of doing business—to change.

Title III is the change agent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is the title that permits the school superintendent and the teachers and the principals to sit down and think back on all the earth-shaking ideas they had when they were fresh out of teachers college, and to hone those ideas, polish them, and update them to meet the pressing educational problems of the 1960's.

All too often I hear criticism of this country's teachers, criticism which labels them as unimaginative, unproductive, ineffective. Well, teacher by teacher that just is not so. But of course you cannot view the educational system on a teacher-by-teacher basis. Every young graduate, fresh with enthusiasm, fired with energy and dedication, enters an educational system that all too often is unimaginative, unproductive, ineffective.

And what can that one young person do? Not much. And so he buries his ambitions and his dreams for change until he can work his way up through the system and become a principal. Then, he reasons, he will be in a position of power to really get things going. Of course, as soon as he becomes principal he realizes that he is faced not only with a board of education hostile to change, but a faculty which has forgotten its ambitions, and which—all too frequently—prefers to ignore present needs that must be met.

Our promising young teacher would still like to rework the curriculum, still like to set up special services for emotionally disturbed children, still like to work something out with that sharp young principal across the State line. But there are other needs: Teachers' salaries, desks, textbooks, repainting the gym, the whole range. And so his dreams are sidetracked, and so is desperately needed change.

Title III has started to change all that. Title III is a seed just starting to germinate in a crevice of the monolithic boulder of education; and as that seed is nurtured, as it grows, it will ultimately split that boulder asunder. Because the funds in title III are earmarked for innovation and change, principals and superintendents who want to spend the funds available can now give vent to their lifelong ambitions—and change.

By funding title III, we have turned on a fountain of ideas and permitted it to flow. Thus far that fountain is a mere trickle in the educational desert, but it shows great promise.

Mr. Harry L. Phillips, then Chief of the Program Advisory Branch of the Office of Education's Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, wrote in the April 1966 issue of American Education magazine that—

> Schools are pushing back their educational horizons: exploring the problems of building a nongraded high school (Athens, Ohio), conducting an annual festival of the performing arts (Orangeburg, South Carolina), or building an Inter-American Educational Center (San Antonio, Texas).
>
> The kinds of educational projects that Title III makes possible are limited only by the imagination and creativity of individual school districts, and we are fast finding that this creativity knows no bounds. In fact, the range of creativity makes it difficult to categorize the projects because each project is unique—subtly keyed to the needs of a particular school or community.

Even my own New York City has taken modest strides to push back its educational horizons. Projects funded during the first three seeding periods include musical ensemble performances which are being brought to all fourth through sixth graders in the public elementary schools in the city and to all fourth through sixth graders in parochial schools in three of the city counties.

Moreover, these concerts, featuring professional musicians who can perform anything from a Mozart string quartet to folk music, are performing for the youngsters in the 600 schools in New York, the schools for children with severe behavorial problems.

As most of you are probably well aware, most of New York City children are deprived in their access to green open space—to nature, fresh air, knowledge of the earth—by their imprisoning environment of concrete and asphalt. Well, another title III project is setting about to alter that somewhat. Children from public, private, and parochial schools are participating in a year-round program of nature study and conservation at Staten Island's High Rock Park.

In another project, 50 selected schools are being serenaded by the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. The Lincoln Center staff prepares youngsters before performances with study guides, bibliographies, discographies, and other instructional materials and then visits the schools with solo recitals, chamber music, drama, dance, and opera. Without title III, this kind of cultural enrichment would not be possible.

And there are so many more: planning for an educational park, offering creative art classes for 3- to 9-year-olds, planning a center to reduce reading retardation, and, a massive project, running a supplementary educational center in the social sciences and humanities for the city. But not only New York is involved. This center, designed to plan, initiate, demonstrate, and evaluate programs and procedures for improving instruction in the social sciences and humanities, cuts across State lines and includes all public and nonprofit private schools on Long Island, and in Westchester County in New York State, Bergen, Hudson, and Union Counties in New Jersey, and Fairfield County in Connecticut.

As Harold B. Gores, president of Educational Facilities Laboratory, has said:

> Title III is providing the first venture capital that many educators have ever had. It is not surprising that many school districts think small and cheap—they have never had the resources in the past with which to think in larger terms.

So, by providing funds dedicated to change and quality, we are, through title III, allowing local schoolteachers and administrators to show their educational mettle—their capacity to create and administer educational change, experimentation, and innovation in challenging, new, and daring directions.

As Norman D. Kurland, director of the Center on Innovation in Education, of the New York State Education Department has put it, in "Theory Into Practice," a publication of Ohio State University:

> When possible solutions are found, Title III money can help to try them out in ways that may not win immediate acceptance from a city council, a school board, or the public. Title III should be risk capital and the risk should be that the idea may fail. It is tried, however, because if it succeeds it should hold promise of dealing significantly with a significant problem.
>
> Title III is a big, fast-growing program—

Everett M. Rogers, associate professor, Department of Communication, Michigan State University, writes in "Catalyst for Change," a national study of Elementary and Secondary Education Act title III.

> It is receiving favorable reaction from educators, in part, because they perceive it is a type of Federal assistance with a minimum of top-down control.

Because of the way the U.S. Office of Education administers title III, there is not so much control as there is assistance. When school district X submits a project, which is then recommended by the State department of education and passed on to USOE, the experts go over it with tooth and comb, often going out to talk with the school officials and examining the situation, and suggesting recommendations and revisions. It is a team effort, combining local knowledge of problems with top-flight expertise to polish the proposals set forth to meet those problems so that the best possible programs will be funded.

The amendment proposed by my colleagues would only ring down the curtain on the promising opening months of educational change under title III. At present, States exercise the power of recommending individual title III proposals for approval by the U.S. Office of Education. Under the amendments proposed by Mr. QUIE and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, the States would be given an absolute veto power over individual project submissions.

At present, interestingly enough, more than 95 percent of the projects generated at the local level in the school districts

of America—and approved by the U.S. Office of Education have previously been approved by the States. The partnership is working.

A distinguished educator Mr. Melvin W. Barnes, superintendent of schools of Portland, Oreg., has written:

For what they may be worth, I am listing a few reactions to the Quie amendment which would modify the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. . . .

ESEA is still relatively new to us. We are learning to use it. This legislation should be continued for a while without major disturbance. . . .

Such goals as the reduction of red tape are commendable, but I doubt that state departments of education would reduce it. In my experience, federal red tape is preferable to the State variety. . . .

State departments of education are not prepared to handle ESEA. Basic to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are some sound ideas such as (1) teaching the disadvantaged (Title I) and (2) stimulating creative solutions to schools problems (Title III.) State departments of education are generally rural-oriented and given to a regulatory style of administration. I question whether they are equipped to administer such important legislation. They handle federal funds and they handle state funds. They are stuck with outmoded distribution formulas; they may respond to political concerns more than to educational. . . .

Mr. Barnes questions the abilities of the States to administer any of Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Right now, of course, titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—titles designed primarily to overcome deficiencies in educational quantities—are administered by the States, simply because Congress felt that States could best handle matters of quantity on a statewide basis.

But title III is designed to stimulate and encourage quality—innovative and exemplary achievements—for the benefit of all American education, and Congress felt that title III would best be administered by the Federal Government. This has been done through a nationwide selection process based on the independent judgment of recognized experts who are free from the local or regional pressure that plump for particular projects or per capita allocation of funds.

At one point, I recall, my able colleague from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAS, was questioning Dr. Paul Briggs, superintendent of schools of Cleveland, about title III, and Dr. Briggs said:

I would like to think that there might be some appeal above the State level. The experience we have had in Ohio in the past, and I am sure it would not be repeated in the future because there are being some real improvements, indicated an unfriendly State department of public instruction to urban areas.

For example, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as the State planned, was first established for the distribution of these funds in Ohio which would not have included a single dime to be spent in any one of the eight larger cities of the State. This was never the intent of this Congress.

If it had not been for massive newspaper and news media support, that money would have all gone into rural areas and none of it into the areas of unemployment. I dislike having to use the weapon of the news media to force a State into putting the money where Congress originally intended it should go. I doubt that this situation will ever occur again.

But it just seems to me that at the source of the appropriation there should also be perhaps an opportunity to appeal.

At the heart of Dr. Briggs' opposition to vesting final authority in the State department of education was the one-sidedness, the rural power domination that the body exercised. This is all too frequently the case in many of our States. Under the Green-Quie amendments these rurally oriented State departments could, if they wished, disapprove all proposals dealing with the problems of big cities. Or, for that matter, they could use title III funds just for a single purpose in the State, or for a limited range of problems—stocking film libraries, or buying reading vans, or what have you.

Again, we must harken back to the essential element of title III—change, innovation—coming in from all over the country forming a wonderful kaleidoscope of creativity that is being disseminated rapidly across the country.

This process of dissemination—of passing on the word—is not now being given as much emphasis as it should, but it is taking place. Title III has been given the acronym of PACE—Projects To Advance Creativity in Education—by the Office of Education. At the end of each funding period, PACE puts out a booklet called "Pacesetters in Innovation" describing all the projects approved during that period on a State-by-State basis, and breaking them down as to purpose, cost, and subject matter. These booklets are widely distributed in the hope that a school district hoping to receive funding through title III may get some ideas of what is being done elsewhere and take advantage of them.

Additionally, the U.S. Office of Education magazine, American Education, has been running a series of profiles on different PACE projects across the country. This handsome magazine also has a wide readership.

There are some other problems that crop up with the Quie-Green approach of investing the States with a veto power: Virgil C. Blum, S.J., professor of political science at Marquette University, one of our great Catholic schools, in a letter to me, referring to the proposed Quie substitute, concludes:

If given complete discretion in the expenditure of Federal funds provided for the welfare and education of the Nation's disadvantaged children, there can be little doubt that the states would, with some exceptions, deny the benefits of Federal funds to deprived children attending church-related schools.

Another question is the competency of the State departments to administer a program dedicated to change. The problems they have experienced in administering title I, a title not dedicated to change, which problems have been fully discussed during the committee hearings on Elementary and Secondary Education Act, reflect negatively on the ability of all the States to administer a program of this kind without assistance.

This is just a reiteration of what Superintendent Barnes of Portland said. We Members of Congress recognized this fact when first we passed Elementary and Secondary Education Act by including title V designed to strengthen State departments of education. I seriously doubt that Mr. QUIE or Mrs. GREEN of Oregon would suggest that there was no need for title V when we passed Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or that title V has completed its job in the last 18 months.

The State departments of education were in trouble when we passed Elementary and Secondary Education Act and they are still in trouble now. They are understaffed, underpaid, lack the requisite number of highly qualified professionals to do the job required, and very often are simply out of touch with what is going on at the cutting edge of education. In some States the chief State school officer is paid as little as $11,500 per year. You just cannot get or keep educators of quality, vision, and leadership at that salary.

The report of Professor Miller of the University of Kentucky, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, bears this out. Based on returns from 47 States on questions asked of administrators in charge of State title III programs, the report reveals that only 10 States have full-time title III coordinators; the rest do not. And of these remaining 37, nearly half of them gave less than 50 percent of their time to title III, and half of that group gave less than 10 percent of their time to it. This ho-hum approach to title III was going on when title V funds were available to the States to beef up their abilities. Surely, this indicates a lack of commitment to educational change on the part of a significant number of our States.

And most interesting and revealing was the report that of the 723 title III project directors queried, only 10 percent said they would prefer more State authority than at present.

In brief, then, what are the problems with the proposed substitutes of Mr. QUIE and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon?

First, there would be a total frustration of purpose of title III. Acceptance of either the Quie or the Green substitutes would effectively emasculate this bold new program. An idea designed to encourage and foster change on a nationwide front would, through adoption of the Quie-Green proposals, result in stagnation at the State level. Because many of the State departments do not have the wherewithal—the professional personnel, the resources, the will—to handle the job, ideas submitted by local schools could not receive the polishing and encouraging they now receive from the U.S. Office of Education.

Second, educational gerrymandering. Some States, refusing to reflect the national view of equality of educational opportunity, could foster inequities in the title III programs through their administration of them—depriving children of educational progress and educational change because of the way they believe in God or because of the color of their skin.

Most important for all of us to realize is that we will soon be voting to determine the future of educational progress in this Nation, voting to determine the

futures of millions of American children. We hold a sacred trust for these children and it is our responsibility to act in their best interests.

We want to validate the principle of local control of the destiny of our schools; the opposition wants to impose a roadblock to this local control. Local school districts should be given the chance to create an educational system to meet their own unique educational needs. This can best be done by giving them the tools and the resources to work out their own salvations.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to divert my colleague from New York on this very important point.

I do understand how the church-state issue could become involved, and I understand that mention of this has been raised during my absence from the floor.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question—I repeat, there is no question that as the title has been operated there has been absolutely no question of the issue of church-state in the various States, because the money has flowed through a public agency, and there has been no question of the involvement of a State's constitution prohibiting the use of such funds through the public school authorities. And the authorities on education, as I understand, have endorsed the manner in which this has been operated, and say that it has been operated to the complete satisfaction of all parties involved.

However, if I read the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon correctly, and I will state that I have read it very carefully, under the new plan it would rifle the money into the State and the State would promulgate the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the knowledge of my colleague from New York with relation to the laws of the State of New York, that this would mean that once the funds are brought into the State treasury, and become State funds as such, that they will come under the church-state prohibition in the Constitution, just as they would in the majority of the State constitutions in this country, and therefore it becomes a real question, and the settlement of such a question as to the use of such public funds in nonpublic schools could not be resolved at the Federal level, but would have to be fought out—and I emphasize that term—at the State level.

Mr. SCHEUER. I will agree that where there is commingling of Federal and State funds there is serious doubt in my mind whether under the constitution of the State of New York we could take advantage of title III.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman in the well be recognized for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the gentleman from Kentucky is in control of the time.

Mr. PERKINS. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. SCHEUER. I would be glad to yield, but I only have 1 minute more.

Mr. Chairman, we have a vehicle that has worked well.

I have a letter from the U.S. Catholic Conference in which they say:

> We are firmly convinced that changing Title III as suggested by Mrs. GREEN would result in the diminution, and in some States possibly the termination of services for children in private schools.

To answer the question of my colleague from New York, we have a machine that was sculptured primarily to chart new byways and highways toward creative, innovative approaches toward resolving the disparate educational deprivation of our children. Let us get on with it, let us give the municipalities and the States of our country a chance to use this excellent machinery that we have created for them to make significant improvements in the quality of education they offer our children.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I support the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because it is a step in the direction of supporting individual needs of the States' school districts. Incidentally, the Governor of my State, the Honorable Daniel J. Evans, and State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Louis Bruno, both favor this amendment because they recognize its merits from the State's standpoint to meet the State's needs. They see that block grants will cut administrative costs and reduce the amount of Federal control over local education.

Throughout the public discussion outside this body in recent weeks, we have read and heard much in the way of false representation and misrepresentations about the supposed adverse nature of the amendment. It is obvious that a great many people fail to comprehend what the Elementary and Secondary Education Act does and does not do. For example, it does not provide general Federal aid to education. This is Federal money for specific projects designed to benefit educationally disadvantaged or culturally deprived children, to purchase textbooks and library and instructional materials, and to establish educational centers for specific purposes.

As it has been, local school districts that wanted to carry out the purposes of this law had to get approval of the Federal Government. This has meant redtape, delay, and Federal bureaucratic control. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Quie amendment because it calls for all programs to be administered through a single State plan submitted by the State educational agency and approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. In this way each State would be able to establish its own priorities and organize its programs in those specific areas covered by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, according to the needs of which only they are so dramatically aware.

Meanwhile, let me emphasize that under the Quie amendment, no State would get less money than it would under the bill as reported by the Education and Labor Committee. Also, it would in no way interfere with the delicate balance between aid to public and private schools.

In essence, the Quie bill does only one thing: it gives the State priority in setting up its own programs as against the Federal Commissioner of Education.

As for my State of Washington, Mr. Chairman, under the Quie amendment, as I am told, if the budget request is fully funded we would get $22,686,216. Under the committee bill, on the other hand, I believe the State would only receive $18,046,806. That is figuring that both allocations would be on the same basis; namely, of the President's budget request.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, previous gentlemen from New York have indicated that the Quie amendment would not bring equity into title I. May I suggest the following figures to point out that there will not now be equity in dealing with deprived children under the H.R. 7819.

Let us examine the States of Kentucky and New York as a case in point.

First of all, in Kentucky, according to the census, we have 282,000 school-age children in families with incomes under $3,000, and in New York we have 374,000 school-age children with family incomes under $3,000.

Under the committee bill, under title I, in 1968 Kentucky will receive $33 million and New York will receive $174 million.

So, Kentucky has two-thirds the number of poor children that New York has, but New York gets over five times as much money next year under the committee bill. Surely this is not equity.

Mr. Chairman, this debate marks a crossroads in the future of American education and indeed will serve as a signpost as we look toward the solutions of the seventies. For the question before us is a basic one—will we continue to center policymaking in education programs in the hands of Federal administrators or can we mold a creative cooperative approach utilizing Federal, State, and local agencies, both public and private?

The people of our Nation made their voice clear on this issue last November when they rejected the present administration's policies. The people spoke out: they put their faith in "proximity government." They spoke out in the belief that that government is best which is closest to the people. The people spoke last November and expressed their firm belief that the programs and ideas of the 1930's and 1940's and 1950's and 1960's will not be adequate to meet the problems of the 1970's.

The people spoke out and said, "Centralism will not work. While the Federal Government has a responsibility to fund, coordinate, and maintain basic standards for programs, it simply cannot and should not do all." That is why a

new structure must be developed, so that State and local unity can be strengthened and developed to serve effectively the educational needs of our Nation. That is why we must turn away from the proliferation process to a program involving proximity decisions.

The Quie amendments, and also to a certain extent the Green amendments, do exactly this. They recognize that the Federal Government must encourage and *fully employ State* and local governments in the educational program. They recognize that the State and local governments must not be allowed to decay because the Federal Government has usurped all their power and initiative. Indeed, only through the sensible use of State and local governmental structures can we avoid ever-continuing centralization of power in the Federal Government and the ever-increasing burdens of Federal paperwork, Federal regulations, and Federal redtape on local school systems.

Let me make clear what the Quie bill does not do. It does not in any way deprive private and parochial schools of Federal funding and aid. In fact, it expands that aid considerably. Secondly, the Quie amendment does not, in any way, change the application of civil rights standards in the distribution of aid. In fact, it seems likely by recent administration maneuvering that it is their bill, not ours, that will soften the application of civil rights standards.

These two issues, civil rights and aid to parochial schools, were resolved in previous Congresses. It has been clearly the sense of the Congress that in dealing with deprived children, private and parochial schools should be involved just as public schools. It has been even more clearly the will of the Nation that civil rights standards be strictly and equally enforced. The Quie amendment does not raise these issues—it confirms and supports the previous sense of Congress.

No, these are not the issues, no matter what type of authoritarian ammunition may be thrown up to cloud the real questions. The issues here are new ones; they are issues of strengthening the States; they are issues of unnecessary Federal control over local educational initiatives. They are the issues of continuing centralism—or creating a new structure to resolve the problems of the seventies—a structure employing the principle of proximity government. The people spoke last November—may their voice be echoed this week on this floor.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question at the time the gentleman who preceded me in the well, the gentleman from Michigan, was making his speech. I did not have the chance to do that, and I do not see him on the floor at this time. He was using figures that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] had used more than once in the RECORD and in press releases. These figures make the allocation and determination on the basis of a full funding something in excess of $3 billion rather than the actual amount of money that everybody in this Congress expects we will be spending under this bill.

There is considerable difference in the way the figures have been put into the RECORD in the past, because the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] uses our figures on the basis of actual expenditures and experience in the distribution of these funds, and he uses a guess with respect to what his formula might do in 1969.

It might be expected that, from what the gentleman had to say with regard to the Quie amendment, any of us from Michigan who opposed that amendment and similar amendments that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is offering to title III would really be committing some sort of political suicide. If you believe the mathematical gymnastics they are indulging in on the other side of the aisle, it looks like we are willing to take a great deal of money from our State and to give it to some other State. I have worked very diligently on my committee to protect Michigan from such a raid. We did it successfully in 1965 and again in 1966 when Members on the floor attempted to take money from the State of Michigan, which, in my opinion, receives less than its fair share, and to give it to other States. I am being consistent in supporting the administration's proposals in the committee bill at this time.

The statement made by the gentleman with regard to the great benefits to my great State of Michigan are without foundation. With regard to the idea of local control, I would like to submit that in our State of Michigan there would probably be as much resentment toward the idea of going to the State office of education as there would be in some other parts of the country in coming to Washington. In our State we have a strong tradition in the idea of locally elected boards of education. In fact, our constitution in a number of instances reserves to those locally elected boards of education specific powers and duties, such as the selection of textbooks, as an example.

What would happen under the proposals advanced here, under several forms of the Quie amendment, is that for the first time in my State there would be put into the hands of the centralized office of education in our State capital decisions that have traditionally by constitution, ever since 1835, been reserved and preserved to the locally elected school boards. I cannot see how anyone could claim that they are in favor of government close to the people when they would take from the school boards the right to come to the source of funds with specific plans and give that power to a State officer. State officials have not heretofore been able to interfere between the school boards and the source of funds in that fashion.

The 89th Congress, which President Johnson has called the Education Congress, took a major step in assuring quality and equality in the education of our Nation's children when it passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The past 2 years have provided overwhelming evidence of the successes of the various programs authorized by the act. Our hopes have been more than fulfilled.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed, Congress voted only a 1-year authorization for its programs. We felt that such a major Federal commitment to the cause of quality education deserved close and continuing congressional attention, to assure that our tradition of State and local control of education was maintained. Last year, in considering the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966, our committee was impressed with the achievements of our country's schools in the portion of the year that funds have been available to them. We recommended, and the Congress approved, a 2-year extension of the act's authorization, through fiscal year 1968.

In the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, as introduced, no further extension of the authorization was proposed. But several days of testimony before the full committee convinced us of the wisdom of extending the life of the act through fiscal year 1969 at this time. There were two major reasons for this decision:

First. School officials across the country have testified to the difficulties they face in adjusting their educational planning to Federal authorization and appropriations schedules. The school year runs from September to June; unless in the early spring school authorities know how much money is going to be available to them for the next school year, or have some idea of the amount, they are unable to hire the best teachers and plan the best programs. Although this extension will not guarantee the amounts to be available for elementary and secondary education for the next 2 fiscal years, it will act as a Federal commitment to the program's continuation and will provide our school districts with some basis on which to plan.

Second. Programs conducted under this act have made a substantial favorable impact on our Nation's educational systems. The strides made toward the achievement of quality education for all children, in my opinion, thoroughly justify the continuation of this Federal promise to the schoolchildren of our country.

Briefly let me describe the purpose of each title of the act which we propose to amend, and why it must be continued in the coming years.

Title I of the act provides for grants to local educational agencies, through State departments of education, to establish programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children, the children of the urban slum and the remote rural area. Last year an estimated 8.3 million deprived children benefited from these programs, conducted by more than 17,000 school districts in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

The programs conducted by local schools across the country recognized the close link between poverty and educa-

tional failure. Almost 5 percent of title I funds were spent on food and health services for children whose prior efforts to learn had been hampered by hunger and poor health. Past learning gaps were also met, as two-thirds of the funds spent the first year for instruction were spent on language, arts, and remedial reading.

For the second year, school districts experienced some difficulty in hiring the specialists necessary for the successful conduct of some programs for the disadvantaged. It is my hope that Teacher Corps members, specially trained in education of deprived children, may alleviate this personnel shortage to some degree. Many school districts utilized teacher aides in their programs, thus freeing highly trained teachers for more professional duties. In our report, the committee applauded this use of subprofessionals and urged their increased utilization. In a time of manpower shortage in the education professions, special training for professional staff, use of subprofessional teacher aides, and new recruitment methods are absolutely essential.

Let me give you some examples of innovative title I programs implemented by the States last year:

Children in New York City remained in school three afternoons a week for special remedial instruction. Tutors were on hand to help them with their homework, and the library was open for browsing.

In the State of Kentucky, a 2-week, tuition-free university workshop in human relations was conducted for 176 public and nonpublic school teachers, and a 2-day orientation session was held for new teachers from inner city schools.

A Pennsylvania community put college juniors and seniors to work as classroom aides. They assisted regular staff members by providing small group instruction in reading, and were especially helpful in encouraging failing secondary students to achieve passing grades and stay in school.

In one summer project in a rural South Dakota town, buses were converted into classrooms. A teacher drove the bus to the farms where the children were living and gave individual and small-group instruction in basic skills.

Such accomplishments fully justify extension of the title through fiscal year 1969. However, the committee was greatly concerned that budget estimtes and appropriations were inadequate to enable the distribution formula to operate equitably. The title I formula authorizes $1,363,962,696 for fiscal year 1967; only $1,053,410,000 was appropriated. For fiscal year 1968, the act provides for a substantial increase in payments to local educational agencies, principally because the low-income factor increases from $2,000 to $3,000 and because half the national average per pupil expenditure will be used in formula computation for those States whose per pupil expenditures are below the national average.

Therefore, if the formula were fully funded for fiscal year 1968, $2,442,337,720 would need to be appropriated; the budget estimate for the fiscal year is $1.2 billion, or about half. If the 1966 amendments were to go into effect in fiscal year 1968, many local school districts would suffer severe cutbacks in funds. Since one of the unique aspects of title I is its local educational agency eligibility for funds, which assures program continuity from year to year, implementation of the amended formula would be self-defeating. For this reason, the committee recommends an amendment which would prevent the use of the $3,000 low-income factor and national average expenditure unless funds are appropriated to fully fund and implement the formula, including those specific changes.

The second part of the law—title II—provides funds for textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials. There can be no doubt that many of our Nation's schools have desperate need for such books. When title II was passed, more than two out of three public elementary schools had no libraries at all, and more than eight out of 10 lacked trained librarians. Public schools spent an average of $2.28 per pupil per year on books, well below the recommended professional standards of $4 to $6.

Title II has gone far to meet these needs. State plans indicate that 49 million students and 1.9 million teachers in public and nonpublic elementary schools now have access to books and materials acquired with Federal assistance.

Since title II is operated on a State plan basis, 5 percent, or a minimum of $50,000, of each State's allotment is available to cover administrative expenses. State educational agencies are making imaginative use of these funds, using them to conduct workshops, to provide consultant services, and to prepare publications for inservice teacher education in selecting and utilizing instructional materials. In addition, 13 States are developing instructional materials centers for demonstration and evaluation, and 19 States have added school library supervisors to their staffs.

Last year the Congress added two new groups of children—Indian children in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior and children in overseas dependent schools operated by the Department of Defense. These provisions received only a 1-year authorization. Therefore, we recommend that they be extended through fiscal year 1969, consistent with the rest of the act.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides for supplementary educational centers and services. This title has two purposes: first, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not otherwise available in a district's schools in sufficient quantity and quality, and second, to develop exemplary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Since the title's enactment, in 1965, more than 4,000 proposals have been submitted by 9,000 school districts. The Commissioner of Education, acting upon recommendations of the States and educational experts, approved 1,202 proposals costing $89 million. These programs have reached nearly 10 million public and nonpublic school pupils, 93,000 preschool children, 250,000 out-of-school youth, 255,000 classroom teachers, and 131,000 parents and other adults.

Typical of the innovative projects supported under title III in the past 2 years are these examples:

In Louisville, Ky., a diagnostic and treatment center for a three-county area will provide visitation, corrective health, and welfare services, psychological services, remedial programs, and consultative followup, psychiatric, and educational services.

In Portland, Oreg., six elementary schools will develop and operate a 29-acre farm to provide city children who are potential dropouts with a variety of agricultural activities as an integral part of their formal studies.

In Medicine Lodge, Kans., a borrowed 2-ton truck trailer and van, specially equipped for year-round air conditioning and with a sound system, lighting, and wiring, will be converted into a mobile museum to take paintings, sculpture, graphic arts, ceramics, and examples of allied arts from the Wichita Art Museum to 16,000 children in 13 unified school districts of nine counties.

The State educational agencies are to be commended for the outstanding job they have done in reviewing and recommending project approvals. Testimony heard before the committee provided convincing evidence that the Office of Education gives major consideration to their recommendations. Indeed, several States with strong State education agencies have developed comprehensive State plans for title III centers and services, and in these States such plans were given prime consideration in project approval. It is my earnest hope that eventually, partially through the assistance of title V, all State educational agencies will be able to undertake this responsibility.

Only one amendment to title III is proposed. Last Year we again amended the title to provide for participation of Indian children in BIA schools and of children in DOD overseas schools. Like the provision in title II, this received only a 1-year authorization. We recommend the provision's extension through fiscal year 1969, consistent with the authorization for the rest of the title.

Title V of the act—designed to strengthen the capabilities of State educational agencies—may eventually prove to be the act's most important title. When the title was passed in 1965, the committee heard repeated testimony concerning the woeful inadequacies of many State departments of education. Years of Federal programs of assistance to elementary and secondary education, with funds made available for staffing at the State level, had thrown the staffing patterns of many State agencies badly out of balance. The States responded eagerly to the challenge of title V—a challenge to assess their own weaknesses and to develop programs to strengthen themselves. During the first year, they attempted to fill 1,800 positions in State departments of education. Unfortunately, the lack of trained personnel which plagues all our education programs again proved the bottleneck; only 1,000 persons were hired, 522 of them professional.

We are proposing an amendment to the formula by which 85 percent of title V funds are presently distributed. The cur-

rent formula discriminates against smaller and more sparsely populated States, which may be among the neediest, since it is based strictly on public school enrollment. To correct this inequity, the committee recommends a change in the allotment formula: of the funds available for allocation among the States, 40 percent will be allotted equally and the remaining 60 percent will be allotted on the basis of public school enrollment.

The committee is also recommending a new part B to title V, which will allow States to conduct systematic, comprehensive, long-range planning. The States indicated that they wanted to use title V funds to plan educational programs; however, other needs were seen to be more pressing, and the amount of money available was insufficient to plan effectively. Therefore, we have added a new part to title V specifically for such long-range planning. States will be able to use their allocation to set educational goals, establish priorities, and to plan means of achieving goals. Seventy-five percent of the funds under this part would be allocated according to the following formula: 40 percent would be allocated equally among the States and 60 percent would be allocated on the basis of the State's population. The remaining 25 percent would be reserved to the Commissioner of Education for special projects grants and contracts, in most instances of a multi-State or regional nature.

Since a new part has been added to title V, the committee recommends a change in the authorization, making $65 million available for fiscal year 1968 and $80 million for fiscal year 1969. Of the total authorization, 70 percent would be spent for programs designed to strengthen State educational agencies—the present title V—and 30 percent would be available for the new program of comprehensive educational planning.

Title VI of the act—providing special programs for the education of handicapped children—was added last year. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] headed, heard testimony from numerous witnesses on the pressing needs for personnel recruitment, training and program support, and research in the area of education of the handicapped. The Congress added title VI specifically to meet these needs.

It is estimated that 300,000 teachers and other professional personnel specifically trained for work with handicapped children will be needed within the next decade; at present there are only 70,000. Therefore, we propose a nationwide recruitment and information dissemination effort designed to attract people into the profession. An authorization of $1 million is proposed to support such activities during fiscal year 1968.

Another major problem in the area of education of the handicapped is the identification of handicapping conditions. All too many children needlessly fail to learn because of unidentified physical or mental handicaps. Therefore, the committee recommends establishment of regional resource centers, designed to test and evaluate the needs of handicapped children and to develop educational programs to meet these needs, with an authorization of $7.5 million for fiscal year 1968.

One of the most successful existing Federal programs in the area of special education is the captioned films for the deaf program. This program has four major components: research, production of films, dissemination, and training. We propose expansion of this highly successful program for all handicapping conditions, with an additional authorization of $1 million for the expanded program for fiscal year 1968.

The committee has also proposed a change in Public Law 88–164, to allow the Commissioner of Education to contract with private educational or research agencies and organizations. This change would allow the research program to take advantage of the expertise of private as well as public educational and research agencies and organizations.

The committee also recommends that the National Teacher Corps program become a special part of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It would be extended through fiscal year 1969, with authority to enable a teacher-intern who began his practical and academic training during fiscal year 1969 to continue his program for one more year. The authorizations for recruitment, enrollment, and training of Teacher Corps members will be contained in separate legislation dealing with the Higher Education Amendments of 1967.

The committee heard repeated testimony emphasizing the great successes the Teacher Corps has enjoyed during the past year. School official after school official bore witness to the efficacy of Teacher Corpsmen employed in his school. Today, 1,213 Teacher Corps members, experienced teachers and teacher-interns, are engaged in service in 275 schools in 111 school systems. They spend part of each week working in a school which has requested their services, and part of the week at a nearby university working toward their master's degrees. The training they receive will make them specialists in the education of disadvantaged children, a new curriculum for many of our Nation's teacher training institutions. Repeatedly, the committee heard evidence from deans of education that they now look to their Teacher Corps programs as a means of testing new concepts of teacher training.

Since members of the Teacher Corps work in elementary and secondary schools across the country, the committee made their legislative authority for such work part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a new part B to title I. In addition, several amendments to the existing Teacher Corps authority were adopted:

Teacher-interns are now paid at the lowest rate for a full-time teacher paid by the school system in which they teach. To assure that no corpsman will receive a financial windfall, the committee proposes that they be paid at such rate, or at the rate of $75 per week plus $15 per dependent, whichever is lower.

State educational agency approval of the local educational agency's request for Corps members would be required.

Teacher Corps members could be assigned to a migrant group not in a regular school, if the number of children made it feasible and if the children were being taught by a public or other nonprofit agency. This will allow Corps members to serve some of our country's most disadvantaged children, children they were formerly unable to teach because they were not regularly enrolled in a school.

Corps members would be permitted, under a committee amendment, to teach in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Again, these children suffer extreme educational deprivation and could well benefit from the specialized services provided by Teacher Corps members.

We also recommend that the "local control" section be amended to make clear what has always been Teacher Corps practice—that no corpsman may be assigned to a local educational agency unless the agency finds the corpsman acceptable.

To support the portion of Teacher Corps activity which is part B of title I—the making of grants to local educational agencies to enable such agencies to utilize teaching teams in the elementary and secondary school systems—the committee recommends an authorization of $21 million for fiscal year 1968 and $25 million for fiscal year 1969.

In addition, the committee proposes several technical amendments to Public Laws 815 and 874—assistance to federally impacted areas. The definition of "Federal property" used in both laws is amended to make it clear that property taxes paid on any interest in Federal property are also to be deducted from a local educational agency's entitlement. The disaster provisions authorized by Public Law 89–313, providing special relief to school districts experiencing major disasters, would be extended through fiscal year 1972. Relief would also be authorized in cases where construction of public school facilities is made necessary because of the destruction of private school facilities which will not be replaced.

Other technical amendments would modify present requirements for eligibility for disaster relief with respect to the amount of local effort required and the minimum damage involved; the amendments would change the level of restoration to the level of education provided during the disaster, thereby taking into account a district's improvement of its educational system. Disaster relief would be extended to technical, vocational, and other special schools operated by public agencies other than local educational agencies; these schools currently are not eligible for assistance if destroyed or damaged by a major disaster.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the progress made under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is only a beginning of efforts to provide quality educational opportunities to all. As President Johnson said in his recent message on health and education, we have quite a job ahead of us—"to solve

old problems, to create new institutions, to fulfill the potential of each individual in our land." The programs we discuss today will do much to achieve these goals.

FUNDS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER THE QUIE PROPOSAL

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of this body are aware of what they are voting for when they consider the Quie formula.

By September of 1968, school districts will be notified of allocations of Federal funds for the support of their programs.

In the event the Quie proposal is adopted by the House and under the further assumption that such a maneuver does not thereby kill Federal aid to education—just before the November elections in 1968, each school district in the Nation will presumably receive notice from its State department of education just how that agency proposes to make distribution to it of the Federal funds.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The Quie formula contains drastic cuts for some States, and even in those States which would receive no less funds than under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the distribution within each State of funds to local school districts will be drastically altered. Many thousands of school districts will lose money for ongoing programs, though others will obviously gain.

Will the school districts of your congressional district gain or lose by the Quie proposal? You will get the answer to that question when the State makes its distribution for the school term beginning just before the November 1968 elections.

This is not true in the case of the formula for distribution of funds under title I of ESEA containing the bulk of Federal funds for elementary and secondary schools, $2,400,000,000 of them under the committee authorizations. Under the committee formula in title I the U.S. Office of Education does not make a distribution of the funds. The State department of education does not make a distribution of the funds. You, the Members of this body, the Congress of the United States, determine the entitlement for every county in the United States for the $2.4 billion authorized for distribution to local educational agencies under title I.

The U.S. Office of Education cannot alter or change this distribution. The State department of education cannot alter or change this distribution.

The formula for distributing funds under title I of the act as extended by the committee bill is uniform in its application throughout the United States. It has been in operation for 2 years and preserves the continuity of school programs designed to target Federal moneys into school districts that need it most to meet the needs of children who need the benefits of the act the most.

I for one recognize that the Quie proposal has been poorly conceived, even more poorly timed, and contains much political mischief.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, local school districts have been given the primary responsibility for policy determination. The Quie proposal is not aimed at establishing educational policymaking at the grassroots level. It seeks to take it away from the local educational agency and firmly establish it in State departments of education

Under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as presently structured, the primary responsibility for local school policy is vested in the local educational agency where it belongs. Under the existing law, the State educational agency has a responsible role to play in approving projects devised by local educational agencies. In this connection, the only role played by the U.S. Office of Education is in the initial understanding and agreement that it enters into with the State educational agency to the effect that the State educational agency will approve local educational agency education projects consistent with the congressional mandate contained in Public Law 89–10.

There was no easy solutions to the resolution of the political, the social, and the real educational problems connected with Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 evolved out of a comprehensive study conducted by educators and laymen in seven States typifying the educational needs of the Nation.

The proposals and recommendations presented by these experts were in turn submitted by the administration in 1965 to the Congress and were followed by extensive hearings by both the Senate and House committees in an effort to carefully direct the programs to the areas of greater need and to resolve the conflicts that had defeated previous efforts to enact Federal aid to education. The committees of Congress worked out legislation which has been widely acclaimed by the education community.

I hope the Members of this body during the course of this debate will keep in mind the welfare of millions of children who are the beneficiaries of this legislation and will not be guided by extraneous considerations. I urge the Members of this body to overwhelmingly reject all the crippling amendments and substitutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. My amendment operates the way title II of the ESEA now does with respect to textbooks and library resources. The State agency there has control.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I am sure the gentleman knows the great respect I have for him as one of the best technicians on the entire Education and Labor Committee with respect to the drafting of this legislation, but he is just not telling a straight story at this point about what the effect of his proposed changes would be.

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious to us all that if States are to continue to discharge effectively their responsibility for the organization and administration of education, State departments of education must play a key role in this effort. It, likewise, seems obvious that most State departments of education must be strengthened considerably before they can make the contributions that must be expected of them in improving State organization and administration of education. Such strengthening of State departments of education was the purpose of title V, Public Law 89–10. We now have the report on the first year of operation under this title, and judging by some of the results in the States, we can believe that the achievements under it will measure up to the expectations of the Congress when it was enacted.

In fact, title V of ESEA has produced dramatic results. Basic grants under section 503 of this title have been used to add 1,000 members to department of education staffs. The leadership activities and services that were made possible by the addition of these staff members are too numerous to enumerate here, but some examples will provide insights into the accomplishments of the State education departments in responding to the challenge.

Most State departments of education—

Improved and updated the competency of their State agency personnel by providing such things as training opportunities and professional libraries;

Initiated or improved programs for educational planning, evaluation, and research;

Improved and expanded leadership consultative services to local school districts in improving curriculum, instruction, pupil personnel services, and the administration of education;

Strengthened the internal management and services of the State education agency;

Strengthened their capacity to develop and disseminate information on the progress, needs, and condition of education in the State. Some State education departments:

Set up advisory committees on various aspects of education;

Initiated kindergarten and prekindergarten leadership activities.

Among the salutory effects of the title V programs has been bringing to the attention of the State boards of education the need for better organization and administration of educational programs activities. For example, seven of 12 States in one geographical area undertook—and several completed—comprehensive studies of statewide educational programs for which they were responsible.

Fifteen major special projects were funded at a cost of $2,208,149 in fiscal 1966 under section 505 of title V, most of them designed to run for several years. These projects employed 126 professionals and 82 nonprofessionals. Although 12 State departments of education administered these projects, 48 States participated in one or more of them. All 15 projects were designed and organized to improve leadership and services of State departments of education.

STATE COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Mr. Chairman, among the ways the State department of education could spend its allotment was in the develop-

ment of a program of comprehensive educational planning.

The States, however, felt the pressure of their regulatory functions, the need for improvement in administrative capability, and the increased responsibilities thrust upon them by new Federal education programs. As a result, the overburdened State educational agencies have been unable to mount as organized and structured programs of statewide educational planning as they deem desirable. To overcome these difficulties, H.R. 7819 creates a new part B to title V earmarking funds for comprehensive educational planning.

Systematic educational planning must be encouraged if State departments of education are to utilize effectively all available resources and to strengthen and improve education at all levels of government. State education agencies should be responsible on a statewide basis for the conscious selection of educational goals, the analysis of these goals from the standpoint of all resources, the establishment of priorities among goals, the development of ways and means of achieving the goals, and the evaluation of the entire process from goals to achievement. The bill presently under consideration would provide Federal assistance for precisely such activities.

Title V–B, as set forth in H.R. 7819, would establish in State education agencies a program of comprehensive educational planning for elementary and secondary education throughout the State. If a State wishes to include higher education in its program of long-range planning, it may do so. Either the State department of education or a coordinate higher education planning agency may undertake this function.

Seventy-five percent of the funds authorized for this part will be allotted among the States according to the following formula: 40 percent would be allotted equally among the States, and 60 percent would be allotted on the basis of the State's population. The remaining 25 percent of the authorization would be reserved to the Commissioner of Education for special project grants and contracts, which might be of a multistate or regional nature.

H.R. 7819 provides for a total authorization for title V of $65 million for fiscal year 1968 and $80 million for fiscal year 1969. Of this sum, 70 percent would be spent for programs designed to strengthen State educational agencies—the present title V—and 30 percent would be available to the State educational agencies for comprehensive educational planning.

I do not think anyone here in this Chamber will dispute the value of prior planning in assuring the wisest possible use of funds for education. H.R. 7819 provides the vehicle for assuring that our States are able to plan, by making Federal assistance available to them for such a purpose. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to title V.

While the effects of title V support have been dramatic in a number of cases, the task ahead is still great. We have still made only a small dent in the total need of State departments of education for improved leadership and operation. Our extension of this title through fiscal year 1969 and the additional money and capacity for planning being proposed under the amendments should take us quite a ways toward the goal of having a fully effective educational leadership agency in each of our 50 States. This, in turn, will assure the maintenance of what has sometimes been called creative federalism.

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

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

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

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin yielding. I would like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made here this afternoon by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and by others who have been supporting him. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH], for the fine statement he just made in the well of the House.

Mr. Chairman, there will be few debates within the confines of this Chamber that have more significance than that being waged today over the future of education in this country.

The die we cast by our actions will directly affect the direction of this country, perhaps for years to come. Today we have an opportunity to improve the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We can make significant reformations in the language and intent of this legislation if we have the willingness to do so.

The act passed in 1965 has many outstanding provisions. Of its weak spots, the degree of Federal Government control and the formula for allocating financial assistance are most important.

Under the present law, the States receive Federal assistance for their education program in categorical grants. For the States this means applying for grants to do specific jobs. The task of applying for these grants is complicated, costly, and time consuming.

Also under the present law, the formula for deciding how much a State may obtain is working a hardship on many, particularly the poorer States. Under the formula for title I funds, the 1960 census data is used and payment to the States is based on the actual State expenditure per child for education. Those States that had not been able to have good education programs when the present law was adopted, are penalized now. They find it harder and harder to get ahead of the formula's limitations created by this title I procedure.

I will not say that Federal control over education is inherently evil. I will say it is not efficient nor infallible. I believe you will agree with me on this point. There is, at present, a dangerous degree of control over education exercised by the U.S. Commissioner of Education through a multitude of separate regulations, applications, justifications, and accountings.

Mr. Chairman, a proposal is before this body which would eliminate the weak spots in the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

These proposals, known as the Quie amendment, would substitute "block grants" to the States in place of categorical grants. The Quie approach would also return the planning of financial distribution to the formula used under the National Defense Education Act. This formula was used for 9 years and was never criticized by the States to the best of my knowledge.

Under the proposal offered by the honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], Arkansas would be able to plan and administer its own education program. While I can only speak for Arkansas, I am fully confident that the people of Arkansas are capable of planning and administering a program of education suitable for the education of their children. We in Arkansas often feel we need advice and we seek it when this occurs. But, we would prefer to be able to get advice from the Commissioner of Education and not commands or directives. The Federal Government would retain authority to assure fair and equitable distribution of moneys to benefit all schoolchildren in all States and school districts.

I have been somewhat distressed by the opinions that have been uttered about the effects the Quie amendment would produce. Some people have suggested that the States would not receive as much assistance under this proposal as under the current law. There have also been views that indicated private school students would be hurt by the enactment of the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has assured this body that his amendment contains a specific provision that prohibits any State from receiving less money than it receives under the current law of titles I, II, III, and V.

The gentleman has also assured this body that private school students would be treated the same under his amendment as under the present law.

If we adopt the proposals being offered by our colleague from Minnesota, we will also solve the problems created by the current distribution formula. Under the new proposal, we would return to the successful National Defense Education Act formula. The poorer States will then be able to make headway toward their goal of improving education quality for their students.

The opinions I express today are not solely mine. I have been in constant contact with the Arkansas Education Commissioner, Mr. Arch Ford.

I have also received a large number of letters from school officials throughout my district and the State of Arkansas. These experts in the field of education have assured me of the preference of the proposal made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Following is a letter from Mr. Arch Ford on May 2 of this year:

HON. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT: I know that you are aware that the present formula in

the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides a payment of $129.64 for each poor child counted in Mississippi, $140.00 for each child counted in Arkansas, and $393.14 for each child counted in New York. Such inequity in the distribution of federal funds for education almost beggars description.

The formula proposed in the Quie Amendment, beginning in the 1968–69 school year, would distribute funds on the same formula basis as has been used for several years in the National Defense Education Act which considers the ability of each State to support education, and as a result favors poorer States. The Quie formula is by all odds the most equitable formula yet proposed for use in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended. Any federal legislation giving financial assistance to education which distributes $393.14 for eligible children in New York, $140.00 in Arkansas, and $129.64 in Mississippi, is certainly not worthy of continuing on a permanent or semipermanent basis.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Arch Ford
A. W. FORD.

On May 17, the Arkansas State Board of Education adopted the following position on the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act:

The State Board of Education has unanimously endorsed the Quie Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Board believes that the primary leadership function should rest with the states and in the local school districts.

The Board has considered the Quie Amendment in light of principles involved, and with no thought in mind of entering into a partisan contest. It is the opinion of the Board that education is not a partisan matter, but is a fundamental service in which all citizens have a legitimate interest.

The Board believes that federal legislation should define purposes and establish floors and ceilings on expenditures in the various categories. Implementing decisions in compliance with federal law, and in keeping with approvable state plans submitted by state boards of education, should be a function of the states and any other arrangement does violence to the fundamental principle of state and local responsibility for elementary and secondary education.

In conclusion, I would ask that we all remember there is nothing sacred about the current law on education. It has many good points, but it could be improved. I hope an openminded consideration of this possible alternation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be forthcoming.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, one of the interesting things that has been developed during the course of this argument has been the question of the present operation of ESEA as compared to what might be expected under a State plan of operation with the Quie amendment. I wish to quote at this time from an attorney general's opinion by the Honorable Bronson C. La Follette, of the State of Wisconsin, dated July 19, 1966, in which he says:

Attorneys General in New York, Kentucky, and Nevada have concluded that funds received by the State under title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 can retain their character as Federal funds and not become subject to State constitutional restrictions.

In each case the opinion was predicated upon the assumption that the Federal funds could be kept entirely separate from State funds and at no time commingled with moneys of the State or of a local subdivision.

The constitution and statutory provisions upon which these conclusions were based, however, were different from those in Wisconsin. Our conclusion must be based upon Wisconsin law.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to insert this whole opinion, so that the Members of the House can see that in Wisconsin, where there can be no commingling, by virtue of the attorney general's opinion, the whole question of whether parochial or private schools can participate to the fullest extent is answered "no" under the present operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In that regard, the Quie amendment would be superior because of its provision of no commingling, so that private and parochial schools would have a greater opportunity to participate.

I put into the RECORD last Thursday a discussion of the inequitable formula of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as it relates to Wisconsin. We found that in Wisconsin under the elementary and secondary education amendments in this bill we would get $26.5 million, and under the Quie amendment we would get $35.6 million, assuming an appropriation of $1.58 billion as recommended by the President.

Such in formula inequities are another reason for reconsidering the hasty action in extending into 1969 the formulas passed for fiscal year 1968 as suggested by the committee.

I put into the RECORD last Wednesday a letter in support of the Quie amendment by our State superintendent of public instruction, and I am going to insert in the RECORD today a letter to the Honorable GERALD R. FORD from the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Warren P. Knowles, in favor of adopting the Quie amendment.

I also wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed unanimously by the Advisory Council of School Administrators of Cooperative Educational Service Agency No. 10, representing 35,817 public school children in Wisconsin, as part of 20 different school districts, and I am going to quote this resolution:

Whereas the present method of distributing Federal aid on a categorical basis is very cumbersome and inefficient,

Whereas the impact on children is very negligible compared to the amount of money being expended,

Whereas the present system of Federal aids to schools does not allow for local control and initiative and causes many problems at the local level,

Whereas shared taxes and general aids distributed on a formula basis through the State Department of Public Instruction have been most effectual in promoting public education:

Therefore we hereby advise our constitutional representatives to work for a change in the present system of Federal aid to public schools.

It is in response to that kind of request on behalf of the schoolchildren and the administrators, not only of Wisconsin but across the country, that I support the Quie amendment.

When all is said and done and we get all of the misinformation about the church-state issue out of the way, the basic question comes down to where we wish to have our elementary and secondary educational responsibility lie. Shall it rest with local and State school officials or with the Office of Education? I for one wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Oregon when she says there are different needs in different areas. I believe that local and State school officials are far better equipped to know their own needs and best judge of their own priorities.

Lastly, let me call the attention of the Committee to the remarks by Dr. James B. Conant, a renowned and distinguished educator, who said in his latest book, "The Comprehensive High School: A Second Report to Interested Citizens":

I believe that a method must be found for apportioning to each of the separate States a share of funds raised by the Federal income tax, to be spent for education as each State sees fit.

I agree.

Mr. Chairman, the material to which I referred above is included herewith:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, May 10, 1967.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: In response to your telegram of May 2, I wired you that I supported the Quie Amendment.

While Federal assistance for educational purposes has been most helpful during a period when the demands for increased expenditures have been unprecedented, I believe that the time has now come to restore the management and allocation of funds for this purpose to the states. Categorical aids tend to establish priorities; they require time-consuming preparation of specific proposals; they may not be geared to the state's greatest needs, and they have the effect of placing the management of the state's educational program in Washington, D.C.

The people of Wisconsin have always accepted their responsibilities for the education of their youth as a state function.

The major purposes of Federal aid to education can best be achieved by setting up a system of block grants which will be administered through appropriate agencies within the state. For these reasons, I support the Quie Amendment and hope that it will prove to be a first step toward tax sharing. Any Federal funds that Wisconsin may receive under the block grant proposal will be used to strengthen those parts of our educational program that are in greatest need and will not be used simply as a device to shift state responsibility to the Federal Government.

I trust that you will keep us informed of the bill's progress and that it may be enacted into law during this session.

Yours truly,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Madison, July 19, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAM C. KAHL,
State Superintendent,
Department of Public Instruction,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR MR. KAHL: You have asked my opinion regarding the state's participation in the federal aid to education program established by the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. More specifically you ask whether payments to a school district by

the State Department of Public Instruction, from funds in the state treasury received from the federal government under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, violate Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution if the money is used in part to pay the salary of a public school teacher who is sent into a parochial school to teach.

Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution provides in part: "* * * nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries."

No state has a more comprehensive constitutional ban against aid to religious institutions. In *State ex rel. Reynolds v. Nusbaum* (1962), 17 Wis. (2d) 148, 165 the Wisconsin Supreme Court said:

"* * * In *State ex rel. Weiss, supra,* this court stated (p. 207):

" 'Wisconsin, as one of the later states admitted into the Union, having before it the experience of others, and probably in view of its heterogeneous population, . . . has, in her organic law, probably furnished a more-complete bar to any preference for, or discrimination against, any religious sect, organization, or society than any other state in the Union.'

"Thus, we deem that the First amendment provision, which prohibits laws 'respecting an establishment of religion,' lends itself to more flexibility of interpretation than the provision contained in the last clause of sec. 18, art. I of the Wisconsin constitution.* * *"

Religious societies and theological seminaries include parochial elementary and secondary schools. *State ex. rel. Weiss v. District Board* (1890), 76 Wis. 177, 215. The next question is whether paying the salary of a public school teacher who is sent into a parochial school to teach is a "benefit" to the parochial school within the meaning of that term as used in Article I, Section 18. The meaning of "benefit" in this context was discussed at length in *State ex. rel. Reynolds v. Nusbaum, supra.* The statute involved in that case was framed, as is this one, to evince a legislative intention to benefit the parochial school pupils rather than the parochial school. In discussing this issue the court said at pages 160–161:

"The legislature, in enacting ch. 648, entitled it, 'An Act to amend 40.53(1) and 40.56(3) of the statutes, relating to the safety and welfare of all school pupils in the states.' The attorney general argues that this act is sustainable on the basis that the transportation of parochial school pupils would promote their health and welfare. It could also be argued with equal plausibility that a direct grant in aid of public funds to parochial schools promotes the general welfare of the pupils of such schools because it aids in their education. In passing on the constitutionality of legislation as to whether it violates the particular prohibition of sec. 18, art. I, Wisconsin constitution, courts are not foreclosed by a legislative declaration that the act is in furtherance of some facet of the promotion of the public welfare valid in itself, if the effect of the questioned act would in fact violate such prohibition had there been no legislative declaration of its purpose included in the title or body of the act. * * *"

Paying the salary of a teacher who teaches in a parochial school is a benefit to that school. That it also benefits the children attending the school does not mean that the payment escapes the constitutional prohibition. The benefit conferred by paying a teacher's salary to teach in a parochial school is not one of that class of benefits, such as police and fire protection, which is permissible under the Wisconsin Constitution. It is a benefit indistinguishable in principle from furnishing bus transportation which was held unconstitutional in *State ex rel. Reynolds* v. *Nusbaum, supra.*

The payment described in your letter is "for the benefit of religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries." The remaining question under Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution is whether the payment is also "money drawn from the treasury." If so it is unconstitutional.

Attorneys General in New York, Kentucky and Nevada have concluded that funds received by the state under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 can retain their character as federal funds and not become subject to state constitutional restrictions.

In each case the opinion was predicated upon the assumption that the federal funds could be kept entirely separate from state funds and at no time commingled with moneys of the state or of a local subdivision.

The constitutional and statutory provisions upon which these conclusions were based, however, were different from those in Wisconsin. Our conclusion must be based upon Wisconsin law.

Wisconsin has specific statutory provisions regarding the way in which federal funds are received and handled by the state. See secs. 16.54, 20.550 (68), 20.650 and 20.951 (1), Wisc. Stats., which are controlling here. The pertinent portions of those statutes read as follows:

"20.650 Public instruction department. There is appropriated to the state department of public instruction for the following programs:

"(1) EDUCATIONAL AND AUXILIARY SERVICES TO LOCAL SCHOOLS. (a) *General program operations.* The amounts in the schedule for educational and auxiliary services to local schools, including the matching of federal funds available under the national defense education act.

"* * *

"(m) *Federal aids.* All federal moneys received as authorized by the governor under s. 16.54 to carry out the purposes of the program."

* * * * *

"16.54 Acceptance of federal funds. (1) Whenever the United States government shall make available funds for the education, the promotion of health, the relief of indigency, the promotion of agriculture or for any other purpose other than the administration of the tribal or any individual funds of Wisconsin Indians, the governor on behalf of the state is authorized to accept the funds so made available. In exercising the authority herein conferred, the governor may stipulate as a condition of the acceptance of the act of congress by this state such conditions as in his discretion may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the state of Wisconsin.

"(2) Whenever funds shall be made available to the state of Wisconsin through an act of congress and acceptance thereof as provided in sub. (1), the governor shall designate the state board, commission or department to administer any of such funds, and the board, commission or department so designated by the governor is hereby authorized and directed to administer such fund for the purpose designated by the act of congress making an appropriation of such funds, or by the department of the United States government making such funds available to the state of Wisconsin."

* * * * *

"20.550 (68) FEDERAL FUNDS. Any and all funds which may be paid to this state under the authority of s. 16.54, *shall,* upon receipt, *be paid into the state treasury,* and the same shall be and are appropriated to the state board, commission or department designated by the governor to administer the same. *Expenditures of such funds shall be made in the same manner and subject to the laws, rules and regulations governing payments made by the state treasury,* and further such expenditures shall be made in accord with federal rules and regulations. *If funds* made available *be retained by the government of the United States,* then the officers and employees of this state designated to administer same *shall be governed by the act of congress and the rules and regulations of the federal government.*" (Italic added).

* * * * *

"20.951 Receipts and deposits of money; procedure; penalties. (1) Unless otherwise provided by law, all moneys collected or received by each and every officer, board, commission, society, or association for or in behalf of the state, or which is required by law to be turned into the state treasury, shall be deposited in or transmitted to the state treasury at least once a week and also whenever required by the governor, and shall be accompanied by a statement in such form as the treasurer may prescribe showing the amount of such collection, and from whom and for what purpose or on what account the same was received. *All moneys paid into the treasury shall be credited to the general fund unless otherwise specifically provided by law.*" (Italics added.)

Under this statutory scheme, federal money received under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is accepted by the Governor under the authorization of sec. 16.54, Wis. Stats., and must be paid into the state treasury upon receipt pursuant to sec. 20.550 (68), Wis. Stats. Under sec. 20.951 (1), Wis. Stats., "[a]ll moneys paid into the treasury shall be credited to the general fund unless otherwise specifically provided by law." The Title I funds must, therefore, be paid into the general fund.

Once federal funds are paid into the general fund they become state funds and are subject to all of the restrictions imposed upon the use of state funds. *Democrat Printing Co. v. Zimmerman* (1944), 245 Wis. 406, 414. Such funds are, therefore, subject to the limitations imposed by Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution and may not be expended for the benefit of parochial schools. Since the payment of funds for the salary of a teacher who teaches in a parochial school is a benefit to that school within the meaning of Article I, Section 18 I must conclude that such payment would violate the Wisconsin Constitution.

This conclusion is also required by the language of sec. 20.550 (68), Wis. Stats., prescribing the method of handling federal funds received under sec. 16.54, Wis. Stats. This section provides that expenditures of federal funds in the state treasury "shall be made in the same manner and subject to the laws, rules and regulations governing payments made by the state treasury, and further such expenditures shall be made in accord with federal rules and regulations." The statute then provides that "[i]f funds [are] *retained* by the government of the United States, then [their administration] shall be governed by the act of congress and the rules and regulations of the federal government." The intent of the legislature is plain. If the federal funds are put into the treasury they are to be treated like state funds. If the state rules are to be avoided the money must be kept out of the treasury.

The legislature has clearly stated that "unless otherwise specifically provided by law" all federal funds received by the state are to be expended subject to limitations imposed by state law. If this policy is to be changed and federal funds are to be used in Wisconsin for purposes which would violate the Wisconsin Constitution the legislature must make that decision.

This opinion does not mean that the State of Wisconsin is unable to participate in the federal aid to education program established by Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Quite the contrary. The State of Wisconsin can participate fully and, I understand, your department is now implementing

the program. This opinion concludes only that teachers paid from funds from the state treasury may not teach in parochial schools. Such use of teachers is not required for participation in the federal program. The pertinent provisions of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provide as follows (Public Law 89–10, Section 205):

"(a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs, * * *

"(2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate;"

The regulations issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare include the following:

"§ 116.19 Participation by children enrolled in private schools.

"(a) To the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency must make provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate. * * *

"(b) The application for each project must show the degree and manner of expected participation by educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools in the program of the local educational agency under Title II of the Act. Opportunity for participation on the basis of geographical area, must be substantially comparable to that with respect to children enrolled in public schools and the provision for such participation shall be designed to be applied, insofar as is practicable, to children enrolled in private schools who reside in the areas affected by the program. * * *

"(c) Any project to be carried out in public facilities and involving *joint participation by children enrolled in private schools and children enrolled in public schools* shall include such provisions as are necessary to avoid classes which are separated by school enrollment or religious affiliation of the children.

"(d) Public school personnel *may* be made available to other than public school facilities only to provide specialized services which the local educational agency determines are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children and only where such specialized services are not normally provided by the non-public school. * * *" (Italic added).

These provisions require that a proposal for federal funds include plans for assistance to pupils in private schools substantially comparable to that given public school pupils. They do not, however, require that the assistance be given by sending public school teachers to teach in private schools. The requirements in this respect may be fulfilled in other ways such as providing dual enrollment or shared time classes in the public schools. While the Wisconsin Supreme Court has not decided the precise question whether such classes in the public schools are constitutionally permissible, there is a strong suggestion in *State ex rel. Reynolds v. Nusbaum, supra*, pp. 159–160, that such programs are constitutional:

"We have also given consideration to whether the benefits, conferred by ch. 648 upon parochial schools, differ in kind from the situation where parochial school pupils are permitted to attend certain specialized courses in the public schools. For example, it has been brought to our attention that pupils of certain parochial schools attend manual-training and domestic-science classes in the public schools. These parochial schools benefit in that they are saved the expense of providing the specialized equipment required for such courses, and of securing teachers trained to teach the same. However, let us assume but not decide that permitting children, who satisfy the age and residence requirements, to secure part of their education in the public schools, even though at the same time they may be in attendance at parochial schools, does not violate sec. 18, art. I, Wisconsin constitution. On this hypothesis it might be argued that permitting parochial school children to take advantage of transportation by public school bus, is a use of public school facilities equivalent to attendance at manual-training and domestic-science classes in the public schools. However, the essential difference, from a constitutional standpoint, is that riding school buses is not an educational objective of the state in itself, but merely an instrumentality to bring the pupils to the public schools where they will secure a public education. *Under ch. 648, parochial school children are not to be transported to the public schools for the purpose of receiving any public instruction; rather, such transportation is merely a convenience to assist them in attending a parochial school.*" (Italics added).

Shared time differs from the plan to send public teachers into parochial schools in the constitutionally significant respect described in the last sentence of the above quotation. Shared time, properly conducted, is a means of providing public instruction to parochial pupils and not a "convenience to assist them in attending a parochial school." In my opinion, shared time arrangements which would meet the requirements of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 can be carried out without violating the Wisconsin Constitution. Other permissible programs involving such things as educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment can probably also be devised. In expressing this opinion I am aware of 53 OAG 187 in which the shared time issue was discussed with the conclusion that the question must be resolved by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. I believe, however, that under these circumstances, where participation in this vital federal program is dependent upon the state's ability to plan educational programs in the nature of shared time, you are entitled to my best judgment on the constitutional issue. I believe that such programs can be conducted within constitutional limitations and I am prepared to assist you in working out such programs.

I conclude that under the present statutes federal funds received under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 must be paid into the general fund. In the general fund these funds are subject to limitations imposed by Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution and cannot be used to pay the salary of a teacher who teaches in a parochial school. Your department can, however, continue to participate in the federal program by providing for participation by private school pupils as described above.

Sincerely yours,

BRONSON C. LA FOLLETTE,
Attorney General.

CAPTION.—Federal funds received by the state under Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 must be paid into the general fund pursuant to secs. 16.54, 20.550 (68), 20.650 and 20.951 (1), Wis. Stats., and in the general fund are subject to Article I, Section 18 of the Wisconsin Constitution. Such funds may not be used to pay salaries of public school teachers who are sent into parochial schools to teach but may be used for properly conducted shared time and other joint education programs.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and to announce my support for his amendment.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I begin by commending not just one side in this debate. I begin by commending many of the Members on both sides of the aisle for the attitude I have seen exhibited as we have gone through the hearings on this bill in the committee.

We may differ on points. I may differ with my very able chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, on point 1 or point 2. But I do not quarrel with the fact—and I believe it is a fact—that among the Members on both sides of the aisle we start from the premise that what we are seeking to do is to improve education in the United States.

I do not believe the question today is a question of whether we are going to have Federal aid to education. I favor it. I believe it has become necessary. In the future it will need to be increased still further.

The key questions today are not whether—but how much Federal aid? For what purpose? What will be the controls?

The bill, H.R. 7819, proposes some highly desirable improvements in the law. We can talk about aid to Indian children, about bringing salaries for the Teacher Corps into line with other programs, and a series of other things.

But there still exist in the law some imperfections, and there still exist in the proposed bill before us today some imperfections and some areas we need to improve still further.

Some of those imperfections are going to be sought to be reached tomorrow as amendments are proposed from both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Minnesota is going to offer an amendment. The gentlewoman from Oregon is going to offer an amendment. As indicated, other amendments will be offered.

I believe there will be other imperfections in this law that will not be reached until years have gone by beyond the year in which we live today.

With all of the good features of the

present law and with all of the improving amendments involved here, there remains a basic imperfection in this bill and in the law as it exists at the present time, which is the emphasis on control in the Office of Education as opposed to the emphasis on control within the States.

The argument has been made in the committee that the history of State inaction proves the need for deep Federal involvement and control. I believe those who make this argument fail to take into consideration that two great changes have taken place in recent years.

One is the massive infusion of Federal moneys into the picture, which was not true in years gone by.

Second, I believe there have been innovations brought forth under the programs that have been in existence in past years that have changed the picture.

We are not talking about the year 1950. We are not talking about the year 1960. We are talking about the year 1967 and the years that will follow hereafter.

With these trails blazed and with the innovation of the grant of Federal moneys, I believe we are in a position that we ought not to freeze into the law the involvement in such great depth on the part of the Federal Department of Education. It is time, while there still is time, to return to our States of Kentucky and of Oregon and of Michigan and of New York and of California control over the programs that they know particularly well.

I feel that our local school districts in my State of Oregon can and will work closely and effectively with our State department of education, and they will produce a State plan for the utilization of funds which are going to be appropriated under the authorization in H.R. 7819, which will do a superior job of reflecting the priorities of need in my State.

Surely the same is already true in most of our States, and surely it can be brought to be true in the remaining States if and when some of these amendments—such as the Quie amendment, such as the Green amendment, such as some of the other amendments—are made a part of our law.

I believe we should not delude ourselves as to what the basic issue here involved is. The fundamental, basic issue is not some of the smoke that has been raised in recent days.

The fundamental and basic issue is what will be the respective positions of the local school districts, of the State departments of education, and of the national Department of Education. I intend to vote in favor of control by local and State people and instrumentalities.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and invite your attention at this time to those elements that will brighten the paths of learning for the handicapped, sections 151 through 160 of this bill.

The slow pace in meeting at even minimum levels the educational needs of our handicapped children torments me, Mr. Chairman, as it does many of our colleagues in this House. Handicapped children—especially the little ones—do not yet realize the trouble they are in, nor can they comprehend the hard, hopeless times that lie ahead if ignorance palls their future. The clock runs slow for the handicapped child. With every passing day that his intellectual development lags, so also do his chances for a satisfying and productive youth and adulthood. Too little, too late has been his lot for too, too long.

The amendments proposed in H.R. 7819 offer positive continuity to the fine beginning the 89th Congress scored toward bettering the educational outlook for the handicapped child.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that just about a year ago, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Education and Labor was appointed. I had the honor of serving as its chairman.

Before this subcommittee came a parade of witnesses—parents and teachers with vexing headaches and heartaches from vainly seeking help that was not available. Then there were the more experienced educators who know the potential strength of education against the defeating blow of chronic handicap. This array of witnesses—through more than a thousand pages of testimony—drove home this hard fact: The handicapped constitute a minority—a group unique in the dismal reality that every single member lacks something of what it takes to be heard most effectively on matters concerning his best interests.

It was apparent from the very start that we lack a national policy with respect to the educational improvement of our handicapped children; also missing were significant data on the true dimensions and intensity of the problems gulfing these youngsters as they mature in terms of the calendar.

President Johnson responded by directing John Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to create a Task Force on Handicapped Children and Child Development within his Department. Our Chief Executive took this action on Independence Day of last year. Here is part of the President's statement on the task force:

> There has been very little attempt to detect and correct problems that might cause children to fail in later life. If the resources of the school and the community can be brought to bear on these problems before they are damaging, the children and the Nation will be greatly benefited. We must expand our national resources to help the handicapped and to prevent failure among our children.

Under the capable leadership of its Chairman, Lisle C. Carter, Assistant Secretary of HEW for Individual and Family Services, the 12-member task force has probed broadly, deeply, and painstakingly into the nature and scope of handicapping problems of children across the Nation.

The task force reported that handicapping conditions among the children and youth of our country rank as a major national health, social, educational, and economic problem. An estimated 50 million of our citizenry have physical, intellectual, or emotional handicaps that limit their ability to carry on major life functions. Of this number, 13.5 million are children and youth.

The combined efforts of the task force and the subcommittee have forged the makings of a firm national policy—a policy that favors excellence in special education for the handicapped as a sound Federal investment. The recommendations of the task force and the subcommittee constitute the backbone of the new title VI on education of handicapped children in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which was enacted into law last October, and provide the basis for the proposals we consider here today.

The new title VI provided grants to States to support programs and projects for the education of handicapped children in public and private day schools. It directed the Commissioner of Education to set up a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to strengthen and coordinate his agency's programs in this area; it called for the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children to counsel with the new Bureau and keep it moving on course.

I am pleased to report that the States are busy drafting their plans for using the grants and have had the opportunity to review and comment on the Office of Education's proposed guidelines for administering the program. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established in the Office of Education on January 12. It includes the training and research grants for education of the handicapped, the planning for the State grants, and the captioned films for the deaf service. As for the National Advisory Committee, a slate of qualified nominees is now in the Office of Secretary Gardner for his approval.

These accomplishments logically lead to the principal proposals contained in H.R. 7819 to further support education for the handicapped.

The first proposal—section 151, "Regional resource centers"—addresses itself to the urgencies of identifying our handicapped children early in life, of scientifically evaluating their educational needs, and of sound planning for remedial action in or near their home communities.

These centers would:

First, provide the necessary testing and diagnostic services to determine the special educational needs of children referred to them;

Second, develop appropriate programs in their localities to meet these needs; and

Third, assist the schools, institutions, and other agencies in the respective areas with professional wherewithal, such as consultation—including counseling with parents and teachers—and periodic followup to reexamine and reappraise the special education programs in action. Other technical services would also be available.

The centers would put special accent on the use of instructional media, on the evaluation of available materials, and on the development of new media, tech-

niques, and procedures necessary to help handicapped children to learn.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents an unprecedented opportunity to gather and study solid data on handicapped children—their numbers, characteristics, and requirements. In addition, the centers authorized under this amendment would place our handicapped children in the presence of competent specialists with resources at hand to chart remedial action on an individual basis. Hence, the wheels of salvation could start spinning earlier than has ever before been possible. This is especially important in coping with the more complex problems presented by multiple handicapped youngsters.

This amendment carries an authorization of $7.5 million to support the centers program for the fiscal years 1968–1969.

Section 152—"Recruitment of personnel and dissemination of information on educational opportunities for the handicapped" packs a double-headed thrust.

First, it moves against the critical shortage of teachers and other professional personnel capable of performing the educational services that handicapped children need. Less than one-half of these youngsters who need special education benefits are getting them because of this shortage. Many good positions stand vacant because qualified personnel are not available to fill them. A large number of special education jobs are occupied by persons only partially trained in the field. Where we need an estimated force of 300,000 within this decade, we have only about 70,000.

Excellent training opportunities are now offered—many partially supported under Public Law 85–926, as amended. More are needed, of course, since only about 300 colleges and universities are now capable of providing the training programs—some in just one area of handicap.

A king-size comprehensive recruitment campaign is now in order to encourage large numbers of students and others to find their career goals in education of the handicapped. Every communications medium should be used to its fullest imaginative and creative potential in attracting all levels and types of personnel to this field.

The second thrust of this amendment faces up to the dearth of accurate information about the programs, services, and resources for the education of handicapped children. Parents, teachers, prospective employers, and others interested in and working with handicapped young people too often find themselves against a thick, blank wall when they go looking for educational direction or referral to help a blind, deaf, or crippled child.

This amendment authorizes $1,000,000 for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the Commissioner of Education to award grants or enter into contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations or institutions for personnel recruitment and for dissemination of information relative to education for the handicapped.

Section 156 in H.R. 7819 would extend instructional media programs to all handicapped children. We have a shining example of the benefits to be expected of this proposal in the highly successful captioned films for the deaf service.

I shall not try to describe or summarize the accomplishments of this service. Instead, I would suggest a short visit to the Kendall School—only a short ride from here—to see those enthusiastic, busy youngsters learning and playing together, thanks to communication made possible through resources provided by the captioned films enterprise.

The authority contained in this amendment would promote educational advancement for handicapped persons through special research in the use of educational media; through production and distribution of educational media for handicapped persons and those who work in their behalf; and through training persons in the use of educational media for the instruction of the handicapped.

This amendment provides for increasing the authorization under Public Law 89–258 by $1 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 in order to extend instructional media programs to all handicapped children.

Section 155 extends ESEA title VI entitlements to handicapped children in Indian schools operated by the Department of the Interior and in overseas dependent schools conducted by the Department of Defense.

Finally, under section 160, existing authority to award grants for research on education of the handicapped would be made more flexible by permitting the Government also to contract for such research with States, State or local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher learning, and other public or private educational research agencies and organizations.

Mr. Chairman, these few amendments in H.R. 7819 are needed to advance our quest for a fair educational deal for our handicapped children. The product of these proposals would add new knowledge, new manpower, new interest, new potential, and new incentive among those actively working toward this goal.

The present status of our crusade for educational opportunities for handicapped children is this:

We acknowledge a beginning—late and underfunded to be sure—on several fronts;

We appreciate the foundations for intelligent planning provided by the task force and the subcommittee;

And, we guarantee to return here again and again and again until that good day when the bill of educational rights for the handicapped is fully written and under full-steam implementation.

Our great country which honors its international commitments with life itself can never rest content while its handicapped remain fallen victims of educational want and broken promise.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to make a comment with respect to the colloquy between the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and, I believe, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], with respect to the question of whether or not there is a church-state issue in respect of the title III amendments which the gentlewoman is proposing. I have just received a letter dated May 22, 1967, the entire text of which I shall put in the RECORD, from the department of education of the U.S. Catholic Conference. It reads as follows:

U.S. CATHOLIC CONFERENCE,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: We understand that during the House of Representative's debate on H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, an effort will be made by Mrs. Green to change Title III (Supplementary Educational Centers and Services) into a totally State-operated educational program without the quality control features now inherent in that program. We are totally and profoundly opposed to such an amendment and urge you to reject it.

The emerging operation of Title II programs across the country has been encouraging. For the first time, in community after community, public and private school educators are sitting down together to work out supplementary programs for children, regardless of the school they attend. We believe that the cooperation now engendered by Title III into a totally State-run operation inevitably would diminish this cooperation and result, in many States, in minimal services to children in private schools.

A State-plan operation would ultimately result in greater State interference in the entire workings of the Title III program. It would raise new and serious questions as to the equitable participation of children in private schools in more than thirty states with strict limitations on state assistance to nonpublic schools. Furthermore, such a fundamental change in the program would undoubtedly result in administrative changes which would operate to inhibit today's encouraging cooperation between public and private school educators. The vast majority of local school district administrators favor the present arrangement, fearful of negative forms of interference by state agencies.

We are firmly convinced that changing Title III as suggested by Mrs. Green would result in the diminution, and in some States possibly the termination of services for children in private schools.

For these reasons, we are adamantly opposed to this crippling amendment.

Sincerely yours,
Very Rev. Msgr. JAMES C. DONOHUE,
Director, Department of Education.

I very much wish there were not a church-state issue involved with respect to her title III amendment, but in view of the colloquy just now and in view of my statement in my opening remarks in which I expressed the view that the gentlewoman's amendment to title III posed serious church-state problems, I felt it was important to give some concrete evidence to support my statement.

In addition to the opposition to the gentlewoman's title III amendment on church-state grounds, I have today received many telegrams opposing the amendment for educational reasons, and I insert them at this point in the RECORD.

I call particular attention to the telegram from Jacob I. Hartstein, president, Kingsborough Community College, City

University of New York, the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on title III.

CHAIRMAN OF TITLE III NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE OPPOSES GREEN AMENDMENT TO TITLE III

As Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I strongly urge you to oppose the Green amendment turning title III over to the State.

The present administrative arrangement of participation by three levels—local, State and Federal—is working to bring about significant and much needed creative educational progress, and is proving to be an invaluable and highly successful experiment in the upgrading of education with the aid of useful Federal leadership. It would be a serious error to turn this program over to the States before they have made a real commitment to innovation and organized appropriately and adequately to assume this important responsibility.

A copy of the resolution regarding this matter adopted at its last meeting by our National Advisory Committee is being delivered to you by messenger today.

DR. JACOB I. HARTSTEIN,
Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Title III ESEA; President, Kingsborough Community College of the City University of New York.

OHIO STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OPPOSES TITLE III SHIFT NOW

Urge transfer of title III ESEA to the States be made through gradual transition. Abrupt move would create serious administrative problems.

M. W. ESSEX,
Ohio Superintendent of Public Instruction.

MAY 22, 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY EDUCATOR SUPPORTS PRESENT TITLE III

The impending vote on the Green amendment that would turn title 3 over to the respective States is a very important one for American education this should not happen it is definitely not in the best interest of American education as director of the independent national study of title three I can say without any doubt whatsoever that the twenty distinguished educators who participated in the study and a substantial majority of the pace directors themselves feel this way for evidence see pages 80–81 of the recently published Senate print on the title three study to repeat myself for emphasis turning PACE over to the States will be a fundamental error and the fine record of the committee will be overlooked by the great protest and criticism that will arise from educators and administrators if this happens copy Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and Congressman CARL D. PERKINS.

RICHARD I. MILLER,
Director Program on Educational Change University of Kentucky.

OREGON EDUCATORS

Urge rejection of pending Green amendment title 3 ESEA. Could create much havoc in title 3 funding now lacking title 1. State Department too sensitive to local political issues and old school tie patronage. Clear evaluation jeopardized by personal legislators and creates tendency to under finance projects feared as States jitters common near elections.

JAMES MCCALISTER,
FRED BEUHLING,
DOYLE MCCASLIN,
ROBERT CASEBEER,
ROBERT MEINHARDT,
ALF MEKVOLD,
Oregon Educators.

MINNESOTANS OPPOSE TITLE III CHANGE

The executive committee of the Educational Research and Development Council of northeast Minnesota representing 38 school districts supports the present policy of the U.S. Office of Education directly handling the grants to local school districts and supportive agencies for Title III funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We feel the present system is satisfactory and our negotiations directly with the U.S. Office have been more than adequate. We would be apprehensive of the funds being turned over to the State departments of education for their dissemination at this time. First, because of the amount of political pressure that would be brought to bear on the State department; second, lack of available personnel to distribute the funds and oversee the projects; and third, ineffectiveness of small school districts in dealing directly with the State departments. Cooperative councils serve to strengthen the position of these districts. In discussing this with executive secretaries of other councils located throughout our State, I have received similar reactions from each of them. Therefore, we would appreciate your support in backing Commissioner Howe's position supporting the U.S. office.

Respectfully,

WESLEY T. SHEPARD,
Executive Secretary, Education Research and Development Council of Northeast Minnesota.

FRANKFORT, KY., SUPERINTENDENT CITES TITLE III ADVISORY PANEL

Congress called for the creation of a representative committee to advise the commissioner of education in the administration of title III ESEA. This committee worked diligently to achieve the purposes of the act and I am convinced that transfer of the administration of title III to the separate states will bring about needless duplication of effort and will inhibit interstate exchange of innovative ideas in education.

HARRY M. SPARKS,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CHARLES KETTERING OPPOSES SHIFT OF TITLE III

As a trustee of a foundation which devotes two thirds of its income to educational innovation and also as a member of the National Advisory Committee working directly with the commissioner of education regarding matters relating to title III of the ESEA I am most concerned about amendments which would allegedly place the responsibility for title III in the hands of the States. State Departments of Education should be strengthened so that they might assume greater responsibility for educational affairs but title III is designed to support educational innovation and change. Education improvement through innovation is of national, even international, concern and is not a function of nor should it be limited to arbitrary political boundaries.

CHARLES F. KETTERING.

SAN FRANCISCO SUPERINTENDENT FAVORS PRESENT ESEA

Urge immediate approval of H.R. 7819, the ESEA amendments of 1967. Consideration should not be given to any other amendments at this time.

HAROLD SPEARS,
Superintendent of Schools.

MAY 22, 1967.

SEATTLE SUPERINTENDENT FAVORS TITLE III

We favor continuation of the present arrangement for administration of the PL 89–10 Title III funds. It enables the State office to make recommendations, but leaves the final decision to the object review of highly trained specialists of the U.S. Office of Education.

FORBES BOTTOMLY,
Superintendent Seattle Public Schools.

May 22, 1967.

WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS APPROVE OF TITLE III

Urge your support for continuation of Title 3 ESEA legislation in its present form. This legislation gives meaning and purpose to organizational participation by regional educational laboratories, colleges and universities, State departments of education, local school districts and related educational agencies. This is a blend of research and development resources that no single State educational agency has been able to create on a sustaining basis. Its developments would not have been possible had Title 3 grants been solely under the control of State departments of education.

GEORGE B. BRAIN,
Chairman, Board of Directors, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory and Dean, College of Education, Washington State University.

MAY 22, 1967.

STOCKTON, CALIF., SUPERINTENDENT FOR PRESENT ESEA

Strongly urge that ESEA programs be continued under administration of USOE. Any change at this time would result catastrophic confusion.

JAMES M. REUSSWIG,
Superintendent of Schools, Stockton Unified School District.

ALBUQUERQUE CENTER OPPOSES TITLE III CHANGE

I wish to urge rejection of any amendments to ESEA, PL89–10, that would place title III, innovative programs, under complete control of State departments of education. Title III programs in New Mexico have experienced no problems with the current dual arrangement which allows both the State Department and the U.S. Office of Education responsibility in program supervision copy of this message sent to Congressmen Walker and Morris.

L. E. "NED" ROBERTS,
Director, Planning and Administration, Education Service Center.

ARKANSAS EDUCATORS OPPOSE GREEN AND QUIE AMENDMENTS

In the interest of educational programs for Arkansas youth, we educators urge the defeat of the Green and Quie amendments to ESEA 1965.

C. W. Oliver, B. Huneycutt, C. Bratcher, B. Phelan, E. H. Simmons, J. S. Graves, J. Moose, B. Conrow, E. Hansard, I. Boyer, L. Pearson, R. Smith, K. Arnold, J. Krakow, M. Richardson.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., FOR PRESENT TITLE III

Our computer uses in education project under the current title III provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a superb addition to our innovative efforts we hope to continue our working relationship with the United States Office of Education.

GUILLERMO LOPEZ,
Project Director, Title Three Santa Barbara City Schools.

MAY 22, 1967.

AVOID PANDEMONIUM SAYS ANNISTON, ALA., SUPERINTENDENT

It is imperative to local school boards of education that the present Elementary Secondary Act legislation be continued without major alterations *to prevent pandemonium*

developing in the local school Federal assisted programs. If changes are to be made they should develop as a result of improving existing legislation extending to State departments of education time in which to strengthen those divisions. The existing legislation provides for that developmental feature for State departments of education. Not only are State departments of education inadequately prepared at the present time to administer titles 1 and 2, but a block grant to the State will otherwise make major alterations to the existing programs. Alterations to the existing bill would bring the innovative nature of the title 3 programs to a screeching halt. Innovations in education are by their very nature overly sensitive to change in structure and administration. If major alterations to the existing legislation can be prevented, a distinct service will be rendered to the boys and girls, the faculty, and staff members who are very deeply committed to the existing programs, especially title 3 of the Elementary-Secondary Act.

J REVIS HALL,
Superintendent, Anniston City Schools.

MAY 22, 1967.

PRESENT TITLE III EXPRESSES FAITH IN LOCAL SCHOOLS

With reference to Edith Green amendment it is believed that purposes of title ESEA legislation are best served under present arrangement the majority of 51 participating systems of the title 3 mid-Tenn. (middle Tenn.) project are enthusiastically involved in investigating and pilot testing innovative instructional practices. In effect title 3 expresses faith in the ability of local systems to up-grade themselves and the response of systems in middle Tenn. support this confidence. Many systems are presently developing cooperative approaches which cross system line. Any effort to remove or diminish this attitude of responsibility on the part of local systems could severely handicap the achievement of the intent of title 3 and current progress under existing legislation Tennessee State department gives valuable assistance in advisory capacity in planning and operation and encouraging local systems to utilize creativity in extending beyond usual structure confines.

MAX VANN,
Director, Project Mid-Tennessee.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN., ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT IS FOR TITLE III

Imperative that Green amendment on Title Three be defeated. Federal review of Title Three proposals an essential "Court of Appeals" for innovative programs. Transfer of Title Three to State and cursory review. Objective evaluations also threaten by transfer to State due to inadequate resources, political motivations and undermanned department.

IRA J. SINGER,
Assistant Superintendent of Schools, West Hartford, Conn.

ANATONE, WASH., SUPPORTS PRESENT TITLE III

We support the present administration for Title 3 Public Law 89–10. We feel the balance of Federal and State control is efficient in helping the local school districts.

HENRY CHARBONNEAU,
Superintendent of Schools, Anatone, Wash., Administrator of Title 3 Grant.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION HAS NOT INTERFERED SAYS WISCONSIN EDUCATOR

We received a grant under Title Three in June 1966 to provide psychological testing services and to initiate a remedial reading program for 17 school communities in our area, where these services were not now being provided for disabled readers. The National Office of Education has not interfered in any way in the operation of our project and has been most helpful in giving us advice when requested. P.L. 89–10 provides the ways and means to aid in educating children which has never been done in the history of our country.

KENNETH POPPY,
Coordinator of CEEA No. 8, Appleton, Wis.

SUPPORT RETENTION OF PRESENT TITLE III SAYS WASHINGTON EDUCATOR

Joint Federal-State participation in allocation of Public Law 89–10 Title 3 funds has been demonstrated as an effective means of encouraging all States and localities to make wider application of educational improvements. I respectfully urge you to support retention of the present method of allocating Title 3 funds.

Respectfully,

GORDON MCCLOSKEY,
Professor of Education, Washington State University.

DEFEAT QUIE AND GREEN AMENDMENTS TITLE III PROJECT DIRECTOR URGES

As director of one ESEA Title III project I urge you to use every effort to defeat the proposed amendments of Edith Green and Albert Quie. Turning funds over to State departments of education would stifle the change process just emerging in education. Universities and State departments are by their nature more provincial and less venturesome than USOE.

FLORENCE MCCORMICK.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., SUPERINTENDENT SAYS TITLE III "HIGHLY SATISFACTORY"

Administration of Title III ESEA programs at Federal level has been highly satisfactory. Program has encouraged creativity and motivated new approaches and solutions to educational problems. Urge continuation and expansion of Title III program in present form.

RONALD E. WALTON,
Superintendent, Bloomington Metropolitan Schools.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, in the final few moments let me suggest that we are seeing at this point in the deliberations on education in America aided by Federal funds from the Federal Government something that might be akin to the Civil War experience when there came to history the development of the McClellan law. The McClellan law, briefly stated, was that whatever can go wrong will go wrong. Recently the distinguished Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, Lee Loevinger, brought that law up to date in terms of criticism of Federal programs when he stated that it seems to be the order of the day now that whatever is working must need fixing. Phrase it this way: Whatever is working must need fixing. That is exactly the status that we find this bill in. There is no one who can come to the well of this House and deny that this bill not only did live up to the expectations of its sponsors in the 89th Congress but it exceeded them in every performance test and who can state that it did not bring people together who never were together before and reached children who never had assistance before they are getting that now? It has gone into areas that have never had quality education before. It has done its work well and it does not need the fixing that those on the other side suggest it does.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, a week ago my colleague from California [Mr. BELL] and my colleague from New York [Mr. REID] announced their intention to support the committee-reported bill, H.R. 7819, and to vote against the proposed substitute, H.R. 8983. Today, I join them in that statement of intent. I do not feel that I can, as a responsible Republican and as a responsible citizen, support a proposal which threatens to wreck our carefully constructed program of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education.

The substitute proposal would give Federal funds to State educational agencies, in the form of block grants, for reallocation within the State. Since I am a strong believer in the concept of State and local control of education, this facet of the substitute proposal is attractive to me. However, H.R. 8983 contains so many undesirable features that I cannot in all conscience support it.

In the first place, the substitute completely negates the commitment we made as a nation only 2 years ago—a commitment to equality of opportunity in education for all children, poor as well as rich. When this Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, it recognized that poverty and educational deprivation were a national problem, a problem which was not bounded by city, State, or regional lines. The Congress also recognized that the solution of the problem of educational deprivation was in the national interest—the children of the ghetto who received an inadequate education became the school dropouts, the juvenile delinquents, the welfare recipients of the future. Rather than becoming contributors to our national economy, the educationally deprived all too often became a drain on our resources. The high cost of compensatory education was seen by the Members of this House as insignificant, as compared to the cost of the rehabilitative and corrective measures which might be required if the education were not provided.

The title I formula, based on the number of children from low-income families residing within each school district, was designed to pinpoint Federal financial assistance on the areas of greatest need. In this it has been successful, as school districts across the country have designed projects to meet the special educational needs of their disadvantaged students. The educational gap between rich and poor has slowly been narrowing.

The substitute proposal would not continue this emphasis on the national concern for the alleviation of the effects of poverty. Although no less than 50 percent of the funds would have to be spent for the education of the poor, this represents a substantial cut when compared with the current program. Since the allocation formula does not take into account the number of children of poverty within each State or district, the States which will suffer financially if the substitute is adopted are the States which need funds the most desperately.

Under H.R. 8983, the authorizations for our 16 southern and border States—some of the States which have the least resources to provide education of high quality—would be cut by $373 million. My own State of New York would lose

$118 million, even with the floor provision which has been inserted in the substitute proposal. New York has an extremely high number of educationally deprived children in its public and nonpublic schools. It cannot, financially or educationally, afford such a loss.

The minority views contained in the report of the Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 7819 quotes Dr. Bernard Donovan, superintendent of schools of New York City, as favoring general Federal aid to education rather than the present program of categorical assistance. One would therefore presume that Dr. Donovan would support the proposed substitute to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, the respected superintendent of the New York City schools clarified his position on April 26, indicating that general aid was considered by the superintendents of large-city schools as a long-range objective requiring careful consideration. Of the substitute proposal, Dr. Donovan commented that "administratively, these changes would throw the present Federal assistance programs into chaos." I cannot in all conscience support a measure which would complicate, rather than simplify, administration of our program of aid to elementary and secondary education.

I feel that the responsible course, if there is dissatisfaction with our current elementary and secondary education program, would be to conduct hearings on proposed amendments. No hearings have been held on H.R. 8983. It was not introduced until April 20, over a week after the Committee on Education and Labor had filed its report on H.R. 7819. Unless any substitute is subject to scrutiny by Members of Congress and educational authorities, we have no assurance that it will be the most effective we can devise. Until we have such assurance, I do not feel that I can support an alternative proposal.

I therefore believe that the only responsible approach open to me is to support H.R. 7819, the committee-reported bill.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. As we approach for the second time, discussion of possible changes in the historic education bill, passed only 2 years ago after some years of abortive efforts, we are faced by a new and serious threat. Our colleague from Minnesota has introduced a bill that would substitute programs of block grants to the States for the existing formula and would in effect amend the present act virtually out of existence. I urge the summary rejection of the Quie amendment that would reverse the progress in providing quality education to America's poor, made possible by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This sudden call for appropriation of block grants to States, when the present education legislation is still in its infancy, is at best ill timed.

At the present time, block aid is not a practical or a feasible goal. It will jeopardize the educational opportunities now being afforded the economically disadvantaged children who are most in need of assistance for the future good of our Nation.

To begin with, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is too new for the drastic changes proposed by the Quie amendment.

It has not even been in operation in some places a year; the most anywhere would be almost 2 years. This is hardly time to allow proper assessment of what we have done, much less to form the basis for a radical change of approach.

One of the crying needs, being met at the present time by title V of the Elementary and Secondary Act, is aid to strengthen State departments of education so that they might function with maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Many such departments, now in the process of reorganizing, would be the first to admit that they are not ready themselves to assume the task and responsibility of administering large blocks of Federal funds. Not that such a capability is not one of the precise goals toward which they are striving. But these State agencies must take the steps toward the realization of their full potential with reasonable speed and in sequence.

Of course the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 was not a perfect tool. We altered it last year to increase its effectiveness. We are in the process of doing so again. These new amendments make refinements that have proven necessary as inadequacies in the operations of the law have made themselves apparent. For example, the formula for allotting money to the States under title V has been revised to place more emphasis on the population which the State department of education in a given State must serve.

Likewise, because it has become apparent that adequate planning is the requisite first step to any kind of successful State program to meet educational needs and problems, the small mention of State planning grants afforded in the original law, would be expanded by these latest amendments to include a whole subsection of present title V to provide for comprehensive educational planning at the State level.

Still another positive contribution of H.R. 7819 would be the inclusion under present title I of provisions for the establishment and utilization by local educational agencies of teaching teams from the Teacher Corps. Since title I now provides a host of benefits for deprived children, including some teacher programs, it is just good organization to include this unique and thus far successful experiment in further providing for the education of the educationally disadvantaged.

The broadening and enriching experiences that are taken for granted by their more fortunate contemporaries have been offered to underprivileged children for the first time under title I. I receive letters almost daily from parents and from school organizations about the great value of services being conducted under title I and about the urgent need for their extension to schools that cannot meet the extremely rigid standards for participation necessitated by lack of sufficient funds. For example, the city of Newark has been compelled to limit eligibility for participation in title I programs to those schools with at least an 18 percent concentration of children from families with an annual income of $3,000 or less. I repeat, an income of $3,000 or less—a sad commentary on conditions that prevail in the richest nation in the world. The grand total of enrollment for title I schools, including secondary, elementary, specials, and nonpublic, is 56,651. However, not all the schools meeting this standard can receive the benefits since funds have been adequate only to cover schools having not less than a 22-percent concentration of such children. Yet, the Quie amendment would substantially reduce assistance to New Jersey and other populous States with the largest numbers of educationally disadvantaged children concentrated in metropolitan areas. It is cruel indeed to punish these children by cutting back authorizations that are already paltry compared to the need. This generation of poor children is not expendable for partisan, political purposes. They are entitled to quality education as a matter of right. The committee bill recognizes this national obligation to bring educational aid to those who need it most.

Another problem of grave concern is the impact of the Quie amendment upon opportunities for educational services to private school students made possible under the present law. I quote from a letter received from the Very Reverend Monsignor Joseph J. Vopelak, coordinator, New Jersey Catholic Conference, Office of Educational and Economic Opportunity Programs, Trenton, N.J.:

> The rights given to these children under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as you well know, are the result of much deliberation, planning, and cooperation by responsible persons throughout the country, which certainly has not happened in this case (i.e., the Quie amendment). These rights have been made specific through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and particularly through its enforcement and implementation both on the state and local level. We are convinced that any change in this Act, without adequate planning and serious discussion, will do violence to these rights. Past experience is all that we can draw on in judging whether or not the inclusion of non-public school children in the fashion in which it is done in the Quie amendment will be effective or not. Our past experience convinces us that there is nothing to be gained from the amendment, but much that can be lost.

At present, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7819 and the law as amended have more of proven worth to offer to this country's educational progress than any of the other suggested alternatives. For one thing there would probably be more money authorized for the continuing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended. Second, there is the advantage of specific programs that "zero" that money in on a specific trouble spot, so that assistance is directed to need. Third, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as the provisions of H.R. 7819 would amend it, has behind it almost two years of basically successful operation, a host of experienced educators, and the

examination of congressional inquiry through hearings and the studies of various research and advisory committees, such as the National Advisory Council on the education of disadvantaged children.

The dangers in the Quie proposal are reflected in the fact that our Nation's major education organizations oppose it. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has demonstrated its worth as evidenced by the endorsement of the committee bill extending the act by the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Parents Committee, the American Library Association, the AFL–CIO, and all major national church organizations. This bill represents the most promising form of support that recognizes all of the various needs and interests concerned with American education.

As we continue to refine, year by year, our original work of 1965, we may hope to move toward the lesser complication of general as opposed to categorical Federal grants. We may hope and plan for the time when the chief role of the Federal grant in education will be to supply financial support in large lump portions to States which will then be fully prepared to administer and dispense those funds. Certainly we are 2 years closer to that time because of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But that time clearly is not yet; and we jeopardize the work that has been so long and so carefully wrought if we jump to the conclusion that it is. That is why I fully support and urge the overwhelming adoption of H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, as being in the best interest of all the schoolchildren of America. Let us carry forward the splendid progress that has already been achieved under this landmark legislation.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on behalf of H.R. 8983, the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

For too long now the Federal Government has been stumbling down the same old road of special-purpose grants-in-aid to solve every problem in every community in America. This disorganized proliferation of programs has become a tangle of inflexible compliances and red-tape seemingly intended to confuse taxpayers, harass public officials, and defeat the purposes of the legislation.

H.R. 8983 does for elementary and secondary education what is needed throughout the whole decaying house of Federal grants-in-aid. It makes a reasonable consolidation of four titles of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, removes most of the Federal strings, then makes a block grant to each State, so that State and local officials can administer their programs according to State and local needs.

There is no doubt that this is an unpopular measure at the Office of Education. It would apparently cause some unemployment and dislocation there. The Commissioner of Education calls this bill a backward step. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare says it "would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs."

Quite certainly it would not spread so much assistance in the Office of Education as before, but when he refers to a thin film of Federal funds, he must be thinking of the current administration of title I instead of the Quie bill.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has presided over the spreading of title I funds into 25,000 of the 27,000 districts in America, including many of the wealthiest, according to a formula which enables the rich school districts and States to get even richer. It is difficult to imagine how a State government could spread the money much thinner if it tried. The Quie bill, on the other hand, gives State governments the freedom and flexibility to concentrate Federal funds in attacking local and State educational problems in a way which is impossible under the current act.

I for one am confident of the capacity of our State governments to administer this program effectively, and I know that many share with me a deep resentment at the charges on the part of the proponents of the committee bill that our State governments are incompetent and corrupt and that they cannot be trusted to administer programs such as this. Their charge is equally false that southerners support this bill only because they see it as a device to maintain school segregation. They completely fail to understand the deep conviction on the part not only of most southerners but of the majority of Americans throughout this Nation that State and local governments are the appropriate agencies for administering elementary and secondary education.

The backers of the committee bill also attempt to argue that the southern and border States would get less money under the Quie bill than under their bill. The administration apparently wants to have its cake and eat it too. The President has requested less than half the appropriation necessary to enable a new State distribution formula to become operative which would actually provide sizable gains for southern and border States. But the administration and its spokesmen in this House are using full authorization figures in comparative charts in an effort to lead us to think that the Quie bill would provide smaller grants.

In actuality, the Quie bill uses a tested and popular formula which has been a part of the National Defense Education Act grants since 1958 and which dollar for dollar favors most southern and border States over the current Elementary and Secondary Education Act formula. The Quie bill, in addition, guarantees every State at least as much in fiscal year 1969, when it becomes effective, as it receives in fiscal year 1968 under Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I prefer a bird in the hand; a significant reform in Federal-State relations, to two in the bush; speculation that just possibly an extra billion and a half dollars might be found somewhere to more than double the fiscal year 1969 appropriation so that a more favorable distribution formula would go into effect.

For those to whom a few dollars makes a great difference, it might be well to remember that the Quie bill would also remove from the stubborn grasp of the Office of Education and give to the States the sizable title III program, for which the administration is asking $240 million for the coming fiscal year. Despite the pleas of educators throughout the Nation, the committee bill continues this supplementary centers and services program as a private preserve of the Office of Education. If this is in fact a program to foster innovation, then certainly 50 different States could provide more fruitful innovative thinking than one small division in the Office of Education. Let us not forget that our strength as a nation lies in our creative diversity.

I am certain that the teachers and administrators of my own State will look upon a vote for H.R. 8983 as a vote of confidence in them. After all, this bill represents a major step in the direction that most of America's teachers have been urging for years. The dedicated and capable schoolmen and women of Tennessee deserve to have a greater voice in determining how to solve problems with which they are more familiar than anyone else. This bill would provide them with $38.6 million more than the administration request to help them do it. If the Quie formula and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act formula are applied to the same amount of money—the fairest possible comparison—for example, the $1.5 billion the administration is requesting for the four titles included in the Quie bill, then the Quie formula gives Tennessee $39,409,930, while the Elementary and Secondary Education Act formula provides only $36,073,629.

The irony of the controversy over this bill is that administration spokesmen from the White House to the Office of Education have been talking about just this kind of reform for years, but because somebody else decided to do something about it first, they are determined to oppose it. That is a familiar story in this administration. So they have hauled out all the tired old cliches to fight it: "You never had it so good!" "Don't let them take it away" "Why rock the boat?"

It may be necessary to rock the boat a little to go forward. The people who oppose this bill like to call themselves liberals, but they are really the standpatters and go-slowers of the 1960's. They quake in fear at the thought of a State or local official receiving some credit for spending Federal revenues. They are the new breed of old guard. They say to the educational leaders of America:

> We can't afford to change the status quo. Sure, it may be bad, but then, it could get worse if we tamper with it. So just be grateful for every cent of your money that we decide to give back to you, and don't ask questions about the terms. And especially don't get any ideas about knowing how to run your schools as well as we do here in Washington.

With $425 million to spend on "public information" the administration might just convince some people that these backward-looking liberals are right. But

I hope that the Members of this Committee will not be misled.

Mr. Chairman, a vote for H.R. 8983 is a vote for strong and effective State government and a vote for better elementary and secondary education. It is a sound investment in America's future.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill—H.R. 7819—to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is very bad news indeed for the schools of Texas. With one stroke, it cuts the fiscal 1968 allocation for the Texas schools under title I from $176 million to $96 million—a reduction of $80 million.

It accomplishes this by the simple means of suspending a change in the formula—approved by Congress last year—which was to have taken effect on July 1, 1967.

From the figures I have seen, the original act was grossly unfair to States like Texas. Under the act, the number of children counted was obtained by: First, using the census estimate of 1960 of the number of school-age children in families with less than $2,000 income, and second, adding those school-age children in families receiving more than $2,000 in aid for dependent children—ADC—welfare payments. This number was multiplied by the State average per-pupil cost of public education.

It just so happens that Texas and nine other States, because of relatively low welfare payments, cannot count a single child under the ADC category, and although Texas has 647,000 children in families with less than a $3,000 income, we can count only the 398,000 who are in families below the $2,000 level.

Not only do we count fewer children than wealthier States, but the schools in Texas are paid at a rate of only $197.80 per child as compared with a one-half of the State average rate in New York of $393.14.

Last year, the Congress removed a large part of this inequity by raising the family income measure to $3,000, so that our schools could count the entire 647,000 children, and by raising our amount per child to one-half the national average per-pupil cost of education—$237.74. This would have meant a title I allocation of $176 million for Texas schools.

This year the administration bill suspends this change in the law until such time as there is a 100-percent appropriation of the title I authorization. With the President asking $1.2 billion for title I for next year—less than half the authorization—the suspension holds for fiscal 1968. With all of the pressures on the budget, it may well hold forever.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have some obligation in the Congress to provide for equitable treatment of all the States in the distribution of Federal aid. I am not making this plea solely for Texas, but for most of the States of the Union which are treated in an extremely unequal way by this legislation.

Title I is supposed to be a program for financing special educational assistance for children who, because of the low income of their families and factors often associated with low income, have experienced educational problems. The use of 1960 census data may be suspect by now for several reasons, but it does provide a rough measure of the relative size of the problem when applied on a State-by-State basis. Let us just look at the manner in which this act operates on the basis of such data.

Texas had 647,000 school-age children in families with less than $3,000 annual income; New York had 374,000 such children—little more than half as many as Texas. But under the committee bill—which President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY and others have praised in such glowing terms—Texas is allotted $96 million for title I and New York is allotted $174 million.

New York has half as many very poor children, but gets nearly twice as much money as Texas to help educate poor children.

That is the cold arithmetic of a Federal-aid farce. It is ridiculous and impossible to justify in any terms.

Congressman QUIE, of Minnesota, has proposed an alternative formula which treats all of the States equally by comparing their school-age population and their relative ability to support education as measured by income per school-age child. If the Congress appropriates what the President has requested for this act next year, Texas would actually receive $12 million more under the Quie amendment than under the Johnson administration bill—and it would receive more under the Quie amendment than New York, because Texas has more poor children to educate. Enactment of the Quie amendment, I feel, is the positive approach of assisting more poor children in more States.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support H.R. 7819, and intend to oppose all weakening amendments.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has served us well, and we should not be beguiled by thinly veiled attempts to evade the clear requirements of the U.S. Supreme Court for a racially integrated public school system.

I am also concerned about the divisive attempt to revive the emotionally charged church-state issue which has already been fairly and legally met by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as it now exists.

I supported Federal aid to education when it was first proposed by President John F. Kennedy, and I support the efforts of the Johnson administration to continue this vitally important program. Skyrocketing municipal tax rates require the Federal Government to come to the aid of the small property owner. Our very future depends on the quality of our educational system, and we dare not compromise in this urgent area of human endeavor.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 7819, the school aid bill reported by the Education and Labor Committee. The alternate measure proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], would undermine programs that have been carefully assembled by local school districts to benefit educationally disadvantaged children, without regard to their race or religion.

The evidence is overwhelming that a vote for the Quie amendment would be a vote against the children of my own State of California.

The probable impact of the Quie proposal on education in California was explored in some depth by six of my colleagues who joined me last week in a special order.

The gentlemen reported the alarm felt by school administrators in at least nine cities—Los Angeles, San Diego, Oakland, Berkeley, Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Huntington Beach, Fullterton, and Sacramento.

San Diego, which I have the honor to represent, would lose an estimated $650,000 a year under the Quie plan to turn over Federal aid funds to the States. Throughout San Diego County, the annual loss would be twice as great, around $1.3 million.

I would like to review, for the record, some of the comments that were made during our special order on May 17.

Speaking of the Quie amendment, Mr. COHELAN said:

> There is absolutely no guarantee that an adequate share of funds to help educationally deprived children would be channeled by the States to the large cities . . . where the problem of teaching the disadvantaged is most acute.

Mr. ROYBAL stated:

> The children in California and elsewhere who need the help the most would be the very children to suffer the most from the adoption of such an amendment.

Mr. HANNA said:

> To completely change the organization, purpose and administration of the (school aid) funds at this point, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] proposes, would prove disastrous to the successful title I programs already underway in over 1,000 California school districts.

Mr. EDWARDS of California pointed out that the existing Elementary and Secondary Education Act, by focusing aid on the child rather than his school, has benefited many categories of students who previously were entitled to no Federal support.

> Now, almost inconceivably—

Mr. EDWARDS said—

> there is an attempt to "improve" this remarkable legislation by cutting $300 million from its appropriation; redistributing its resources to less needy students; redirecting its most important feature, the aid-to-child approach, by channeling all funds through State departments of education; replacing order with chaos in the administration of Federal education funds.

Mr. Moss cited the objections of Sacramento County educators to the Quie amendment.

Mr. CORMAN warned that adoption of the Quie amendment could make the education bill unacceptable to a majority of Members and result in the complete rejection of the bill. The gentleman pointed out that the Los Angeles school district is currently receiving about $15 million a year in title I money, an allocation that he feels could be wiped out by a divisive fight over the Quie plan.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in opposition to the Quie amendment which will do irreparable damage to big city school systems like that of

the Cleveland public school system of my congressional district. The school systems of my community are in need of every possible consideration now available under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as now constituted.

In reviewing programs in which the State has the sole responsibility for distributing Federal funds, there is very little evidence to support hope that the critical needs of the urban centers will be met. The cities and their critical needs are "outvoted" by the suburban and rural representatives who insure that State allocations are diverted and diffused. In Ohio, education allocations are resolved by a State board of education which is not oriented or particularly aware of the critical problems facing central city areas.

At this point, I want to call the attention of the Members to the testimony of our very able superintendent of the Cleveland public schools, Dr. Paul Briggs, who last month stated before the Committee on Education and Labor:

> The experience we have had in Ohio indicated an unfriendly State department of public instruction to urban areas.

He cited the troubles we have had in Ohio over the implementation of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, where under the original State plan not one cent would have been given to any of the eight largest cities in Ohio, where the largest numbers of unfilled jobs and untrained youth are located. In all fairness, I think things are improving but we do not feel that the end of the fight for equity for our urban areas is yet in view.

A second example: When we compare the distribution of title I funds under the predetermined poverty formula with the ways the States have distributed title II, ESEA funds—and you will recall that title II funds must be distributed on the basis of "need"—we find that our large northern cities get a much smaller share of title II funds than they do from title I. New York City, for instance, gets almost 60 percent of New York's title I allotment, but only 24 percent of its title II allotment. Under title I, Cleveland gets double its title II share. Baltimore gets 45 percent of Maryland's title I funds, but only 17 percent of its title II funds.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Office of Education containing comparative figures for these and other northern cities:

City	Percent of city allotment to State allotment	
	Title I	Title II
Los Angeles	19.4	10.0
San Francisco	4.4	1.1
Denver	25.9	17.3
Chicago	51.1	34.3
Baltimore	44.8	16.7
Boston	21.9	10.3
Detroit	34.5	15.1
Minneapolis	10.1	6.0
New York City	59.3	24.1
Cleveland	12.3	6.0
Portland	23.5	18.3
Philadelphia	21.8	8.0
Seattle	15.5	9.8

Mr. Chairman, I frankly do not see how any Member of this House who is concerned about the overwhelming problems of our cities can have any confidence whatsoever that the Quie amendment would be a forward step for urban America. Unless the pattern changes radically in the next year, I think we will find that our big cities will lose under this legislation—and I shudder to think of what the costs to our society may be.

If the Quie amendment is adopted, I know that the cost to the city of Cleveland would be unbearable. Last year, the city received $5,459,000 ESEA funds, while the rest of the county received $1,305,000. Included in these amounts were four title III grants providing supplemental centers to the city of Cleveland, Parma, Orange, and Warrensville Heights. Because of the present grant formula of ESEA and its seed-money effect, Federal assistance of all forms to the primary and secondary schools in Cuyahoga County and Cleveland, Ohio, increased last year from $7 million to $16¾ million—an increase of 135 percent.

The ESEA in Cleveland was immediately utilized to provide the first supplemental educational center in the entire Nation which was established in a warehouse in downtown Cleveland on October 17, 1966. Between October 1966 and February 1967, this center has been used by almost 19,000 different individual Cleveland children from public and nonpublic schools. They come in groups of 300 per day for specially enriched instruction in science, music, and in the heritage of Cleveland.

The people of Cleveland are aware that education is the key to economic and social life and progress. Last November, Cleveland's voters dramatically supported the largest bond and tax issue that the public school system had ever placed on the ballot. People of Cleveland approved, by a plurality of 70 percent, to increase the bonded indebtedness of the school system by 110 percent. They also voted to increase local taxes by 20 percent for the day-to-day operation of Cleveland schools.

This hearty support is clear evidence that the voters of Cleveland are willing to back their school system at a time of greatest need and financial crisis. This clear mandate of support occurred at the same election at which time State bonding requests were rejected in our county and were rejected by a 2-to-1 margin throughout the State. It is obvious from the results of this election that the voters of our city clearly understood, without question, the high need of our school system. It should also be understood however, that, while we in Cleveland are willing to pay to the maximum extent feasible and required for the education of our children in Cleveland, we do not yet have sufficient resources locally to maintain a minimum, adequate education program.

My community is in full support of H.R. 7819 as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. It is my hope that this proposal will be reported out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take long to voice my views on the major controversy surrounding this bill—the substitute bill which we all understand the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] will be offering sometime during the debate this week.

I shall vote against the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota. I shall vote against it for the simple reason that I am convinced that this amendment, however sincerely it is meant, will have the ultimate and unavoidable result of bringing crashing down on our heads the entire elaborate structure of Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education.

We have built this structure, Mr. Chairman, painfully and with great effort, over the past several years. For many years I sat in this House and saw every effort to put national resources to work to attack this national problem rejected. Prior to the late 1950's, a number of efforts were made—unsuccessfully—to persuade the Committee on Education and Labor to hold hearings and report a bill. After the advent of the space age, and the unbelievably belated realization that our national power rested on our national brainpower, aid to education bills got to the floor of the House or the Senate. However, year after year, they failed enactment in one House or the other. Finally, under the leadership of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, and the support of distinguished and dedicated Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as the constructive good will of public and private schoolmen, school administrators, and national organizations of all kinds, we found the formula which enabled us to surmount the last hurdles. At last we could begin the job of putting Federal funds into the school system.

The devices we used are perhaps not symmetrical. They do not, perhaps, meet all the requirements that students of administration like to see on an organization chart. Our system may not be the simplest which man could devise. But—it has one virtue which the simpler systems cannot boast. It works.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as it now stands, enables us to meet the constitutional objections which block grants might give rise to, were they to be made available to private schools. It enables us to make aid available to those millions of American children who attend nonpublic schools. The systems of categorical aid, which are found in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also make it possible—and the Quie amendment would make it virtually impossible—for aid to be channelled where it is most needed—into the urban school systems, into the poor rural school systems, into the systems, where the fires of discontent smoke and are ready to burst into flame unless we continue—as the present act and the committee amendments would allow us—to cope with these problems.

It is ironical, indeed, that the gentleman from Minnesota is willing to surrender, in effect, every type of control which this Congress has, over how the money we appropriate will be spent. My friends on the other side have been, over the years, consistently in favor of proper restrictions on the use of Federal funds. Usually, they want tighter restrictions

than I, for one, have been willing to support. Yet now, with respect to this one area, they are willing to cast responsibility and caution to the winds and allow large sums of money to be expended, from the Federal Treasury, without the slightest guarantee that they will be spent where the Congress wants them to be spent.

Under the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, we would be unable to determine, much less control, the expenditure of these funds. We would not know—and if we knew, we could do nothing about it—whether these funds were going into the poverty areas, or into the most affluent suburbs. The substitute amendment, which will be offered to the bill the committee has so carefully worked out, will put the Congress in the position of simply turning its back on the educational problems of the Nation, and saying to the States, "You work out your solutions, you figure out what you want to do, and how you're going to do it. We'll just pay the bills."

Mr. Chairman, the educational problems of this country are not hidden from us. We know what they are. As legislators, as citizens, we have sought to cope with them. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not, and has never been, a bill for Federal aid for school officials. It is a program of aid for schools, and, even more fundamentally, of aid for students. I would hope that we might be allowed to pursue the programs we have so recently begun, and continue to help young people where they need to be helped, in the manner which the Congress has adjudged appropriate.

The concept of categorical aid, Mr. Chairman, has served us well. It has served us under the National Defense Education Act for a decade. It has served us under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for a shorter period, but still long enough for us to know what we are getting for our money. The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota will only serve to undermine this system. I believe in administrative neatness, I believe in devising simple systems wherever possible. But above all, I believe in Federal aid to education. I do not believe we should chance sacrificing the whole structure just for the sake of a neater organization chart and a simpler procedure for distributing funds.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have just received a telegram which reiterates the strong support for H.R. 7819 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, and expresses the strong opposition of this organization of American teachers to the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mr. Chairman, the text of this telegram follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1967.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, reiterates its strong support for H.R. 7819 and its vigorous opposition to the proposed Quie substitute amendment. In like manner we completely and unalterably oppose the amendment sponsored by Congresswoman Edith Green. Enactment of the Green amendment will so cripple the established desegregation guidelines as to nullify their effectiveness. The National Education Association, in announcing its support of the Green amendment not only switched its stated position, but also participated in an unconscionable surrender to antiprogressive and antidesegregation forces. We commend you and fully support you in your unwavering stand for sound Federal aid legislation.

CHARLES COGEN,
President.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the following is a detailed explanation of the Quie amendment:

THE QUIE AMENDMENT

GENERAL OUTLINE

The amendment takes effect in fiscal 1969, not fiscal 1968. It authorizes an appropriation of $3 billion in fiscal 1969, and such sums as may be necessary for each year thereafter, to consolidate titles I (for deprived children), II (textbooks and library materials), III (supplemental centers) and V (aid to State education departments) of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act under a single title, and to fund other special programs needed in a given State. All programs would be administered through a single State plan submitted by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

Education of handicapped children and the Teacher Corps would not be affected by the amendment.

DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Under the present Act grants are made in Title I to individual school districts or counties based primarily upon 1959 census data. The Quie Amendment adopts the formula used in title III of the National Defense Education Act for a block grant to each State based upon the number of school-age children and personal income per child in that State. This formula would replace four separate allocation formulas under the present Act, and the result favors low income States. The Council of Chief State School Officers has commented that the Quie formula "would eliminate vast inequities." To avoid hardship in States that might lose money under the Quie Amendment, a specific provision requires that *no State shall receive less money than allotted in fiscal year 1968.*

USES OF THE FUNDS

The amendment follows the Act in specifically continuing special programs now authorized under separate grants, and it adds authority for in-service teacher training, counseling and guidance work, and other special programs the States and localities might devise. The amendment would not authorize general aid, such as for raising teachers' salaries or general school construction. But it does give a great deal more latitude for State and local initiative in determining the best use of funds in a State or locality.

PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED CHILDREN

The amendment continues a major focus on deprived children, requiring that each State spend at least one-half its allotment on special programs for the educationally deprived child carried out by local school districts having a high concentration of such children. Since another 7 per cent must be reserved for title II type projects (textbooks, etc.), a State could spend a maximum of 93 per cent of its funds on school programs for deprived children.

PRIORITY FOR NEEDIEST SCHOOLS

The present title I of the Act scatters funds indiscriminately among over 90% of the school districts, including the wealthiest and the poorest. The amendment directs each State to give priority to those school districts confronted with the most urgent educational needs. Such needs would be measured by factors such as "heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, rapid increases in school enrollment and areas of economic depression." The priorities apply to all funds in the four major titles of ESEA and would concentrate funds in inner-city slum schools and in impoverished rural areas to a greater extent than under the present Act.

PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

The amendment continues the Act's benefits for private school pupils, requiring the State plan to provide for special arrangements for such children on an equitable basis. It expands these benefits by providing for the loan of laboratory and other instructional equipment on the same basis as textbooks and library materials are now supplied, and it requires special arrangements for all school programs funded under the Act (rather than merely programs for deprived children). Since the programs authorized are special programs, with separate commingling of funds, State legal restrictions on the use of State funds to aid private school pupils would not apply.

FLEXIBILITY IN ADMINISTRATION

As noted, the amendment provides far greater flexibility in meeting State and local needs. For example, it returns administration of the title III supplemental centers to the States, so that they can be set up to fit State patterns of school organization within each State. Also, except for the minimums set for special programs for deprived pupils and instructional materials and equipment, it permits shifting emphasis among programs to meet local needs. This cannot be done under the present Act.

CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Office of Education administers *more than 30 separate grants* in elementary and secondary education alone. The Quie Amendment is the minimum step that should be taken now to cut down this maze of Federal aids by consolidating those in this Act. If this small step cannot be taken, the likely alternative is that these separate, narrow grants will grow in number with the consequent increase in paperwork, red tape, and Federal controls. This single consolidation would save many millions of dollars in unnecessary administrative costs and would greatly simplify Federal aid for schools. The alternative is increasingly rigid, more restrictive legislation for each small segment of the total educational program.

FALSE ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THE QUIE AMENDMENT

ALLEGATION

1. Private school students would be eliminated or unfairly treated under the Quie Amendment. It would destroy the carefully devised Church-State compromise in ESEA.

Answer

The Quie Amendment adopts exactly the same procedure as ESEA requiring State and local public school officials to provide equitably for private school students. The Quie Amendment actually expands the type of services that must be made available to private school students. Those making this argument are, in effect, contending that any increased discretion to State and local officials jeopardizes private school students.

ALLEGATION

2. Some States will get less money under the Quie formula.

Answer

Most States will get more money under the Quie formula. No State can get less than it received in fiscal 1968.

ALLEGATION

3. Provisions for handicapped children and the Teacher Corps will be eliminated by the Quie Amendment.

Answer

The Quie Amendment does not affect either handicapped children or the Teacher Corps.

ALLEGATION

4. Cities and educationally deprived children will receive less money under the Quie Amendment.

Answer

The Quie Amendment requires that at least 50% of the money be spent on educationally deprived children under State plans. In addition, *all of the money* must give highest priority to "heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, areas of rapid increase in school enrollment and areas of economic depression."

ALLEGATION

5. The Quie Amendment will make it easier to evade civil rights guidelines.

Answer

The Quie Amendment does not in any way alter civil rights enforcement under title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

ALLEGATION

6. The Quie Amendment will be harsher on States alleged to be discriminating because it would permit denial of funds to an entire State when a single school district is found to discriminate.

Answer

The Quie Amendment does not alter basic law in this respect. The Administration now has authority to deny funds State-wide but has never used it.

ALLEGATION

7. The Quie Amendment would delay funds and disrupt programs now under way.

Answer

The opposite is true. The Quie Amendment would not take effect until fiscal year 1969. Upon approval of State plans administration would be greatly simplified and funds available without massive filings and repetitious review by administrators.

ALLEGATION

8. The Quie Amendment would provide general aid for teachers' salaries and school construction, thus depriving private school students who cannot qualify for such direct grants.

Answer

The Quie Amendment does *not* provide general aid for teachers' salaries or school construction. Special programs would qualify, as under the present Act, for special construction to meet special problems.

ALLEGATION

9. The Quie Amendment has had no hearings and provides complicated changes that should be only adopted after careful deliberation.

Answer

The Quie Amendment is simple and straightforward. It adopts the basic procedure of the present Act and an allocation formula long applauded in NDEA. Most witnesses testified favorably as to its objectives. The major change in the Quie Amendment is to provide flexibility for local and State educators to meet their own priorities. The Higher Education Act, Vocational Educational Act and Manpower Development and Training Act, all were written by committee or on the House Floor. They never received committe hearings, as such, in their final form.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, 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. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken today may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 7819.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SUBMISSION OF CONFERENCE REPORT AND STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY S. 666—AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. HARDY (on behalf of Mr. RIVERS) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 666) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

RELIABILITY OF THE M-16 RIFLE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House, as well as millions of Americans, have been greatly disturbed over recent reports that the M-16 rifle presently being used in Vietnam is unreliable. A special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House under Representative ICHORD is presently holding hearings concerning the M-16. I have, this morning, brought to the attention of Secretary of Defense McNamara and the Ichord committee disturbing information that has come into my hands concerning our fighting in Vietnam in general, and the M-16 rifle in particular.

These are some excerpts from this disturbing letter from one of our fighting men:

I can just see the paper back home now. Enemy casualties heavy, Marine casualties light. Let me give you some statistics and you decide if they were light. We left with close to 1,400 men in our battalion and came back with half. We left with 250 men in our company and came back with 107. We left with 72 men in our platoon and came back with 19. Believe it or not, you know what killed most of us—our own rifles. Before we left Okinawa we were all issued the new rifle, the M-16. Practically every one of our dead was found with his rifle torn down next to him where he was trying to fix it.

I have asked the Secretary to supply me with some speedy answers as to the reliability of the M-16, the amount of testing that was done before it was issued, and the extent of its present use in Vietnam. I hope the answers come quickly and will indicate our men are being provided with the type of equipment they deserve to have available to them. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include copies of the letter from the servicemen and my letters to Secretary McNamara and Representative ICHORD. Included also is a copy of an article from the Asbury Park Evening Press of May 20, 1967:

DEAR ———: I just got your letter today aboard ship. We've been on an operation ever since the 21st of last month. I can just see the papers back home now—Enemy casualties heavy Marine casualties light. Let me give you some statistics and you decide if they were light. We left with close to 1400 men in our battalion and came back with half. We left with 250 men in our company and came back with 107. We left with 72 men in our platoon and came back with 19. I knew I was pressing my luck. They finally got me. It wasn't too bad though, I just caught a little shrapnel. I wish I could say the same for all my buddies.

The ratio was something like 8 to 1 confirmed. We don't know how many they dragged away. It was a lot from all the blood we saw, believe it or not, you know what killed most of us? Our own rifles. Before we left Okinawa, we were all issued this new rifle, the M-16. Practically every one of our dead was found with his rifle torn down next to him where he had been trying to fix it. There was a newspaper woman with us photographing all this and the pentagon found out about it and won't let her publish the pictures. They say they don't want to get the American people upset. Isn't that a laugh?

All this just because we had to take some hills with numbers on them. The ones we caught hell on were 861 and 881.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed you will find a very disturbing letter and news release from the Asbury Park Evening Press of Saturday, May 20, 1967, concerning the reliability of the M-16 rifle presently being used by our forces in Viet Nam.

I would appreciate an early reply from you as to the accuracy of the statements as well as the reliability of the M-16. Specifically I would like to know whether the rifle is reliable, whether the difficulty suggested in the letter is being faced by our troops, the amount of testing of the rifle that took

place before it was supplied to our men and the present evaluation by your Department of the weapon.

I also request to be informed if photographs of this situation had been taken as suggested by the letter and have been suppressed by any agency representing our government.

I am sure you are well aware that the American people are quite concerned about the controversy surrounding the M-16 and trust you will favor me with an early reply to my questions.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES J. HOWARD,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1967.

Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ICHORD: The enclosed information is being sent to you in connection with the investigation your subcommittee is presently holding concerning the M-16 rifle.

If I can be of any help to the subcommittee, please do not fail to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. HOWARD,
Member of Congress.

CAUSING DEATHS—MARINE HITS FAULTY RIFLE

"Believe it or not, do you know what killed most of us? Our own rifle.

"Before we left Okinawa we were all issued the new rifle, the M-16.

"Practically every one of our dead was found with his rifle torn down next to him where he had been trying to fix it.

"There was a newspaper woman with us photographing all this and the Pentagon found out about it and won't let her publish the pictures. They say they don't want to get the American people upset.

"Isn't that a laugh!"

So wrote a Marine from Vietnam to his family in the Shore area. His parents said the public should be made aware of this but asked that their son's identity not be disclosed for fear of reprisals against him.

YEAR IN VIETNAM

The Marine is neither a newcomer to the service nor to service in Vietnam. He has been in the Marines since 1962 and has spent more than a year in Vietnam.

As his mother phrased it:

"Just as anyone in a particular line of work is acquainted with the equipment he works with, so a Marine who has to use a gun knows all about it."

The Marine, in his letter, also questioned whether the American public was being told the truth about casualties among United States forces.

Before commenting about the M-16 rifle, which is being investigated by the House Armed Services subcommittee because of reports the rifle jams easily, the Marine wrote:

LOST HALF

"We left with close to 1,400 men in our battalion and came back with half."

He also reported statistics at the company and platoon levels indicating equally high casualties.

It was then he posed the question whether the folks at home "know what killed most of us."

At the same time he noted that while American casualties were high, "the ratio (of enemy casualties) was something like 8 to 1 confirmed.

"We don't know how many they dragged away but it was a lot from all the blood we saw.

"Oh, well, I guess no one cares to hear about this kind of stuff."

CHICAGO'S MEMORABLE TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO JOSEPH J. LAMORTE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, hanging on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building is a photograph of Joseph J. LaMorte, one of the giants in the labor movement and chairman of the AFL-CIO's Second Congressional District COPE Committee in Chicago. Mr. LaMorte was a vibrant and dynamic factor in my primary election campaign of last year. Last Saturday he was tendered a testimonial dinner on his 25th anniversary as a staff man of the United Steelworkers of America. It was the big event in Chicago last weekend and I was privileged, honored, and happy to be present. I was especially fortunate to be seated by the side of the charming Mrs. Joseph LaMorte and near his daughter, Suzanne, Mrs. Arnie Lehto, a high school English teacher, and his son, Richard LaMorte, a senior in Bogan High School. An older son, Charles LaMorte, petty officer, second class, U.S. Navy, is now on sea duty.

Edward Sadlowski, president of Local Union No. 65, United Steelworkers of America, was the able and eloquent toastmaster, and the orator of the occasion was Joseph Germano, director, District No. 31, United Steelworkers of America, who paid Mr. LaMorte the highest of compliments and spoke touchingly of his long association with Joe LaMorte in the good works of the steelworkers.

The invocation was by an old and beloved friend in labor's cause, Msgr. Daniel M. Cantwell, pastor of St. Clotilde's Roman Catholic Church, and the benediction by another stout and warmly esteemed friend of the steelworkers, the Reverend Edward Williams, pastor of Prayer Band Pentecostal Church.

Xavier "Sailor" Smykowski, president of Local Union No. 1033, United Steelworkers of America, was cochairman of the dinner.

After the dinner and the ceremonies there was dancing until 1 a.m., with music by Edward Lis and the Internationals. It was a great and memorable night, a recognition of 25 years of dedicated labor by a great and noble man.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a biography of Joseph J. LaMorte that should be an inspiration to all.

BIOGRAPHY OF JOSEPH J. LAMORTE

Joe LaMorte was born on November 16, 1906 of Italian immigrants in Dunmore, a suburb of Scranton, in the heart of the anthracite coal mining region of northeastern Pennsylvania. It was there he attended grammar school going on to Dunmore High School from which he graduated in 1923.

Mr. LaMorte learned of unions at an early age. His father became a coal miner and a member of the United Mine Workers shortly after arriving in America. Two older brothers also were coal miners and UMWA members while two other brothers were members of the brotherhoods by virtue of their employment on the railroad. Joe himself became a member of the United Mine Workers when he followed in his father's footsteps as a coal miner.

After a short stint in the mines after finishing high school, Joe decided there must be other ways to earn a living than going far below the earth's surface. He left the mines and went to work for the Atlantic and Pacific Tea Company as a shipping clerk in the company's Scranton warehouse.

From there he moved on to become a baker in the company's shops in Scranton and later in Pittsburgh and Jacksonville, Florida. The work had little appeal to Mr. LaMorte so back he went to the mines once more.

In 1935, he left the mines for good, moving on to Pittsburgh where he secured employment as a roll grinder in the Hazelwood plant of the Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation.

LaMorte and the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, the forerunner of the present United Steelworkers of America, came to the J & L plant at the same time. It was not long before he was in the thick of the campaign to organize his fellow-workers into a SWOC local and to bring a measure of industrial democracy to this company and its operations.

He played a major part in the successful organizing drive that led to a victory in the election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board and the establishment of Local 1843. He subsequently served as a grievance committeeman, recording secretary and president of the local.

Mr. LaMorte's leadership abilities were recognized and in 1942 Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America appointed LaMorte to a full-time position as a staff representative. He was assigned to District 22 with headquarters in Huntington, W. Va. working under the direction of Director William Mackey.

Shortly thereafter, Mackey placed LaMorte in charge of the union's operations in the Charleston, W. Va. area extending up and down the Kanawha River Valley. He was elected president of the Kanawha Valley Industrial Union Council and vice president of the West Virginia State Industrial Union Council.

During World War Two, he served as a labor member of the West Virginia Regional War Labor Board and as a member of the West Virginia State Office of Price Administration.

When District 22 was merged with District 23 following World War Two, LaMorte was assigned to an organizing team to finish the task of bringing the balance of the aluminum industry into the Union. In 1946 he was transferred to District 31, the Chicago-Calumet District of the Steelworkers. In his work for the union on the west side of Chicago, he was responsible for the organizing of many plants. He subsequently accepted an assignment from District 31 Director Joseph Germano to service local unions. He established an outstanding record as a negotiator of contracts and in providing leadership for the locals under his charge.

In 1957, Director Germano placed Mr. LaMorte in charge of the District 31 office in South Chicago and it is this position that he now occupies. He is presently the chairman of the AFL-CIO's Second Congressional District COPE Committee. He served as a labor representative on the executive board of Blue Shield.

Mr. LaMorte married Marjorie Blackney of Dunmore in 1938. He is the father of one daughter, Suzanne, married, and living in De Kalb, Ill., and two sons, Charles, serving in the U.S. Navy and Richard, a student at Bogan High School in Chicago.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS PERILOUS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East is perilous—Egyptian troops are massing on Israel's borders; the United Nations Emergency Forces have been withdrawn in what I regard as a regrettable action on the part of U.N. Secretary General U Thant; and, of course, the Syrians, whose terrorism ignited the latest flareup, are ready to move.

Mr. Speaker, since the State of Israel was established in 1948, four Presidents of the United States, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, have made clear our commitment to the preservation of the territorial integrity of Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East.

In 1950, the United States joined Great Britain and France in the Tripartite Declaration, which made this clear.

It said in part:

> The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.

On May 8, 1963, the late President Kennedy made crystal clear that we would act promptly if Israel were attacked. He said:

> In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or to put a stop to such aggression; which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time.

President Johnson reaffirmed this commitment in 1964 and 1966. On August 2, 1966, when President Shazar, of Israel, visited Washington, President Johnson said:

> As our beloved, great late President, John F. Kennedy, said on May 8, 1963, as a declaration of the leader of this country and as a spokesman for this land: "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East." We subscribe to that policy.

Mr. Speaker, at this critical moment I call upon President Johnson to reaffrm our policy—which has been the policy of all administrations since 1948, and to make it clear we will keep our commitment and oppose any aggression against Israel.

I urge the U.S. Government to use all of its influence to urge Britain, France, and the Soviet Union to do everything they can to lessen tensions. The Soviet Union, which has supported the arms race in the Middle East by providing weapons to the Arab States, should be asked to meet in a conference with the other three nations in an effort to prevent the use of force and the violation of the borders of Israel.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, steps should be taken to reinstate a United Nations presence on the border of Egypt and Israel. The United Nations Emergency Forces should not have been withdrawn so precipitously.

GUN CONTROL LAWS DO WORK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, two murderers, five dope addicts, two rapists, seven former mental patients, four people convicted on intent to kill, 16 persons with previous records for illegally carrying concealed and deadly weapons, two habitual drunks, 22 persons with convictions for aggravated assault and battery, 25 burglars, and 13 robbers recently have been denied the "right" to purchase firearms.

They were denied this "right" under Philadelphia's new firearms ordinance—the first law ever enacted in the United States to regulate the purchase of rifles and shotguns as well as handguns.

In the first year and a half of its life, the ordinance prevented 110 convicted criminals from purchasing guns locally. These criminals were among the 139 people who were denied permits out of a total of 5,034 prospective gun purchasers.

These figures were compiled by Carl Bakal, author of "The Right To Bear Arms." Mr. Bakal recently wrote an article entitled "Do Gun Control Laws Really Work?" which appeared in the April 22 issue of the Saturday Review.

FBI records show that the number of murders in Philadelphia during the first 9 months of last year dropped 17 percent below the corresponding figure for the previous year while the number in the Nation as a whole jumped 9 percent. Murders in Phoenix, Ariz., rose 32 percent and those in Houston—the scene last week of a gun battle between students and police in which one policeman was killed and two other policemen and a student were wounded—skyrocketed 59 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these figures constitute evidence that gun-control laws do work. Indeed, I would say they would be worth the inconvenience they cause law-abiding citizens if they prevented only one crime of violence.

On the heels of the Philadelphia ordinance, the State of New Jersey enacted a firearms control law. Effective as they are, they suffer because of the absence of equally stringent local or State regulations in other jurisdictions. Only seven States require a permit for the purchase of hand guns. None but New Jersey requires a permit for the purchase of shotguns and rifles. We have no Federal law controlling the shipment of firearms across State lines.

One Philadelphian denied a police permit to purchase a pistol because of the new Philadelphia ordinance, obtained a gun outside the city and used it to murder his wife.

I think it is significant to note Mr. Bakal's account of an earlier Philadelphia effort to enact a gun-control law. He reports how this effort was thwarted and cites "the well-organized lobby led by the National Rifle Association." He recalls that an NRA legislative bulletin listing the names and phone numbers of all Philadelphia's councilmen was dispatched to the city. This sparked an avalanche of protest calls the entire weekend preceding the scheduled hearings on the bill.

The author recounts:

> Local sportsmen called the bill "Communist inspired," echoing an NRA charge made 5 years before against a proposed statewide registration law: "it is common knowledge that one of the tenets of the Communist Party is the disarming of local citizens through registration of firearms."

Mr. Bakal also describes a February 9, 1965, hearing in Philadelphia City Hall and noted:

> The abundance of literature passed around included a freshly issued National Rifle Association legislative bulletin, the fifth to be dispatched to the organization's members in the Philadelphia area since May, 1964.

The National Rifle Association, of course, today enjoys a tax-exempt status as a social welfare organization. On May 15 I asked the Internal Revenue Commissioner to review the NRA's tax status.

The more I study this whole matter, the more convinced I am of the need for Federal firearms legislation. As a consequence, I am cosponsoring Chairman CELLER's gun control bill. And I do hope we can have action on this much-needed measure during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I include Carl Bakal's illuminating article, following my remarks:

THE PHILADELPHIA STORY: DO GUN CONTROL LAWS REALLY WORK?

(By Carl Bakal)

During the long hot summer of 1964, an orgy of shootings took place in Philadelphia that would have put Dodge City to shame, and certainly belied the venerable reputation of America's first metropolis as the City of Brotherly Love. In one of the city's taprooms, two bibulous brothers created a disturbance that culminated in a fellow tippler's running out to his car, taking a .25-caliber pistol out of the glove compartment, and shooting the brothers dead. A few weeks later, a deranged seventy-two-year-old Philadelphian, using a .22-caliber revolver he customarily carried in his belt, shot to death a forty-six-old housewife who had spurned his advances. Then on July 30, Detective Lt. Daniel J. Mccann, a thirty-seven-year-old police officer and father of three, was shot and killed by a woman he had just evicted from a bar because of complaints that she was annoying customers. The murder weapon was a .38-caliber pearl-handled revolver that the woman, a former resident of a correctional institution, had bought in a local gun shop several months before with scarcely more difficulty than would have been entailed in buying a new hat.

The McCann murder, coming as it did on the heels of the shootings described and perhaps a half-dozen others, was to have far-reaching implications. For it sparked a campaign that led to the enactment of the most

stringent gun-control law in the nation's history, one that has been cited as a model measure for other cities and even states. How it was enacted provides an object lesson of how courageous and dedicated civic leaders can arouse the ordinarily apathetic public.

Public opinion polls taken after the Kennedy assassination, duplicating the results of a previous poll taken four years before, revealed at least 75 per cent of the people (90 per cent in Eastern cities) to be in favor of a law requiring a police permit for the purchase of any gun. But this reported sentiment was not translated into the popular clamor that weighs so heavily in the decisions made by legislators. In fact, only several months before the McCann murder, Philadelphia's City Council President Paul D'Ortona had proposed an ordinance aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of the homicidally bent, the mentally unstable, and the irresponsible. Inspired by the terrible tragedy in Dallas the preceding November, the proposed ordinance required the registration of all firearms.

At the time, Philadelphia law required a police permit only to carry a handgun concealed, but no permit to carry one about openly in the street or to keep one at home. The tolerant state law imposed on would-be handgun purchasers only the minor inconvenience of waiting forty-eight hours for delivery after filling out a perfunctory application form for the police to check. But applicants were not required to furnish fingerprints or photographs, and so no meaningful check could be made for a criminal record. Lieutenant McCann's slayer, for example, a Mrs. Yolanda Federico O'Donnell, by filing her application under her married name, had been able to conceal the fact that she had a police record in New Jersey under her maiden name. Rifles and shotguns, which were to figure in 135 of Philadelphia's homicides, robberies, and assaults during 1964, were not covered by either state or local law, an oversight that the proposed D'Ortona ordinance sought to correct.

The D'Ortona bill's chances, however, were weakened by several circumstances. One, as D'Ortona later conceded, is that he had drawn up and presented his bill hastily, without consulting most of the city's key civic organizations or giving them adequate advance notice of the public hearing in May. There is also some indication of what could be called a communications breakdown between D'Ortona and Mayor James H. J. Tate—his rival as the city's leading Democrat—and the Mayor's Law Enforcement Committee, whose monthly meetings ordinarily brought together not only the Mayor and the City Council President but also the city's police commissioner, district attorney, chief magistrate, superintendent of prisons, judges, and officials of the Crime Commission and other civic organizations and city agencies concerned with crime and law enforcement and, which, since the Kennedy assassination, had been considering legislative proposals to regulate the purchase and ownership of firearms.

On the other side, meanwhile, stood the well organized lobby led by the National Rifle Association. With the dispatch to the Philadelphia area of an NRA legislative bulletin listing the names and phone numbers of all the city's councilmen, the latter were swamped with protest calls the entire weekend preceding the scheduled hearing on the D'Ortona bill. Council member Mrs. Virginia Knauer recalls, "I spent so much time on the phone Sunday that I burned my roast." As even an NRA partisan concedes, "Midnight telephone calls, threats, browbeating—no wrong-headed tactic was neglected by the people fighting to prevent adoption of the law."

Yet they succeeded. The hearing was packed by some 300 gun buffs and dealers. D'Ortona three times threatened to clear the room because of the noise from spectators. Local sportsmen called the bill "Communist-inspired," echoing an NRA charge made five years before against a proposed statewide registration law: "It is common knowledge that one of the tenets of the Communist party is the disarming of loyal citizens through registration of firearms." Other sportsmen repeated the canard that registration is unconstitutional, and one local hunter with the felicitous name of Starling crisply pointed out that a registration law would have little or no effect on criminals and would serve only to harass the law-abiding citizens who would obey it.

"This simple-minded tautology," the *Greater Philadelphian* magazine later commented, "could be used against the enactment of any law, regardless of its merit. It might be argued with equal logic that it makes no sense to have a law against, say, bigamy, because it would not be obeyed by criminals. It also supposes that a group of individuals can be easily divided into two clear-cut groups—criminals and law-abiding citizens."

However, after hearing only five of the fifty-seven scheduled witnesses, D'Ortona abruptly withdrew his measure. Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary (now New York City's Police Commissioner), who testified that "registration would aid the department," was the sole witness who came to speak in behalf of the measure.

Even right after the McCann murder there still was no great outpouring of civic sentiment for firearms controls. D'Ortona, asked if he would reintroduce his bill, recalled his virtually lone stand at the May hearing and the fact that he had not received a single letter or phone call demanding enactment of his bill. "I won't do it on my own again," he said, noting that his mailbox was still as empty and his phone still as silent as it had been since the Kennedy assassination. "We've had a President slain and now a fine detective killed, and still I don't get one letter," he said. "Where does the public stand? Where are all the goodie-goodies? Let the people write, make calls, statements, and create public support that I didn't have before. It is senseless for me to reintroduce the ordinance now and have the same thing happen again." The city's Crime Commission and the Administration also should bolster any request for gun legislation, he added.

In August the Philadelphia *Bulletin* stated:

"It is just possible that Mayor James H. J. Tate, the City Council, the Fraternal Order of Police, and civic organizations that failed to speak up in favor of such an ordinance in May can see to it that Lieutenant McCann's death, which at this moment appears to have served no purpose, can be the trigger that will lead to legislation that may save the lives of other police officers and civilians as well. Certainly, tighter regulations will not deter most criminals from getting their hands on weapons if they are determined to do so. But why make it easy for them—and for the unstable, unbalanced element that is every bit as dangerous?"

Slowly, the murder of one of the city's police officers began to stimulate what the assassination of a President could not bring about—a swelling of local sentiment in favor of a change in weapons regulation laws. "I'm shocked and horrified by the senseless slaying of Lt. Daniel J. McCann," Mayor Tate now said. "This type of lawlessness is an outrage against every decent citizen and we must do everything in our power to prevent such tragedies. We already have laws that provide stiff penalties for those who carry 'concealed weapons' without a license, but it is still too easy for anyone to walk into a store that sells guns and purchase one."

The Fraternal Order of Police, understandably concerned about the death of a colleague, passed a resolution in early August decrying the "great increase" of deadly weapons in the hands of citizens, citing their hazards to police, and vowing to testify in favor of any new legislation. Armed with such words of encouragement, D'Ortona announced, "I'm going to meet with Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary, Solicitor Edward G. Bauer, and members of the Crime Commission to see what we can work out."

On September 3, a new ordinance was submitted to the City Council, this time by Mayor Tate. In order to neutralize the opposition of the firearms faction, the new bill, unlike the earlier ill-fated proposal, did not require the registration of guns already owned by people, but merely those newly acquired by purchase or transfer, either in or outside the city. Under the proposal the would-be gun owner would have to apply for a permit, furnishing fingerprints, photographs, and the firearm's registration number. The Police Department would be empowered to refuse permits to those under eighteen, persons who had been convicted of crimes of violence, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, the mentally ill, and those "not of good moral character or those without proper reason for acquiring a firearm."

In favoring the inclusion of all types of guns—shotguns and rifles as well as handguns—in the ordinance, the president of the Fraternal Order of Police, John Harrington, said: "The most dangerous weapon in use today is the shotgun. Yet even a teenager can walk into any store and purchase one. The police can do nothing. The only law under which a person can be arrested for carrying a gun is the hunting code, and even then the gun must be loaded." Some justification for this view came in October when a thirty-one-year-old divorcee, who had been under the care of a psychiatrist, shot and killed her four-year-old daughter and then herself with a 12-gauge shotgun delivered by a Northeast Philadelphia department store only a few hours before the shooting.

The Philadelphia Crime Commission, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization with counterparts in fourteen other U.S. communities, began an intensive campaign to mobilize public support for the legislation. On September 18, the Commission convened a meeting to plan strategy and outline a course of action. Representatives of more than twenty of the city's leading civic, fraternal, and religious organizations attended. Members of the Crime Commission made individual calls on the officers and board members of dozens of other groups such as the Federation of Community Councils and the AFL–CIO. The Commission also distributed literature, issued press releases, and staged and spoke at countless meetings. At a luncheon attended by the widow of Lieutenant McCann, Ephraim R. Gomberg, executive vice president of the Commission, reminded 150 business and civic leaders that 1965 must "mark the end of apathy, the beginning of genuine public concern, and the start of a positive program to bring crime under more effective control." No possible source of support was overlooked, no matter how small: At one women's club meeting, Commission Director Ira H. Lennox enlisted the support of twenty-five West Philadelphia grandmothers.

As a result, 106 organizations and companies, representing a cross section of the community leadership and speaking for more than 1,000,000 persons, came forward in support of the proposed firearms law. The groups ranged from the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Women's Clubs to the Board of Rabbis and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and they included such businesses as the Yellow Cab Company, the Reliance Insurance Company, and Gimbel Brothers. The Commission asked each organization to write letters to City Council President D'Ortona calling for the enactment of the ordinance. "Letters should be sent

immediately," Gomberg said in a mimeographed memorandum mailed January 6, 1965. "The last time City Council considered firearms regulations more than a thousand letters in opposition to the proposals were received against a handful in support. The people of Philadelphia were silent. If we are to have firearms regulations we need several thousand letters of support."

The Commission also urged the groups to send representatives to the hearing, which was scheduled for February 9. "What happens at that hearing," said the Gomberg memorandum, "will determine whether or not Philadelphia law enforcement agencies are to be supported in their wish for an ordinance controlling the purchase of firearms. . . ."

Before a standing-room audience of more than 500, the hearing opened at 10 o'clock on February 9 in the City Council chamber of City Hall. The profusion of men present who wore plaid sportshirts made for what was probably the most colorful, folksiest assemblage to be seen in the somber chamber in many a year. The abundance of literature passed around included a freshly issued National Rifle Association legislative bulletin, the fifth to be dispatched to the organization's members in the Philadelphia area since May 1964. There also was material from political-action and other groups, such as the *Dan Smoot News Letter,* which held that gun registration laws were part of an unconstitutional and subversive plot to disarm the American populace. "Basically, the only reason for registering privately owned firearms," read a statement from the Pennsylvania State and Fish Game Protection Association, "is to make it possible for the governing authorities, through the police whom they control, to seize such weapons when, in the opinion of those authorities, such seizure is desirable."

However, the hearing—which lasted till 2 o'clock the morning of the following day—was not quite as one-sided as the previous one. Eighty-eight persons were mustered to speak against the ordinance—one a *blind* firearms enthusiast named John Mallon who, after fashioning a zip gun on the spot in 30 seconds, held it aloft and asked: "What legislation is going to stop this? No one is going to register this."

"I don't know what you're trying to prove," responded City Council President D'Ortona.

"Close your mouth and I'll tell you," Mallon shot back, and he went on to compare D'Ortona to Adolf Hitler. Another opponent of the ordinance, to sustained and noisy applause from the gallery, suggested that in its stead the city give thought to establishing gun clubs and shooting ranges—"a far better deterrent to crime than the ordinance."

But on hand to speak for the measure was now a parade of thirty of the city's most illustrious civic, religious, and business leaders, led by Mayor Tate himself. Admonishing the sportsmen for their stand, Tate declared: "Too long have we listened to the sportsmen's point of view and watched the slaughter and the gory statistics. Too many reckless slayings have been committed by people who should never have been allowed to possess a gun in the first place. Too many vicious murders have been committed by persons with prior criminal records who could not legally have obtained a gun here in Philadelphia had this proposed ordinance been in effect."

Pointing to the fact that firearms had figured in many of the city's 188 homicides, 2,753 robberies, and 4,004 aggravated assaults in 1964, Tate said he agreed with Police Commissioner Leary that "if such a law prevents one murder or assault, it would be well worth it." He added that the law was not intended to harass or to interfere with legitimate gun users, but "to protect the decent citizen and help safeguard law-abiding families."

"Though such an ordinance may cause some inconvenience to a small portion of our good citizens," said Archbishop John J. Krol of the Philadelphia Roman Catholic Archdiocese, "the principle of licensing, which we accept in our community life, generally requires some inconveniences to secure the common good of all the citizens."

The proposed ordinance was passed, with only minor modifications, by a vote of 17 to 0. It went into effect in April 1965—the first law ever enacted in the nation to regulate the purchase of rifles and shotguns as well as handguns.

How has the law worked out? Elements of the firearms fraternity have continued to snipe at it—one outdoors magazine, echoing dealer complaints about a loss in local gun sales (to whom?), recently branded the law a "flop" and misquoted a Philadelphia police official to the effect that the law was not doing any of the things it was supposed to do. But all the available evidence indicates it has been a resounding success.

In the first eighteen months of its life, the ordinance prevented 110 convicted criminals from purchasing guns locally. They were among the 139 people who were denied permits out of a total of 5,034 prospective gun purchasers. Among those denied the "right" to purchase guns were twenty-five burglars, thirteen robbers, twenty-two persons with convictions for aggravated assault and battery, five dope addicts, two rapists, two habitual drunks, seven former mental patients, sixteen people with previous records for illegally carrying concealed and deadly weapons, four convicted of intent to kill—and two murderers.

Belying charges that the ordinance has had no effect on the city's incidence of crime, FBI records show that the number of murders in Philadelphia during the first nine months of 1966 dropped 17 per cent below the corresponding figure for 1965, declining from 158 to 131, whereas the number in the nation as a whole rose 9 per cent. (The number of murders in Phoenix, Arizona, rose 32 per cent, and those in Houston, Texas—another city without gun controls—rose 59 per cent!) Significantly, only 37 per cent of Philadelphia's murders in 1966 involved guns, compared to 42 per cent the year before. In Texas, guns account for nearly 70 per cent of all murders.

In August 1966 in New Jersey, a unique statewide law, comparable to the Philadelphia ordinance, went into effect, thanks largely to the persistent three-year efforts of a courageous public official, Attorney General Arthur J. Sills. This law, too, has been maligned as ineffective by gun dealers and the NRA, but Attorney General Sills recently reported that 7 per cent of the applicants for permits have been turned down because of criminal records. One, an NRA member who had been convicted of a felony six years before, was found to have, in his home, seven guns, a sword with a 31-inch blade, and a large quantity of ammunition. Another applicant, the required fingerprint check revealed, had been convicted of nineteen criminal offenses. The constitutionality of the law was upheld as recently as February 10, 1967. In dismissing a suit brought by a group of gun dealers and sportsmen, the judge said that enactment of the law was entirely within the police powers of the state.

To be sure, the Philadelphia and New Jersey laws are not completely effective, ignoring as they do guns already in criminal or otherwise unsafe hands. More important, the laws suffer because of the absence of equally stringent local or state regulations in surrounding or other jurisdictions (only seven states require a permit for the purchase of handguns; none but New Jersey requires a permit for the purchase of shotguns and rifles), or of a strong federal law controlling the shipment of firearms across state lines.

Do these loopholes really matter?

After Philadelphia adopted its ordinance, an enterprising firearms firm located just outside the city limits advertised that it could "guarantee all Philadelphia area residents the handgun of their choice within forty-eight hours." The advertisement featured seductive pictures of a six-shooter and an automatic. One impatient Philadelphian, denied a police permit to purchase a pistol, then in fact did obtain a gun outside the city and used it to kill his wife.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS AND THE EASTERN EUROPEAN BLOC

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week on the occasion of the 56th annual Peoria Association of Commerce banquet, Mr. William Blackie, chairman of the board of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., delivered the principal address of the evening. It was a very thought-provoking speech, having to do with United States-Soviet Union relations and the Eastern European bloc.

Mr. Blackie has been one of those in the forefront, advocating bridges of trade as our best hope for easing the tensions between East and West.

In reading the text of his remarks, I could not help but recall my trip to the Soviet Union back in 1958 when, in the company of Mr. Dean McNaughton, editor of the Pekin Times and a number of business and industrial leaders, we came to the conclusion that even then one perceived a very slight move toward the hallmark of free enterprise—incentive and competition—while at the same time our own Government seemed to be dashing headlong toward a more socialistic society. We know that the Soviet Union is a long, long way from ever employing those tenets of free enterprise that have made our country what it is today, but competition can sometimes work miracles, and this would seem to be the roots upon which Mr. Blackie builds his case for East-West trade.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the full text of Mr. Blackie's speech at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF WILLIAM BLACKIE'S SPEECH TO 56TH ANNUAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE BANQUET, PEORIA, ILL.

"Throughout this strife-ridden world there is today one great yearning—one great hope: peace. But hanging over all is the knowledge that today men are fighting and dying—for what? For peace! The objective of war is peace. War in itself can never be an end. It can only be a means; but toward what, if it is not something which ends in peaceful enjoyment of the result achieved—by the side which is not the loser?

"The objective of war by those who start it is to achieve peace by ultimately reestablishing it under a different set of conditions than those theretofore prevailing—conditions which they deem better—for their purpose.

"Now there exists in the world today a body of thought which professes that it is the enlightened protagonist of a superior way of life—one which should be imposed upon those who do not choose to accept it

voluntarily. Its concentration occurs in the so-called Communist countries—among which there are two of present major significance, Soviet Russia and Communist China. And it is from either or both of these two sources that directly or indirectly can be traced most of the major trials and tribulations which have beset worldwide international relations since the end of World War II.

SOVIET ERRORS

"If this be true, then two developments of recent origin call for very serious attention by all who, like us, seek to have a world in which there shall be both peace and good will to men. One of these is the unconcealed evidence that the Soviet Union and most of its East European allies are discovering some of the errors of their economic ways and are making appropriate modifications of their systems. The other is that the adoption of these modifications accompanied by other departures from classical Communist dogma is creating a widening schism between Soviet Russia and Red China.

"These are the primary developments. Two more might be deemed secondary, though they are not unrelated. One of these is the resurgence of a spirit of nationalism among the separate Communist countries in East Europe; the other is the growing disaffection and the resulting power struggle which is dividing Red China. The former of these, portending a disintegration of the Communist Bloc, is undoubtedly being encouraged in Eastern Europe by the divisionary influence of the split between the two major Communist regimes; the other, the division within Red China, is caused, at least in part, by the same kind of reform movement which is going on in Soviet Russia and other East European states.

"Take in combination and as a preface to what I am about to say, these developments may become compounded into the most important political event of our times.

"The schism between Soviet Russia and Red China is based on a charge by the Chinese that in changing its ways Soviet Russia, in common with most of the other Communist countries of Eastern Europe, is departing from classical Marxist-Leninist doctrine and moving toward Western-style capitalism, while at the same time it is espousing the idea of peaceful coexistence with the capitalism. The 'crime' is called revisionism—presumably because that is just what it is: a revision of earlier ideas about ways and means of best developing what is presumably deemed to be 'the greatest good of the greatest number'.

THE CHANGES

"Among others, the changes being proposed or adopted in one or more of the countries in Communist East Europe or the Soviet Union involve movement toward some of the most basic elements of a free enterprise economy. Thus the influence of a freer marketplace as expressed in more flexible pricing would be given recognition as a necessary functional mechanism having the purpose and effect of more closely reconciling supply with demand—production with consumption. This was an objective which the central planners sought, but they bogged down in an unmanageable morass of bureaucratic paper and statistics which, even if it could have been handled and interpreted, would still not have put shoes on the feet or clothes upon the backs of people who did not choose to buy them because they did not like the fit, the style, the quality or the price. There were simply too many unknowable and interdependent variables for planners, anywhere, to anticipate the contingencies or evaluate the probabilities.

"A change of this kind would operate, of course, to create both the need and the opportunity for a reduction of price controls and price subsidies. (In Hungary, for example, about 80 per cent of all prices have been set by the state. Under the new model, nearly the same proportion would become free or at least flexible under ceilings.) No less important is the Soviet decision to raise basic industrial prices even though these would still remain under control. Heretofore, coal, oil, gas, and steel were sold at prices obviously far below cost. This was part of the method to force development of a heavy industry base. That kind of price subsidy is now to be eliminated and, in a modification of emphasis, the needs and demands of the consumer are being more generally recognized. This admitted responsiveness to public pressures has, in turn, required that the managers of the various enterprises become obliged not to ignore something which we would consider to be the influence of a freer and even competitive marketplace. They need, just as we do, the feedback of the market servomechanism.

NO OTHER WAY

"As explained by Professor Ota Sik, the architect and the Liberman of the reforms in Czechoslovakia: 'There was no other way but to start using the market again . . . if we take free enterprise to mean free price competition in the market, then even socialism cannot do without this enterprise . . . if the system is to work as a market, it needs real market prices.'

"Profit would be determined as a means of measuring the efficiency of an enterprise and would be employed as an incentive for promoting higher productivity and greater cost-effectiveness. This incentive would operate in two ways: one applicable to the enterprise as a whole, and the other to its managers and employees. Part of the total profit would be retained for the expansion or security of the enterprise, as through capital additions and modernization. The other part of the profit would go to the managers and and workers as bonuses which, in the Soviet Union, for example, would reward gains in productivity, increases in the volume of production, improvements in quality, and economies in the consumption of work materials. There would be a limitation upon the amount of such bonuses, designed (under some kind of formula) to ensure that labor costs would not increase faster than productivity. Resort to material incentives is not entirely new in the Soviet system but their current extension is certainly a notable departure from the classical Marxist credo that the profit motive is both evil and unnecessary. It means that profits and return on investment would supplant the fulfillment of quantitative quotas as the standard of performance. And it recognizes that the stimulus of a system of relative rewards (or penalties) constitutes a justified departure from a creed which once held 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.'

"Accompanying these changes as a matter of necessity if not wholly of desire, authority and responsibility for investment and production decisions are being decentralized. Henceforth central planning will be confined largely to projections reaching out five or more years and be concerned with over-all economic goals. Shorter term execution will be assigned to the managers in charge of the individual enterprises and they will operate with a more responsible degree of autonomy. In what would seem to be a natural concomitant, managers will henceforth be selected less for their loyalty to the party and more for their industrial competence. This portends not only a possible deterioration of party influence but also the development of a trained professional management—one which may not be particularly interested in party ideologies.

"One means of governmental control would be continued through the allocation of capital funds. Heretofore such funds came directly out of the state budget as required to meet the master plan—and free of charge. The concept of capital in terms of its cost and productivity was considered a capitalistic notion, and the result was a most inefficient use of capital. Now central government banks would make capital advances or loans on the basis of investment analyses submitted by the industry trusts or the individual enterprises and would do so at a charge or rate of interest which would provide a reasonable return to the lender and at the same time impose a much-needed degree of financial discipline upon the borrower. The very introduction of such a capitalistic instrument as interest or its equivalent is, of course, significant. (And note, please, that their government-owned business enterprises would be paying taxes, interest or capital charges to the state. Ours are not usually obliged to face up to such a proper responsibility.)

COMPETITION

"As will be observed, these changes could not achieve their purpose without another capitalistic element: competition. If the efficient are to be distinguished for reward and the laggards are not, then the former must establish their supremacy over the latter. In industry, the final test of this occurs at the point of sale—when the customer buys. So goods and services will vie for the favor of the purchaser, and he, accordingly, will have a choice among competing alternatives. This, in turn, is already encouraging an idea that the time has come when Communist 'entrepreneurs' should be resorting to that most despicable device of the capitalists: advertising.

"Listening to Soviet officials in Moscow two years ago, I was told that these changes need cause no surprise in capitalist circles. Lenin, it was said, had always advocated the adoption of whatever methods would produce the best results even though this might require departure from what theretofore had been considered Communist doctrine. And it is true that, to a greater extent than is generally appreciated in the West, the processes of attrition and modification had been going on even before they were so openly brought into the public realm—after the revulsion from Stalinism. Nevertheless it does come as something of a surprise to hear it said that, as opposed to our concept of free enterprise based upon private property, the one basic tenet of the new economics, Communist style, lies in state ownership of the means of production and distribution.

"When pursuing this particular matter further in the East European countries last October, I was given a subtle modification. Ownership of the means of production and distribution, I was told, is to rest in the hands of society, with management by the state. To work for another—a private employer—is deemed to be a subjugation to degrading, undignified, unprincipled exploitation. Working for society—for all of the people—is held to be an uplifting, dignified, highly principled duty. This sharpens the point of the hackneyed story of the Communist who, when asked to distinguish between the two systems, replied that capitalism is the exploitation of man by man and communism is just the opposite.

"Concomitant with these economic reforms there would inevitably have to be another—a growth of personal and political freedom. The evidence shows in a variety of ways. If centralized planning could not be made to work effectively for the major industries, how could it ever succeed for the hundreds of thousands of small businesses which are necessary to service the living habits of big urban populations—the barber, the beauty shop operator, the tailor, the self-employed repairman, the individual craftsman, and thousands of others whose work is of a more personal nature and does not lend itself to mass bureaucratic regula-

tion. So small business people of that kind are gradually having their liberty restored. They will work as independent enterpreneurs rather than as servants of the state. And the intention to let small farmers have ownership and operation of their farms is probably not as significant as the decision to let them sell their surpluses on the free market at prices of their own setting. This may hardly justify description as rugged laissez-faire individualism but it certainly is a form of free, private enterprise.

"(In Poland, there are now 98,000 privately owned workshops employing 164,000 people; and 85 per cent of its farmland is in private hands. Poland, incidentally, is granted most-favored-nation tariff treatment by the U.S. and is supplied surplus foodstuffs under our Public Law 480.)

DEMAND RIGHTS

"It is further reported that decentralization of the Communist economy is being accompanied by growing demand for more democratic rights. If so, that would be in full accord with our belief and experience that economic freedom and personal political freedom go hand in hand. Destroy one and the other dies because it cannot live alone. And it is surely not without significance that voters in Hungary and Poland as well as in Yugoslavia are to be allowed to elect government representatives from among a choice of candidates—even though all of one political party. This suggests a possibility that within that party there could be graduations or, someday, even wings—left and right—just as we have here. In that event there could at least be some choice between differing ideas.

"The changes mentioned are not all being made or being introduced contemporaneously in all of the Communist countries of Europe. Most of them are being adopted in the Soviet Union where it is planned to have all important industries working under some form of profit measurement and incentive by 1968. Czechoslovakia, which has been ahead of the Soviet Union in several respects, is moving into a formally approved program this year. Hungary will adopt a substantially similar program at the beginning of 1968. In varying aspects or degrees, Poland and East Germany are ahead or behind the others; while Rumania holds back, watching the developments in the others from a position of somewhat greater economic security. (It is Rumania, however, which repudiated the Soviet principle of a socialist division of labor wholly within the Comecon countries as a bloc. And it was the Rumanians who insisted upon complete freedom of economic action—in particular to trade with the West when they deemed it to their advantage to do so. The process going on there may be not so much revisionism as it is "de-Russification.") But it should not be assumed from these developments that any of the countries of Eastern Europe intend to build their society on anything which they would consider to be a radical departure from Communist principles, and there is no present reason to believe that dissolution of the bloc or a break with Moscow is in the offing.

"It should also be understood that the changes mentioned are apparently being introduced not so much out of any great admiration for free enterprise capitalism—successful as it may be—as in recognition of the failure of the communist system to begin to produce equivalent results. Failure, of course, is a relative term. It is to be measured only against some standard—some calibration of what constitutes success. This was recognized by the early Communist prophets. They declaimed that our system had to be destroyed, presumably in order that theirs might succeed. The matter was not one to be based on any self-determination of peoples—to be established independently, internally, country by country. Instead, the true believers undertook the greatest attempt in all history not only to convert others to their way of thinking but to subvert them in a manner which would seek to strengthen the communist hold in the world by weakening that of all who believe otherwise. It was not to be a matter of open international rivalry—one in which there would be any willingness on the Communist side to let the better system win. It was to be an open battle for the minds of men to the end that those enslaved by the power of communism—ideological, political, economic or military—would join or be forced together in a world in which there would no longer be room for our kind of free, private, competitive capitalism.

"Now in this context, and in this one aspect of their dogma, I suggest that the doctrinaire Communists are correct: their economic system cannot, in the long run, survive or succeed in the same world as ours. The reason: ours, by producing infinitely superior results, is proving theirs to be fundamentally inferior.

THEIRS VERSUS OURS

"The whole idea of communism and a communistic state lies entirely in a body of theory which defies all human experience. In one place or another and at one time or another, it has been tried—and it has always failed. On the other hand, our theories of capitalism were not conceived in advance of trial and test. They are the derived principles of a long economic pragmatism which has proved their worth.

"A viable economic system is not a matter of theory or faith; it is one of empirical results. It is an instrument for a purpose—to be shaped and perfected in the course of its use until it becomes the most appropriate tool for that purpose. Ours is the best—not because it is ours, but because it has produced better results than any other. And it is the best because it has also achieved its success with a minimum of infringement upon that one precious virtue which transcends all other considerations, freedom of the individual.

"Nevertheless, as with change everywhere else, the reforms described are meeting with resistance within each country where they are being proposed or introduced. The "conservatives" defend the status quo of classical Communist ideology and cling to its doctrinaire cliches while the liberals press for change. (Perhaps this could be the embryo of two schools or—more doubtfully—two parties.) In several countries the political survival of present incumbents would be jeopardized by reform; and bureaucrats—being the same everywhere—defend their entrenchments. Workers will presumably have to work harder and better if the motivating incentives are to be effective. They may not like the change. And for many of the old-line reactionaries it could hardly be easy to accept such radical departures from a system for which they had fought, worked or suffered so much. Think too of the horrors of repression, terror and punishment through which so many had to pass in order to reach something which, in part at least, is now being found unworthy of the terrible cost. Sometimes progress has to wait for an older generation to die out.

"So it cannot be presumed that all the reforms will come into being quickly—or even at all. On the other hand it might not be too presumptuous to assume that if they are given a fair trial those changes which move in the direction of our successful practices are more likely to succeed than the abortive theories they would supersede. And should they succeed, the further erosion of Communist faith would surely cast more doubt upon the validity of other aspects of what had theretofore been held to be immutable dogma.

WEST FLOURISHES

"Today the East European sees a nearby Western civilization flourishing at a level which far exceeds his own. The contrast and the choice between Communist austerity and capitalist prosperity stares him in the face—and he is not blind. He may believe that revolutionary dictatorial communism did carry him away from downtrodden serfdom faster than might have been possible in any other manner. But now that progress has slowed to an embarrassingly low rate, the deficiencies of the system are beginning to reveal themselves.

"In all of these circumstances we, the United States, are surely faced with both the need and the opportunity for a reexamination of postulates—for a far-sighted reconsideration of national policies and objectives. To proceed without responsible recognition of what is going on now as contrasted with the conditions prevailing only a few years ago would be to ignore the march of history. Soviet Europe has been de-Stalinizing itself; in a petrification of thought we often seem to be harboring hate of the past more than hope for the future.

WE MUST LEAD

"And there is hope for the future—if we who, by the random fate of history, are the leaders of the world accept our obligation to lead.

"First, I suggest that our objective should be, as I think it is, not the killing of Communists but instead a lighting of the way toward a reform of communism—by the voluntary decision of the Communists themselves. Men are not "converted" by force of arms or even by punishment. True conversion can only come from within, whether the subject be individual man or that body of men recognized as a state. But—and more by tangible evidence than oral suasion—the way toward conversion can be shown by the demonstration of better alternatives. It is the very nature of man that he must live on the basis of choice among competing and sometimes conflicting alternatives; and to the maximum extent possible within the mores or conventions of his society that choice should be a matter of his own personal decision. This is the very essence of freedom.

"To make his selection intelligently, however, there must be adequate knowledge and understanding of the alternatives.

"Among the peoples of Soviet Europe there has been little or no exposure to the concept or practice of capitalism as a feasible alternative to Communism—and few ever lived in a democracy. Pre-revolutionary Russia and several of the other Communist countries never had the chance to enjoy modern-style capitalism, and even those older people who might once have known something of its advantages and successes are now heavily outnumbered by younger generations who have not only been deprived of the opportunity to study comparison of the two systems but have been indoctrinated with a philosophy which would reject any idea that there could be an alternative to communism.

CRACKING WALLS

"That is—until now! Today there are signs which portend a possibility that the walls of ignorance, intolerance and international hostility may be cracking under the strain of failure on the one hand as compared with success on the other. It is in this spirit that on Oct. 7, 1966, the President of the United States delivered a major foreign policy speech. In it he said that 'a just peace remains our most important goal.' 'Our purpose,' he continued, 'is not to overturn other governments but to help the people of Europe to achieve together a continent in which the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe work shoulder to shoulder together for the common good—a continent

in which alliances do not confront each other in bitter hostility but instead provide a framework in which West and East can act together in order to secure the security of us all.' Espousing 'the vigorous pursuit of further unity in the West,' the President emphasized that 'One great goal of a united West is to heal the wound in Europe which now cuts East from West and brother from brother. That division must be healed peacefully; it must be healed with the consent of Eastern European countries and consent of the Soviet Union. This will happen only as East and West succeed in building a surer foundation of mutual trust. Our task is to achieve a reconciliation with the East, a shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement.'

"Continuing, the President said, 'We do not intend to let our differences on Vietnam or elsewhere ever prevent us from exploring all opportunities. We want the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to know that we and our allies shall go step by step with them just as far as they are willing to advance. So let us, both Americans and Europeans, intensify, accelerate and strengthen our determined efforts.'

"There might, ladies and gentlemen, be differences of opinion about the means of pursuing these policies, but surely there can be no quarrel with the objectives.

"Everywhere in the world today communism, as a political or an economic system—and occasionally as both—is on the retreat. It is being defeated in some countries, repudiated in others, and in Europe, it has lost its momentum. The causes for this turn of events lie in the paucity of what communism has to offer, in its restrictions of personal freedom, in its denial of human motivations, and—perhaps more than any present single factor—in its failure.

CAUSE OF REFORM

"One of the major causes of Communist reform is undoubtedly the increasing awareness of capitalist success and the growing penetration of this knowledge through the rusting Iron Curtain. If this be so, the major contribution which we might make to the peace of the world need not necessarily be the deterrent of armed might; it could be the demonstration of our industrial strength as evidenced by the quality and quantity of the benefits brought to our society by the wise employment and continuing development of our still evolving capitalism.

"These benefits would include our personal freedom and political democracy; our mode of living, our institutions, and the patterns of our culture; our goods and services; our comforts and pleasures; and whatever other qualities go into life as we know it at its best. Not all of these might, of course, be desired by others. That is not the point! The essential requirement for individual freedom and dignity is that there be a right of personal choice, and opportunity to exercise it free from enslaving dictation by others.

"In the long run the healing of the rupture which has split the world into two—or three—camps will not come through nations or governments. It will come through ordinary people who, like us, have the normal human aspirations for a society in which they can enjoy freedom and family, work and play and the pursuit of that same kind of happiness which our American forebears deemed to be a worthy objective.

"In the building of bridges toward peaceful engagement nothing, of course, should be done which would threaten our national security. If the bridges are to fulfill their two-way function as linkages binding East and West in a durable peace, Soviet militancy must give way to a 'peaceful coexistence' which is more than an empty phrase. And in our desire for a detente, we should not abandon deterrents which would serve to provide us with an adequate measure of security. As always, we should deal from strength; and we should recognize too that the communist leaders will be most likely to move our way when they appreciate that this will be the least costly means of reaching their goals.

"Nothing in these remarks conflicts with what we have to do at this time in Vietnam: succeed in achieving an honorable termination of the hostilities on terms which will offer the prospect of something more than another truce between wars. For the time being, positions and emotions on this issue are having the effect of retarding U.S. movement toward peaceful engagement. The processes of establishing more constructive relations between East and West are, however, proceeding apace in Europe. We, isolated by our present unwillingness to participate, are not a part of them; and the East-West trade bill introduced on behalf of the national administration a year ago continues to lie dormant in congressional committee.

"But even while Vietnam has the priority of our attention, sight should not be lost of the larger objective; an enduring world peace. We must constantly seek to find means of abolishing all war—hot, cold and lukewarm. The goal may never be attainable, but how will we ever know if we do not try everything in our power to reach it.

EPILOG

"That might be the most fitting point on which to conclude these remarks. Pardon me, however, if I add a brief epilogue. In a sort of 'far out' extrapolation of these changes and aspirations which I have attempted to describe let us, for the moment, accept it as a premise that the principal difference between the two economic systems might become only one of the ownership of the means of production and distribution—a sort of socialist state capitalism as contrasted with our private capitalism. Could that of itself ever be a valid cause for international war, or subversion or for anything more than dialectical difference? We live in harmony with many countries where public or tax-supported ownership of industry is an accepted way of life. Such a type of ownership exists within our own federal system as well as in numerous state and municipal enterprises. It is seldom if ever as effective as a private profit-earning tax-paying enterprise. But it can be tolerated if the taxpaying electorate is willing; and in certain circumstances it has the allure of providing earlier what private capital might only be willing to provide later.

"Furthermore, if the changes now being proposed or wrought in Communist practice were to become successful—as we of the West should hope they will—it would appear to be only a matter of some further time until there could be personal earnings which would exceed the cost of mere sustenance and become disposable income or savings. Wealth is created only by people, and their personal savings are the very essence of investment-capital. How then could an enlightened communism fail to move—almost automatically in spite of itself—toward that kind of progress which would seek to regenerate itself on the wealth created by the constructive work of its own people?

"Carrying the hypothesis one or two generations further, suppose—for the moment—that the two great proponents of the opposing systems were to find their differences evaporating into nothing more than separate forms of self-determination. Our basic quarrel with the Communists is not that they are Communists per se; it is that they are not content to be whatever they want to be within the confines of their own countries. We still subscribe to a policy which favors the self-determination of peoples, but Communist aspirations and actions are extraterritorial, and it is this which gives us proper cause for concern. Should they manage to succeed beyond their own boundaries our national security would be jeopardized; were they to stay at home and abandon international imperialism, all our security needs might not be met, but peaceful coexistence would then seem to be more readily possible. And surely that kind of existence is already preferred to an alternative of unpeaceful coextinction.

"But mere coexistence under an uneasy truce would not provide those conditions of mutual trust which would be necessary for an enduring international peace. Nor could these conditions be successfully fostered under a necessarily negative, defensive policy of containment. Since the beginning of the cold war such a policy has served its purpose well. But that war—as is the case sooner or later with all wars—is drawing to the end of its course, and Vietnam may well be its Waterloo. Now we must look beyond containment—a policy which has always been hopefully regarded by us as only an interim one to be superseded at the appropriate opportunity by a more positive, more constructive one. That opportunity may be here today in the economic changes which are sweeping the Soviet Union and most of the Communist-governed countries of East Europe. Surely we cannot afford to ignore it. And if it is to succeed, our new long-range policy—by whatever name it may be called—must as surely rest on a moral foundation of peaceful engagement.

"So, as we move forward into the next chapters of history, let the moral of our leadership be—in the words of Winston Churchill—"

In War: Resolution
In Victory: Magnanimity
In Peace: Good will

LAW BY SECRETARY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary to take more of this honorable body's time on a matter that should have been settled through routine liaison with the Department of Agriculture. But today I feel it is truly necessary to inform you and other Members of Congress of an attempt that is being made by an executive department of our Government to legislate. My complaint is of law by Secretary, as practiced by Orville Freeman, a man who is supposed to be the appointed delegate to the President's Cabinet, representing our country's farmers.

Mr. Freeman has arbitrarily decided that six agricultural stabilization and conservation offices in the State of Montana are unnecessary and, disregarding the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, has ordered these elective offices disbanded and joined with like offices in neighboring counties. As authority for his actions, the Secretary quotes a section of obscure regulations that were promulgated by his subordinates.

I contend these regulations are a direct circumvention of this act and, in effect, amend the act, a power allowed only to Congress.

This usurpation of congressional pow-

ers would be alarming even if the Nation's farm economy was not in its present sorry state. But to put aside this question briefly I review the ramifications of these consolidations.

ASCS offices in each county are the farmers' direct link with that vast confusing bureaucracy, the Department of Agriculture. These local offices, staffed by local people who know the problems of the area, set the acreage allotments and inform farmers on whether their planned plantings meet regulations. They are the core of the rural communities and are probably more important to the farmer than the post office and the general store. When the farmer makes a trip to town in Treasure, Musselshell, Petroleum, Meagher, Golden Valley, and Lincoln Counties, he stops at these ASCS offices and finds out the Department of Agriculture's latest directive and thereby keeps in touch with Washington. This office is his city council, in a way, because it allows him to have first-hand information on the matters that most vitally concern him. It allows him to exert pressure locally when conditions do not suit his purposes. Perhaps these are the reasons the Secretary has decided to close these offices.

Far out at the end of a dirt road in Petroleum County, a farmer has little contact with his county officials, much less with that ivory tower of organization in Washington that makes so many of his decisions. Of course, this is a free country and he has the right to write a letter to Secretary Freeman and make known his complaints. He can also write a letter to President Johnson or the European Common Market when he feels his interests are being jeopardized. When it gets right down to it, though, he knows his letter will never reach the President, Mr. Freeman, or the Common Market. His Congressman becomes the only person he can contact and be sure of receiving a reply.

I have received 75 letters on this subject and, I am sorry to say, I have not been able to offer much hope. This matter is small only in Washington. In these six Montana counties ASCS elimination is the main subject of conversations. Even with farm parity hanging precariously at 72 percent, this matter is the main concern of these farmers. If these offices are moved to an adjoining county, they can see their present high costs multiplying. Instead of a 10-mile trip, the farmers in these counties will have to travel upward of 100 miles to obtain services of ASCS officials.

ASCS officials in Washington have given the impression that county ASCS committees agreed with this move, but since this problem came to light almost 3 months ago, I have heard from officials of all the affected counties and they unanimously have opposed closing their offices and moving to another county. Supplied with this information, Department of Agriculture officials reply that they have the authority through regulation to close these offices whether the county offices agree or not.

Gentlemen, I intend to ask Secretary Freeman once more to review his directive and withdraw his order for closing these offices. If he persists, I intend to ask Congress to pass a resolution, requesting the Secretary to resign his office.

If Mr. Freeman cannot represent the farmer fairly and continues acting to the detriment of the people he was appointed to serve, he has no business in this position.

AN ASSIST IN THE PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes.

The Surplus Property Act authorizes conveyance to any State, political subdivision, or municipality, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any surplus land which in the determination of the Secretary of the Interior is suitable and desirable for use as a public park, public recreational area, or historic monument for the benefit of the public. Under provision of the act, conveyance for park or recreational purposes must be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal. Conveyance of property for historic monument purposes under the act is made without monetary consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the explosive population growth in our metropolitan areas, particularly in the suburban areas, is devouring land at a tremendous rate. The resulting physical expansion has been so rapid as to make the preservation of some remaining land for parks, playgrounds, recreation areas, increasingly difficult. If we are to retain the desirable features of civilized living in densely populated areas, it is imperative that all levels of government undertake immediate programs for the preservation of open space in urban and suburban areas. The increasing difficulties of which I speak are particularly felt at the local government level, the cities and counties. The major problem facing them is that the prices for recreational lands are escalating at an ever-increasing rate, and I am sure that we all know the financial conditions of our cities; they are fighting just to keep up with the everyday operation of government.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation just recently has published a study which disclosed that land values throughout this Nation are rising on the average of 5 to 10 percent annually. The cost of lands suitable for public recreation is rising at a considerably higher rate.

It has reached the point, Mr. Speaker, where local government is now finding it impossible to compete with individuals and developers for prime recreational lands even at the 50-percent price allowed under the Surplus Property Act. The Federal Government is committed to various programs to assist local public bodies in the acquisition of land to be used for park and recreation; why, then, not donate surplus lands which would be suitable for public parks and recreational areas?

The President said on October 13, 1966:

> We are creating recreation areas where they will do the most good for the most people. We are putting parks and seashores where a man and his family can get to them.

This is exactly the philosophy behind my bill. Opening up certain surplus properties that will assist in doing the most good for the most people.

The park and recreation sites today generally require long travel time from large population areas, but my bill would greatly benefit those least able to travel great distances by providing recreation land in some urban and suburban areas that otherwise could not be theirs.

The Surplus Property Act today allows the Federal Government to deed over lands with no monetary consideration for historic monuments, public health, education, wildlife conservation, and for public airports. Is it not, Mr. Speaker, just as important to the welfare of our people, that consideration be given under the act to the fact that the increasing tempo of urbanization and growth is already depriving many of the right to live in surroundings with adequate parks and recreational areas?

The Federal Government is committed to a program of providing open spaces. The Congress can give the program a tremendous assist and cut the cost to the American taxpayers. For example, under the Housing Act, which includes the open space program, the Federal Government is allowed to give grants to any governmental agency to acquire land for open space purposes. There are many areas in this country where there are surplus lands which could be acquired by the local governments for recreational purposes except that the cost is prohibitive.

Mr. Speaker, the President pointed out in his message to the Congress on March 2, 1965, dealing with the problems of the cities why it is becoming impossible for cities to compete for lands when he said:

> Our cities are making a vigilant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources . . . waged an heroic battle to improve the life of the people they served.

A review of the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans submitted by the States for the years 1968 through 1977 to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation reveals an estimated capital cost of $7.1 billion needed for acquisition and development projects. Of this total, approximately $2.8 billion would be for State projects and $4.3 billion for projects financed in part by local governments but sponsored by the States. These figures may be conservative when one considers the growing demand for State and local

public recreation facilities in or adjacent to urban centers where costs are greatest. Furthermore, those figures do not include any estimates for eight of the States and three territories.

It is obvious that State and local governments will not meet needs of this magnitude over the next ten years without Federal assistance. My amendment to the Surplus Property Act is a concrete proposal to give them some assistance.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that the local levels of government could not indiscriminately claim surplus property for parks or recreation, for the act, as I have mentioned, states that the Secretary of the Interior must give a determination on whether or not the property in question is suitable and desirable for use as a public park or public recreational area.

THE NEAR EAST SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Near East today is critical. What happens in the next few days will be a test of diplomacy, a test of the United Nations, and a test of the U.S. commitments dating back to 1950.

More recently, speaking at a press conference on May 8, 1963, President Kennedy said:

> In the event of aggression or preparation for aggression, whether direct or indirect, we would support appropriate measures in the United Nations, adopt other courses of action on our own to prevent or put a stop to such aggression; which, of course, has been the policy which the United States has followed for some time.

The United States also has a more specific commitment to free access to Israel's crucial southern port of Elat, on the Gulf of Aqaba. On February 1, 1957, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in an aide memoire to Israel's Foreign Minister, Abba Eban:

> With respect to the Gulf of Aqaba and access thereto, the United States believes that the gulf comprehends international waters and that no nation has the right to prevent free and innocent passage in the gulf and through the straits giving access thereto. We have in mind not only commercial usage, but the passage of pilgrims on religious missions, which should be fully respected.
>
> In the absence of some overriding decision to the contrary, as by the International Court of Justice, the United States, on behalf of vessels of United States registry, is prepared to exercise the right of free and innocent passage and to join with others to secure general recognition of this right.

I would hope that our Government would explore, at the highest possible level with the Soviet Union, means of helping to defuse the situation while there is yet time.

Second, I would hope that the mission of the Secretary General to Cairo will help to reduce tension and to establish what the intentions of Cairo might be.

In the interim I think it important to state that this is of no small moment and that the UNEF forces and their deployment be watched very closely, and hopefully that the UNEF deployment at Sharm El Sheikh will not have to be changed in the near future.

It is very clear, I think, that should there be any overt act by the United Arab Republic interfering with the freedom of shipping and Israel ships in the Gulf of Aqaba, it could result in a very prompt response from Israel.

I hope the U.N. forces presently at Sharm El Sheikh commanding the Strait of Tiran will stay there pending the efforts of the United States, the U.N. and other countries to reduce tensions and to move back toward a more peaceful situation in the Near East.

ADMINISTRATION STRING PULLING

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the postponement of consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, everyone has recognized, was due to the administration sensing the growing dissatisfaction with the way it has worked in the various States. They needed and wanted time to scrape up enough votes by one manner or another to pass it once again even though it fails to be responsive to the needs of education.

We expected that the puppet strings of the Great Society would begin to be pulled in the White House and individuals tied to the Great Society would begin to respond, but we did not expect the figures they would use would be as erroneous as they are. One of the examples of this response is a letter from the Governor of North Dakota to the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]. The Governor's letter, as could be expected in response to such an appeal, is as phony as a $3 bill in maintaining that North Dakota would lose $1,300,000 as a result of proposed amendments introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. Such is simply not the case. Estimates used by the Council of Chief State School Officers of which our own North Dakota superintendent of instruction, M. F. Peterson is second vice president, give a fair comparison of the present program and proposed changes and shows that the Quie amendment actually results in increased income to North Dakota.

In order that there shall be no doubt of the true needs of the children of North Dakota in the minds of the Members of the House, I would like to include with my remarks a letter from our competent superintendent of the department of public instruction, an elected official who has spent his lifetime in the field of education. He points out that he would be 100 percent for the Quie bill even if North Dakota did lose funds in some instance—which, of course, it does not—since as he points out, the block grant system would make it possible to do the same job with fewer people. I share this feeling and intend to cast my vote on behalf of the schoolchildren of our State.

Unfortunately, our Governor seems to believe that our State and local school officials are not competent to handle the education of our children. I feel most North Dakotans believe they would rather have a program responsive to the needs of education in our State than responsive to the needs of the politicians of the Great Society.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MAY 17, 1967.

Hon. HUGH L. CAREY,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAREY: I have your letter dated May 15 addressed to "Friend of Education." I am a friend of education. As a matter of fact, you can see by this letterhead that public education is my business.

However, I have not been convinced that H.R. 7819 would be better for the states—at least this state and its local subdivisions—than it would be with the Quie amendment added. I have taken an official stand in the Council of Chief State School Officers in favor of the Quie amendment on condition that the money allotted to the States will not be less than that authorized in H.R. 7819.

I am for the Quie amendment because it reduces the categorical aid system of funding to a more general aid, block grants. I understand, too, that the Quie amendment will make it possible for states to submit just one plan rather than a plan for each of the categorical aids. The argument that the states and school districts are now accustomed to ESEA as it was originally passed is not valid. I do not know whether all people will ever become used to the detailed specifics that are required under ESEA.

I am 100% for the Quie bill if there is no loss of funds. Furthermore, I am willing to support the Quie bill even if there is a loss of funds to North Dakota and its school districts. The block grant system would make it possible to do the same job with fewer people.

Should the Quie bill actually amount to less in terms of dollars for the states it would not necessarily mean that the Quie bill would be less effective as far as schools are concerned. The administration of the bill with the Quie amendment would, I believe, necessitate the employing of *fewer* people and thus a given amount of dollars would make the same impact on the schools and school children.

Yours sincerely,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
M. F. PETERSON, *Superintendent.*

HOW BROADCASTERS SERVE THE PUBLIC INTEREST

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the text of a report

from the Tennessee chairman of the Emergency Broadcast System, H. W. "Hank" Slavick, a veteran broadcaster of 42 years' experience. The information contained in this report covers the activity and services performed by every radio and television broadcaster in Memphis, as well as other agencies such as, the police and fire department and local Red Cross, during the time a tornado struck Memphis at 3:52 p.m. on Sunday, May 14. I am sure the report will be of great value to other Members of this Congress, who could perhaps utilize the methods used in our great city of Memphis for their respective districts. The people of Memphis and the mid-South were provided a 2-hour advance warning and minute-by-minute reports of the progress and locality of the tornado and what to do to protect themselves during the emergency:

AN EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY WEATHER WARNING SERVICE FOR THE PUBLIC

From an inquiry in August 1965, by Mr. Gilley T. Stephens, meteorologist-in-charge of the Memphis Weather Bureau, to H. W. "Hank" Slavick, then general manager of the WMC radio, FM, and TV broadcasting stations in Memphis, as to a more reliable, efficient, and speedy method of transmitting vital weather information from the Weather Bureau to each respective broadcasting station in Memphis, there evolved a plan known as the Emergency Weather Warning System. Mr. Slavick, being Tennessee Chairman of the State Industry Advisory Committee of the Nation's Emergency Broadcasting System, recommended to all broadcasters in Memphis there be established a direct wire—"hotline" network directly connected between each individual broadcasting system and the radar room of the Memphis Weather Bureau.

At considerable expense to the broadcasters, who maintain the costs of this wire rental-service from the Telephone Company, the broadcasters also installed necessary equipment for the radar room of the Weather Bureau enabling the Bureau, through predetermined signals direct to all broadcasting stations in Memphis, to prepare them for severe and emergency weather information to be directed to the general public. This network is tested each day at 11:50 a.m. for the purpose of maintaining continuity and furnishing a general routine weather-report.

In his official connection with the Emergency Broadcasting System, Mr. Slavick further expanded the Weather Warning Service to more than forty additional broadcasting stations located in a radius of approximately eighty miles of Memphis by furnishing "off-the-air" pickup service to these outlying stations. The alarm system to these outlying stations consists of the official notification signal employed over our National Emergency Broadcasting System.

Interconnected to the Memphis network are additional public agencies such as: the Mayor's office; Memphis Department of Public Works; Memphis Police and Fire Department; Memphis Light, Gas, and Water Division; local and regional chapter of the American Red Cross; and the Memphis-Shelby-County Safety Council.

The "wired" network in Memphis is terminated to the control rooms of each radio, FM, and television station, and is maintained in a "on-and-ready" position at every hour of each station's operating schedule. Due to the efforts of Mr. Slavick, this Weather Warning System is now operating in Chattanooga, Knoxville, and Nashville, Tennessee. From reports received from the official channels of the Emergency Broadcast System, many other cities throughout the country are modeling their system after the "Memphis Plan." During the tornado, which struck Memphis at 3:52 p.m. on Sunday, May 14, the Memphis Fire Department began operating the Civil Defense sirens throughout the City, and broadcasters were broadcasting warnings and information to their listeners and viewers within two minutes of the first sight and strike of the tornado. All broadcasters thereafter interrupted regular programs frequently to appraise the public of the location and direction of the tornado, as well as advice on methods of protecting life and property. It should be noted that tornado "watches" or "alert" warnings were broadcast two hours prior to its strike in Memphis. This was furnished by the Weather Bureau when it sighted the tornado in the vicinity of Marianna, Arkansas.

PANAMA CANAL: GIVEAWAY BY TREATY MUST BE PREVENTED

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the major policy questions now facing the Congress is that of interoceanic canals, with particular reference to continued U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal that the executive branch of our Government is now attempting to cede to Panama. The full story is long and complicated.

Though told many times, this chapter of U.S. history has been practically ignored by the mass news media and needs retelling. In this connection, attention is invited to the recently published volume of selected addresses by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," House Document No. 474, 89th Congress. This document has been distributed to all Members of the Congress and among government depositories in various parts of the Nation. It is an indispensable source for authentic information on canal questions, which I have found most helpful.

Though the major press of the Nation has neglected the canal question, there are individual publicists who have studied it in depth and stated their views with a degree of candor that is refreshing. Among such writers is Dan Smoot, one of the leading commentators of the United States in vital questions of public policy, who publishes a weekly known as the Dan Smoot Report.

During the recent Punta del Este meeting in Uruguay of the Presidents of the American Republics, the United States and Panamanian Presidents conferred at length. Subsequent to the conference, in a speech in Chiriqui Province of Panama, President Robles of that country announced that the current Panama Canal Treaty negotiations will be concluded "sooner than you think"—A.P. dispatch from Panama, May 3, 1967.

The treaty or treaties that President Robles had in mind are those that will give away to Panama our sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone. It would be just about as logical to cede back the Louisiana Purchase to France.

As two previous reports by Dan Smoot supply documented information on the canal sovereignty question with much historical background, I quote both as parts of my remarks and urge that they be read by every Member of the Congress, officials of the executive branch, editors, publicists, and commentators.

The indicated reports follow:

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Nov. 7, 1966]

PREPARATION FOR THE PANAMA GIVEAWAY

On October 7, 1966, the foreign minister of Panama said that talks with U.S. negotiators are well on the way toward an agreement to abrogate the treaty of 1903.[1]

The importance of that statement is incalculable. President Johnson—sacrificing American lives in Vietnam under pretext of fighting communism and protecting American security interests—is preparing to surrender vital American interests to Panama, in compliance with demands which communists have been making for years.[2]

The Panama Canal Zone is United States territory as clearly and completely as the city of Washington is. President Johnson has no more right to grant Panama sovereignty over our Canal Zone than to cede the State of Alaska to the Soviet Union.[2]

The current talks which are "well on the way" toward our final surrender in Panama have been going on since April, 1964. Piecemeal surrender, for the purpose of appeasing communists and other agitators, has been going on since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is a twice-told tale which needs to be told again.

Prior to 1903, the Isthmus of Panama was a province of Colombia. The revolution which separated Panama from Colombia was promoted by a New York lawyer and five ambitious men in Panama, three of whom were United States citizens. This group, backed by the United States government, created the nation of Panama in 1903.[2]

At that time, Panama (a land of chronic political instability, owned by a few wealthy families) was the pesthole of the world. Virulent tropical diseases had to be conquered before we could wrench worthless land from the voracious jaws of a steaming jungle and convert it into a mighty waterway to lift ships over the bedrock of the continental divide. Many American lives and millions of American tax dollars went into that dual miracle of sanitation and engineering.[2]

The Republic of Panama was not a partner in the Panama Canal enterprise: she was the principal beneficiary.

In our 1903 treaty with the New Republic of Panama, we *bought* the Panama Canal Zone—a ten-mile-wide strip across the Isthmus, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—for 10 million dollars plus an annuity. The annuity was not a *lease* or *rental* fee: it was a guarantee of revenue to keep the Panama government alive. We acquired full ownership and sovereignty, by grant in perpetuity, making the Canal Zone United States territory forever.[2]

When Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union in 1933, he gave a boost to communist activity throughout the world. Most Latin American nations followed Roosevelt's lead in recognizing the lawless Kremlin gang as a lawful government. Communist agitators who had been operating illegally, came out in the open with their "yankee imperialism" propaganda; and many became successful politicians.

The ground swell of anti-United States propaganda, which developed south of the border after our recognition of the Soviet

---

Footnotes at end of report.

Union, was one reason for F.D.R.'s "good neighbor" policy in Latin America. F.D.R. presented his "good neighbor" policy in a way which implied that the United States had formerly been a bad neighbor. This encouraged more anti-United States activity until everyone, north and south, was ready for us to "make amends" for past behavior.

The most important consequence was a renegotiation of our treaty agreements with Panama. In the Hull-Alfaro Treaty (signed March 2, 1936, but not ratified by the U.S. Senate until July 25, 1939), the United States raised annuity payments to Panama from 250 thousand dollars to 430 thousand, to compensate for the 40% loss in purchasing power of the dollar which had resulted from Roosevelt's taking us off the gold standard in 1934. This concession was reasonable.[2]

In the 1936–39 treaty, we renounced the 1903 treaty provision which made Panama a protectorate of the United States; and we renounced our right to maintain public order in Panama, outside of the Canal Zone. These concessions were incongruous, because we must protect Panama from anarchy as long as we maintain and defend the Canal. Now we have the responsibility without clear treaty authority.[2]

The most harmful concessions Roosevelt made in the treaty of 1936-39 were: (1) renunciation of our right of eminent domain for the acquisition of property, in Colon and Panama City, needed for canal purposes; and (2) renunciation of our right to build defense bases in Panama outside the ten-mile Canal Zone. Roosevelt's treaty of 1936–39 left us with the responsibility of defending the Canal Zone—for ourselves, Panama, and every other maritime nation—but with no room to stand and fight. In less than two months after the treaty was ratified in 1939, World War II began in Europe; and we were begging Panama for defense sites to protect the Canal. We had to pay heavily for 134 base-sites which had been ours under the 1903 treaty provisions.[2]

Before the guns of World War II were silent, Panama was demanding evacuation of American bases, and more changes in U.S.-Panama treaties. President Truman evacuated most of the bases and *gave* them to Panama. President Eisenhower, his first year in office, sent a team to change the treaties.[2]

The result was the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955, in which the United States: (1) increased annuity payments from $430 thousand to $1.93 million; (2) gave Panama land and other properties—including the Panama Railroad Company's yards and terminal stations in the cities of Colon and Panama; (3) promised to build a $27 million bridge across the Canal on the Pacific side. The only thing Panama gave us in the 1955 treaty was the right to use, for 15 years, the Rio Hato Air Base—which we had built for World War II and had given to Panama in 1948.[2]

The American property which Eisenhower gave Panama (valued at about $20 million) quickly deteriorated into uselessness.[2] Before 1955, the United States, in order to enforce sanitation rules necessary to public health in Panama, collected garbage in the cities of Colon and Panama. Panamanians considered this service an affront to their national dignity. We permitted them to collect their own garbage—and Colon and Panama became filthy places, their streets littered with refuse.

As soon as the 1955 treaty was ratified, Panama started agitating for more concessions—specifically for recognition of Panama sovereignty in the Canal Zone and for 50% of *gross* revenue from the Canal. Gross reveenue from the Canal is about $43 million a year; net revenue is less than $3 million. Panama—with no investment, or responsibility for operating, maintaining, defending the Canal—gets in annuity alone more than half of net revenues. Corollary benefits of Canal operations are the very life blood of Panama's economy.

In May, 1958, mobs of Panama "students," incited and led by communists demonstrated for "Panama sovereignty in the Canal Zone" by invading the U.S. Zone and planting 70 Panama flags. U.S. authorities removed the flags and gave them to the Panama government. Riots in Panama ensued and lasted some 3 weeks. Our State Department tried to appease Panamanians by announcing that Dr. Milton Eisenhower would soon visit Panama on a "good-will" trip.[2]

On November 3, 1959, Panama mobs again demonstrated for Panama sovereignty by invading our Canal Zone to plant the Panama flag. They also pulled down the American flag at the U.S. Embassy in Panama, mutilated it, and hoisted the Panama flag. During the day, 82 people were injured. Some of the injured were American soldiers who had been pelted with rocks. The mobs were led by communists and prominent Panama politicians who apparently had the sanction of the Panama government which had ordered Panama police to stay away from the scenes of violence.[2]

Our State Department tried to appease Panamanians by ordering U.S. Embassy personnel in Panama to "curtail" the flying of the American flag in front of our Embassy. Eisenhower tried to appease them by announcing that Panama does have "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone.[3]

Congress reacted angrily to Eisenhower's announcement. On February 2, 1960, the House passed a Resolution (381 to 12) which, in essence said that we should not permit the flag of Panama to be flown in our Canal Zone. On February 9, 1960, the House, in an amendment to an appropriations bill, prohibited the expenditure of tax money for any flagpole to fly Panama's flag in our Zone. On September 17 1960, (after Congress had adjourned) Eisenhower, defying Congress, ordered the flag of Panama to be flown at key places in the U.S. Canal Zone to demonstrate Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the whole Zone.

On October 25, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy expressed approval of Eisenhower's action, but said it should have been taken 18 months earlier.[2]

On June 15, 1962, President Kennedy and President Chiari of Panama signed a secret memorandum agreeing to renegotiate the 1903 treaty.[4]

On October 12, 1962, the Thatcher Ferry Bridge at Balboa (which the U.S. had promised in the 1955 treaty) was dedicated. During the ceremonies, a riot erupted, and a Panama mob desecrated the American flag.[2]

On October 29, 1962, President Kennedy ordered the raising of the Panama flag at the American Canal Zone Administration Building.[2]

On January 10, 1963, the State Department announced that the United States had agreed: (1) to permit the Panama flag to be flown with the U.S. flag anywhere in the Canal Zone; (2) to recognize Panama's sovereign right to issue papers of authorization (exequaturs) to foreign consuls operating in the Canal Zone; (3) to use Panama postage in the Canal Zone; (4) to grant Panamanians in the Canal Zone opportunities and privileges equal to those of U.S. citizens, including U.S. Social Security benefits.[2]

On July 23, 1963, the State Department announced another agreement conferring more benefits and concessions on Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone. On October 29, 1963, the Panama government announced official arrangements for Panama Independence Day parades, *inside the Canal Zone*. On November 5, 1963, the City Council of Panama held an official Council meeting *on the steps of the United States District Court House in the Canal Zone*.[2]

In December, 1963, the American Canal Zone Governor (Robert J. Fleming, Jr.) ordered that the U.S. flag could no longer be flown at the U.S. Court House or at American schools in the Canal Zone. Americans were even ordered not to fly the American flag at the Gamboa War Memorial inside the Canal Zone—a memorial to American soldiers who died in World War II.[2]

On January 7, 1964, American students raised the American flag at the American Balboa High School in the American Zone. The principal and a Canal Zone official took the flag down. The students raised another flag, and gave the pledge of allegiance. Officials announced that the flagpole would be removed. Students kept raising the American flag each morning, taking it down at night, and keeping vigil over the flagpole to prevent its removal.[2]

On January 9, 1964, mobs of Panamanians rioted to protest the flying of the American flag at Balboa High School. The riots spread throughout Panama and the American Canal Zone. When they ended on January 13, an immense amount of American property had been destroyed or damaged. Twenty-one people were dead (including 4 American soldiers), and 300 injured.[2]

Present negotiations, already "well on the way" toward total surrender of American sovereignty in the Canal Zone, were initiated by President Johnson as a result of the 1964 riots.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "New Canal Treaty Said Well Along," by Sam Pope Brewer, *The Dallas Morning News*, October 8, 1966, p. A3

[2] "Panama—Part I," and "Panama—Part II," *The Dan Smoot Report*, January 20 and 27, 1964, pp. 17–32 (1 copy for 25c, 6 for $1.00)

[3] "U.S. Giving Up Canal; Agrees to Scrap Panama Pact, Write New One," *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 1965, pp. 1, 2

[4] "The Panama Canal—It Must Remain American," by Dr. Charles Callan Tansil (Committee on Pan-American Policy, 60 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10017; price: 15c), 12 pp.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Nov. 14, 1966]

OUR FLAG IS COMING DOWN IN PANAMA

Present U.S.-Panama negotiations of a new treaty (to meet demands of Panama politicians and of international communism that the U.S. surrender sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone) were initiated by President Johnson as a result of the bloody Panama riots in January, 1964. Those riots were precipitated by Panama mobs protesting because American students raised an American flag, at an American high school, in the American Canal Zone. Here are excerpts from a contemporary log kept by a La Crosse, Wisconsin, radio commentator who was in Panama as a tourist at the time of the riots:

"The Canal Zone radio went off the air at 11 last night. . . . The radio announcers [on Panama stations outside the American Canal Zone] are screaming at the top of their lungs . . . 'to kill all the Americans you see.' Thelma King, a deputado (congress-woman) and Communist, screaming for two hours on the radio and loudspeakers in the city—to hunt out all the Americans and butcher them in the streets. . . .

"All kinds of armament . . . in the hands of the mob: pistols, clubs, Molotov cocktails. . . . Snipers previously posted on the surrounding rooftops . . . [firing] with rifles at the [American Canal Zone] police. . . . The looters . . . running in mobs . . . looking in the streets and in windows for Americans to kill. . . .

"Then they attacked the U.S. Embassy. We . . . phoned there, and were told to hang up as they were busy evacuating. So, there we were—no protection, and it appeared the U.S. didn't give a damn about us. . . .

"A show of force any time during this anti-American Red-inspired riot would have

brought a quick end . . . and saved how many American lives? How many Americans are now dead in their apartments, or torn to pieces and hacked to bits? How many are dead in the outside villages hanging from trees and lamp posts? How many? . . . We know for sure the Panamanians hanged five Americans. Cut one more up in little pieces with machetes. This news . . . has been classified as secret and the . . . . classifying is being done by our own government. . . ."[1]

All fighting in which Americans were involved occurred inside our Canal Zone where American troops were trying to protect American lives and American property from foreign mobs which had invaded American soil. Nonetheless, the Panama President accused the United States of "aggression," and broke diplomatic relations saying he would not resume relations until the U.S. promised to renegotiate U.S.-Panama treaties.

President Johnson said he would not yield to force and that violence was no basis for talks; yet, he rushed Thomas Mann to Panama for talks. On January 23, 1964, Johnson made an appeal for Panama to restore diplomatic relations with us, promising to discuss or renegotiate anything. Commenting on the riots, Johnson placed as much blame on American youngsters who had raised an American flag as on communist-led Panama mobs who had murdered, vandalized, and pillaged for more than a week.[2]

On March 21, 1964, Johnson sent Panama another conciliatory message re-emphasizing his willingness to discuss anything desired by Panama.

On April 3, 1964, Johnson resumed diplomatic relations with Panama—on Panama's terms—and began negotiations for "prompt elimination of the causes of conflict between the two countries, without limitations or preconditions of any kind."[3]

On April 5, 1964, when General Douglas MacArthur died, the American and Panama flags were lowered to half-mast in our Canal Zone. A few Panama "students" objected. The U. S. State Department, on orders from Johnson, had the Panama flag raised to full staff, above the American flag—in defiance of American military regulations, which forbid the flying of *any* flag above ours on American soil or at an American military installation.[4]

On July 10, 1964, an Alliance for Progress team submitted *to the government of Panama* a report saying that Panama should be given a more important role in the operation of the Canal; that Panamanians should be promoted to positions of high responsibility in the Canal organization; and that the U.S. should return to Panama all land in the Canal Zone that is not indispensable for maintenance, defense, and sanitation of the Canal.[5] Alliance for Progress is the organization which dispenses United States tax money to Panama and other Latin American countries.

On July 15, 1964, the government of Panama released a report revealing its future plans for the Canal Zone. Among other things, Panama will force all Canal Zone residents (Panamanians and non-Panamanians alike) to move out. This will require them to live somewhere in the Republic of Panama where the government of Panama can levy income taxes on them. This plan is supported, in part, by the Alliance for Progress.[6]

On December 18, 1964, President Johnson—with the election safely behind him—announced that he would negotiate a new treaty to recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone.[7]

On September 24, 1965, Johnson gave a progress report, saying that, after 18 months of negotiations, the U.S. and Panama had decided to abolish the 1903 treaty, replacing it with a new one which would recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone and permit "political, economic, and social integration" of the Zone into the Republic of Panama. The new treaty will also provide for a new sea-level canal across Panama—if the commission studying the problem decides that Panama is the best place for a new canal.[8]

Johnson says he thinks the new sea-level canal being planned can be built on the site of the present Canal; but he promises that Panama will receive "adequate compensation for any economic damage suffered" if the new canal is built elsewhere. The implication of this promise is enormous. Panama's two largest cities—Colon and Panama City, at the Pacific and Atlantic terminals of the Panama Canal—will die if a bigger Canal is built elsewhere. Johnson's promise of "adequate compensation" can mean nothing less than putting Panama's two major cities on the American dole forever.[9]

On October 7, 1965, Diogenes de la Rosa (an admitted marxist who is Panama's negotiator in treaty talks with the U.S.) spoke to the Panama National Assembly, giving Panama's official reaction to the promises President Johnson had made on September 24. De la Rosa said that Panama's objective is "a Panamanian canal in Panamanian territory under the Panamanian flag." He acknowledged that in 1964, Panama's direct income from the Canal was $115.4 million, which generated activities totaling another $233 million for Panama. This income derived from the Panama Canal Zone was 39% of the Republic of Panama's gross national product ($578.8 million)—a "fearful figure," de la Rosa said.[10]

Panama demands that the U.S. continue to supply technology, experience, and money to operate the Canal, but under Panamanian direction and sovereignty, guaranteeing to Panama whatever economic benefits Panama feels she should receive. Panama also demands that we pay for the privilege of rendering such vital services to Panama by: (1) constructing another bridge across the Canal—this one on the Atlantic side; (2) providing ports, piers, and auxiliary installations for the cities of Panama and Colon; (3) improving and expanding our facilities for furnishing sanitary water to the Republic of Panama; (4) providing short-range and long-range "training of Panamanians in all occupations."[10] In other words, they want us to pay for a poverty program that will embrace the total population of Panama.

On February 3, 1966, Dr. Arnulfo Arias (former President of Panama who was defeated by Marco A. Robles in 1964) said the Panamanian people will accept no treaty with the U.S. which is negotiated by the Robles administration. Asked whether he would support a Robles-negotiated treaty that conformed with his own position, Arias said, facetiously:

"If the treaty is very good—if they give us a few little things like New York City—we accept it."[11]

When the January, 1964, riots erupted in Panama, a propaganda campaign *against* the Panama Canal erupted in the United States. The theme of the campaign was that the Panama Canal, great in its time but now inadequate and obsolete, should be replaced with a larger sea-level canal. On September 2, 1964, Congress hastily passed a bill appropriating a large amount of tax money for studies of sea-level canal alternatives to the present Canal.[12]

The propaganda (preparing Americans to accept without protest the giveaway of one of their most valuable possessions, by convincing them it is no longer useful) does not recognize, much less answer, the critical question: If our government will not hold on to the Panama Canal which it has owned and operated for 52 years, will our government protect a multi-billion-dollar investment in a new canal?

Surrendering our Canal Zone territory and giving away our present Canal will whet foreign appetites for more. If we build a new canal (in Panama or elsewhere in Central America) the nation that provides the right-of-way will demand full sovereignty and ownership.

In all Central American nations where a sea-level canal might be built, general political instability is so commonplace, and communist influence so strong, that a canal operated under *any* authority except the *exclusive* authority of the United States would be a detriment, not an asset, to our nation.

From the day the Republic of Panama was born, her economy has revolved around benefits provided by the United States. Her military security, and the health of her people, depend on us. Our treatment of Panama has *always* been magnanimous. Our only disservice to that nation has resulted from our government's efforts to comply with the outrageous demands of Panama politicians—thus encouraging them to keep their country in turmoil, making it profitable for them to play politics with the "yankee imperialism" propaganda of communism.

The treaty of 1903—the birth certificate of the Republic of Panama—did not give us too much in comparison with what Panama got.

When we acquired right to build the Canal, we accepted responsibility to maintain, operate, and defend it. A vulnerable, critically-important, ten-mile-wide strip of land such as the Canal Zone cannot be easily defended by military bases confined within the strip itself. Our government did not insist on a wider Canal Zone in 1903, because the Treaty gave us the right to *acquire any property anywhere in Panama* which might be needed for operation, sanitation, or defense of the Canal.

In the treaty of 1936–39 and in the treaty of 1955, the Republic of Panama promised to cooperate in every way feasible to demonstrate mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries and to strengthen bonds of understanding and friendship between their respective peoples.

Panama has blatantly and continuously violated the expressed intent of both treaties. Hence, we should declare both

---

[1] "La Crosse Man, Caught In Panama Riots, Writes Home," by Don Athnos, *The La Crosse Tribune*, January 30, 1964, p. 1 and the editorial page.

[2] "Johnson Talk on Panama," *The New York Times*, January 24, 1964, p. 13.

[3] "Texts on Panama Accord," *The New York Times*, April 4, 1964, p. 2.

[4] "Humble Pie," editorial, *The Dallas Morning News*, April 28, 1964, Sec. 4, p. 2.

[5] "RP Needs Bigger Role in PC, Alliance Says," *Panama American*, July 10, 1964, p. 1.

[6] "Shift Zonians To RP, Levy Taxes, RP Asks," *Panama American*, July 15, 1964, p. 1.

[7] "U.S. Decides To Dig A New Canal At Sea Level in Latin America and Renegotiate Panama Pact," by Tad Szulc, *The New York Times*, December 19, 1954, pp. 1, 10.

[8] "U.S. to Scrap 1903 Treaty With Panama," by Mike Quinn, *The Dallas Morning News*, September 25, 1965, p. 1.

[9] "U.S. Giving Up Canal," by Michael Pakenham and Jules DuBois, *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 1965, pp. 1, 2.

[10] "RP's Sweeping Treaty Agenda Revealed," *Star & Herald* (English-language newspaper published in Panama), October 8, 1965, pp. 1, 8.

[11] "Arias Says Government Lacks Support To Get Treaty Passed," *Star & Herald*, February 4, 1966, p. 1 ff.

[12] "Help! Save The Panama Canal," by Harold Lord Varney, *American Opinion* reprint, March, 1965, 16 pp.

treaties null and void. We should return to the terms of the original treaty of 1903, and enforce them meticulously, with the military might of our nation if necessary.

The present Panama Canal is not obsolete. It is too small for a few of our aircraft carriers, but will handle most of our naval craft and commercial vessels. We should keep the Canal, as well as the Zone surrounding it, exclusively under our jurisdiction and control, making whatever improvements *our* national interests may require. We do not need the consent or approval of Panama. All we need is an aroused and determined public which will compel our government to assert our national rights.

Suggestion: Begin *now* demanding that Congress stop spending tax money on plans for a new transisthmian canal. Begin *now* bombarding U.S. Senators with demands that the Senate reject the new U.S.-Panama treaty when President Johnson submits it.

BLACKMAIL FOR PEACE

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the business protection racket of Al Capone 40 years ago was a tenderfoot program compared to today's leftwing extremists.

The blackjack operation of rioters and demonstrators to frighten President Johnson into a $75 million appropriation to appease rioters in major American cities this summer is sheer criminal blackmail. Denouncing our leaders and Government as imperialists and oppressors of the poor, they would now set the stage to scream exploitation and being bought off with "hush money."

In fact, our Vice President, in talking to leaders in Washington, D.C., put it on the line:

> Do you know how much a riot will cost this city—I'll lay it on the line. No matter how much you pay now, it won't even be a down payment on the damage from the trouble.

It is like a bank president receiving a call from the sheriff that unless the bankers kick in to build recreational facilities for the voters the people will rob their banks. The bankers pay off and thank the crooks for leaving them a part of their money.

Mr. Speaker, Hitler, in his rise to power, threatened people's cities and their lives and property. He was able to shake down every major country in the world until eventually the leaders had to stand up and take notice.

The courage for law and order and leadership has dropped so low that it is like the woman who disapproved of violence. She was a patsy and could not say "no" if it hurt someone's feelings. She was never raped—she prevented violence by giving in.

Why do our leaders and our businessmen not look honestly at the facts and determine who the blackmailers against law and order and the American people are—and what the financial shakedown is for. There is ample proof on record that the boycotts, riots, and violence never would have occurred without the war on poverty. The American taxpayer has financed this little game of threats, scare, and overthrow. And we are now being asked to re-finance another long hot summer? Paying blackmail does not pay off—it only costs more in the end.

Mr. Speaker, I include two articles dealing with this subject:

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 19, 1967]

PLAN TO PREVENT RIOTS IS PUSHED BY JOHNSON

(By Lyle Denniston)

President Johnson plans to put a quick infusion of cash into city projects to help prevent rioting this summer.

Johnson told a press conference late yesterday that his staff aides had been spending their weekends "for the last several weeks" trying to discover methods of preventing unrest—in Washington, Baltimore and eight other major cities.

If Congress will put up the $75 million he recently requested, Johnson said, "we will immediately get it to areas that need it."

The funds would "provide employment, to supervise recreation, light playgrounds, provide new jobs, swimming pools, hydrants, et cetera, in cooperation with the mayors and school board officials," Johnson explained.

The special $75 million appropriation faced a Senate test today as part of a catchall money bill supplying more than $2.26 billion for a wide range of federal undertakings.

The money was requested by Johnson after the House had approved the bulky measure with a total some $218 million below that approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The President said Sen. John O. Pastore, D-R.I., had assured him of Senate efforts to clear the $75 million and "we are now working on House members, hoping they will approve that request."

The investigation of possible summer work-play projects have been made, the President said, in San Francisco, New York, Chicago, Baltimore, Washington and five other cities, which he did not name.

FIVE DOMESTIC ISSUES

Johnson's remarks made it clear he was concerned about recent reports, rising in number, that city officials around the country expected rioting to occur this summer unless something were done.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 19, 1967]

HUMPHREY TELLS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO AID POOR OR FACE RIOTS

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey laid it on the line to District leaders yesterday: Provide for the poor of the District this summer before there is violence.

"I challenge the District of Columbia to stand up to the agitators, not by scolding them and telling them they are wrong—which they are—but by doing something about meeting the real problems."

The vice president was asking business leaders to provide jobs this summer for needy youths in his "Youth Opportunity Campaign."

Humphrey said, "Every business firm in this city has something to lose if there is trouble this summer."

The meeting was called by the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, which invited Humphrey to appear, in the District Building main hearing room. About 250 persons attended.

Humphrey said he wouldn't debate with demagogues, obviously referring to extremist civil rights leaders. But he went on:

"Do you know how much a riot will cost this city—I'll lay it on the line.

"No matter how much you pay now it won't even be a downpayment on the damage from the trouble."

Humphrey said people had told him not to talk about such things as riots, but he said, "We're all grown up now and have to face such things."

"We need preventative medicine before we are struck down by the disease of violence."

"There are those who want to mar our good record last summer," Humphrey said. "My blood is red hot for doing something constructive around here."

He called on the business leaders, represented by Board of Trade President Leonard Doggett who introduced him, to give jobs to the 20,000 District youngsters needing them.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the documented story "Suffer Little Children," by Shirley Scheibla, which appeared in Barron's on May 8 at this point in the RECORD:

SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN: ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS ARE FINANCING PUBLIC SCHOOL BOYCOTTS

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—On May Day this demonstration-plagued city endured its first school boycott. An estimated 400 students met on the grounds of the Washington National Monument to hear such volunteer teachers as James Bevel, who led the recent anti-Vietnam war demonstration in New York. While the boycott boosted normal absenteeism by only 1,000 pupils, and could hardly be called a triumph of militance, it had some noteworthy aspects.

The action was planned as a protest against the recent reappointment of Dr. Carl F. Hansen, who had earned national acclaim as an educator, as Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia. Opposition to him springs from his stubborn refusal to meet the demands of anti-poverty, leftist and "civil rights" groups, which are seeking to carry out the War on Poverty's heady promise of "maximum feasible participation." To them, this means having parents ultimately set school policy. Meantime, they want a superintendent who will abolish grades, hire non-teachers to teach, present history and social studies with what they regard as the proper slant, and bus Negro children to suburban schools. The anti-poverty forces argue that such measures would improve the lot of the impoverished Negro children who make up most of the D.C. school population. Dr. Hansen calls this a formula for chaos.

SIMILAR AIMS

The boycott has been tardy in reaching Washington. Chicago, Rochester and New York City had school boycotts much earlier, the aims of which—control of the public schools—have been remarkably similar. In each case, moreover, leftists and anti-poverty workers have fostered the organized unrest.

Far from disclaiming any connection with the turmoil, anti-poverty workers are proud of their roles. For example, Melvin Moore, Assistant Director of the Near Northeast Neighborhood Development Program here (which receives federal antipoverty funds), told Barron's, "It might be necessary to do away with the schools and start all over again."

Preston Wilcox, a New York school boycott leader and paid consultant to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, told Barron's "What we need is more violence to accomplish our aims." Melvin Moguloff, OEO Regional Director in San Francisco, told a Howard University audience here: "We must support the following functions . . . educating clients to understand that they are a valuable resource to agencies—that if they do not choose to play the role of client, the producing system will collapse.

This is exactly the gambit used in the school boycotts. Schools, after all, need pupils."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEADSTART

What is happening in Washington points up an increasingly worrisome problem for educators and the general public. Dr. Hansen incurred the wrath of antipoverty workers when the D.C. school system was given responsibility for D.C. Head Start, a program to prepare impoverished children for entering elementary school. Funds were to come from the United Planning Organization, the local anti-poverty agency funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The D.C. school system would not be paid until UPO approved its final report.

Dr. Hansen objected to the arrangement and refused to sign such a contract. The superintendent also balked at accepting responsibility without authority. He told the D.C. Board of Education that UPO had saddled Head Start with conditions under which the school system could not run the program. Subsequently, it became clear that UPO merely was following orders from OEO, first circulated by word-of-mouth and then put in writing in an official memorandum, issued November 7, 1966.

Signed by Lawrence E. Williams, Acting Director of OEO's Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, it said that each agency delegated to run a Head Start program must have policy set by a committee composed 50% of the parents of the children enrolled; "the remaining half of the committee should be drawn from (a) parents and community members of previous policy advisory committees; (b) representatives of public and private associations and organizations; (c) interested members of the community-at-large." This policy committee, the memo explained, must approve the selection of a Head Start director and all of the non-professional staff.

WOULD VIOLATE LAWS

Dr. Hansen won several points in connection with Head Start. Along with school superintendents from nearby Montgomery, Prince Georges and Charles counties in Maryland, Arlington and Fairfax counties in Virginia and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia, he wrote to Sargent Shriver and complained that the unprecedented authority for the policy committee would violate laws which give school boards authority to hire and fire.

This move led Mr. Williams to write another memorandum in which he said that a school board should not be placed in the position of hiring a key executive in whom it or the committee does not have confidence. He said the choice must be made only after "an effective process of consultation between a school board and a committee." He failed to say what would happen in case of a deadlock between the board and the committee over the choice of a director.

Dr. Hansen also won the right to pay Head Start teachers salaries commensurate with, not higher than, those of other teachers. Even so, the D.C. school system was swamped with requests for Head Start appointments on a political basis. Foreseeing that Head Start could become a new political patronage base, Dr. Hansen lashed out publicly at "power grabbers and politicians" trying to use anti-poverty money for such a purpose.

MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION

The redoubtable superintendent also balked at placing the so-called Model School Division under the control of the policy committee set up to run Head Start. This was the name given to innovative educational processes tried at 24 D.C. schools, including new kinds of reading programs, tutoring services, extension of the school day, teaching on Saturdays, volunteer services of college and university students and a parent education project. All told, the Model School Division accounted for about 5% of the total costs of the 24 schools, and was paid for by UPO.

Dr. Hansen insisted that an investment of 5% should not give UPO control over 95% of the budget. Moreover, he argued that he could not ask Congress for money to run these schools unless the school system controlled their budgets.

Subsequently, an OEO educational consultant advised the UPO that it was a bad idea to split up the funding for the Division among many schools. On April 14, 1967, UPO not only took the hint, but went even farther; its board of trustees voted 10 to 8 against funding the Division at all. Instead, it voted to spend $242,000 previously contemplated for the Division for "education action teams" to organize D.C. residents to press for changes in the schools, i.e., more money for activities upon which the UPO had already embarked.

FARMER AND RUSK

On June 4, 1966, UPO sponsored jointly with the Washington Urban League a Community Action Assembly in this city, at which James Farmer, former director of the Congress of Racial Equality, was the keynote speaker. The League receives anti-poverty funds from UPO; its Associate Director is David Rusk, son of the Secretary of State. At an Urban League meeting in Philadelphia last summer, the young Mr. Rusk stated:

"How much do you have to show your 'black bourgeoise' board member before he decides that it's about time to shelve this old, comfortable image of the Urban League, which didn't picket, boycott, or organize strikes? . . . How much does the white businessman have to see before realizing that the Urban League should no longer be a moderating and reasonable influence?"

Among the 450 people who attended that jointly sponsored assembly were representatives of virtually all of Washington's many federally funded anti-poverty agencies. The assembly established the Committee for Community Action in Public Education (CCAPE), and named the aforementioned Melvin Moore as its chairman. Mr. Moore was then, and still is, Assistant Director of the Near Northeast Neighborhood Development Program, funded by UPO.

Embracing the aims of the anti-poverty worker, the CCAPE decided that the best means of achieving them would be to abolish the appointed D.C. Board of Education and elect another within six months. If that proved impossible, it would set up a shadow board to publicize the will of anti-poverty forces. When this proved more easily said than done, CCAPE decided to concentrate on getting rid of Superintendent Hansen.

A SLEEP-IN

Meantime, the UPO ruled that since Mr. Moore was employed in the anti-poverty program, he should not head CCAPE. He then stepped down to Vice Chairman, while the Reverend Channing E. Phillips, pastor of Lincoln Memorial Congregational Temple, took over as Chairman. Rev. Phillips gave up his job as Co-Chairman of the D.C. Coalition of Conscience, in which capacity he took part in a sleep-in at the Anacostia-Bolling military complex in Southeast Washington. Under Rev. Phillips, the Coalition of Conscience also sponsored a boycott of Washington merchants.

Rev. Phillips wound up getting anti-poverty funds after all, however. Besides his CCAPE post, he is Chairman of the Housing Development Corp., set up to house the impoverished. Last February, OEO gave HDC $294,294 for administrative expenses, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development promised an additional $100,000. HDC's proposal to OEO indicates it wants to make use of rent supplements to locate poor people in middle class housing. It adds: "Welfare recipients, persons with criminal records, alcoholics and men and women living together out of wedlock will be welcomed."

Despite his far-flung activities, Rev. Phillips has found time to lobby against Dr. Hansen at the Board of Education. Wearing his CCAPE hat, he went to the Board last November to contend that Dr. Hansen is "incapable of implementing and administering decisions of the Board which may be inconsistent with his own thinking." Other anti-poverty workers followed this up by picketing Dr. Hansen at his office on February 15 with signs saying: "Hansen must go."

DESTROY CONFIDENCE

Earlier, UPO's community action centers set out to destroy the parents' confidence in the schools. Melvin Moore led a group of parents in picketing Crummell School to protest its condition. A poster distributed last November by UPO's Urban League Neighborhood Development Center asked, "How concerned are the members of the Board of Education about the conditions of the schools your children attend? Are you aware of these facts?" Then it stated, "Perry School is condemned and might fall on your child any minute. Seaton School has a defective boiler that might blow up any minute."

Dr. Hansen ordered an immediate inspection of the Seaton School boilers, which revealed nothing wrong. He also called for a structural investigation of the Perry School; subsequently J. A. Blaser, Director of Buildings and Grounds, issued a report which concluded that the school is "structurally safe, sound and solid."

The Board of Education met on March 15 to vote on the reappointment of Dr. Hansen. It voted 5 to 4 to reappoint him for a three-year term when his contract expires May 15. His victory, however, was not clear-cut. Out of the five members who voted for him, the terms of three expire in June. It then will be up to federal judges either to reappoint them or name successors. Without a majority on the Board, Dr. Hansen could be helpless.

EXPLOSIVE ACTION

Nevertheless, the reaction to the vote was explosive. Julius Hobson immediately called for a school boycott on May 1. He is an employe of the Social Security Administration here and also heads the Washington office of ACT, a civil rights group. He has accused Dr. Hansen of having "consigned the poor and the black children of this community . . . to the economic and social junk heap."

Mr. Hobson has an interesting background. In the early 'Sixties, he was Chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Currently he has two court cases pending against the D.C. school system. In one he charged that appointment of the Board of Education by judges is unconstitutional. The D.C. Court of Appeals ruled against Mr. Hobson, who says he will appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. In the other, he asked the court to give control of the D.C. public schools to the U.S. Commissioner of Education until racial imbalance in the schools is changed. This case is pending.

The Washington Star recently quoted Mr. Hobson as follows: "You can't make Socialist promises within the Capitalist system. It won't work. I'm a Marxist Socialist, not a Communist, but I don't have any illusions that I can change the system, although I think I can improve it."

In March, Mr. Hobson announced that supporters of the boycott include Ralph D. Fertig, Executive Director of UPO's Southeast Neighborhood House; Patricia Saltonstall, paid Director of Volunteer Services for UPO; Mrs. Willie Hardy, former Director of UPO's University Neighborhood Council; CORE and SNCC.

VARIATION ON A THEME

What is happening here is only a variation on a theme which began to develop first in New York City with Mobilization for Youth, a federally funded group which served as inspiration and pilot project for the community action phase of the War on Poverty.

A December 1964 report of the New York (State) Senate Committee on Affairs of the City of New York found that MFY employees aided community organizations which conducted the school boycott of that year and even made MFY facilities and equipment available to them.

Rev. Milton A. Galamison was the leader of the school boycott then, as well as of those which have recurred in New York each year. A friend of Rev. Phillips of Washington, he shares his beliefs and aims regarding public schools. Like Rev. Phillips, Rev. Galamison is involved in the War on Poverty, as a member of New York City's Poverty Board, a policy-making group established by Mayor John V. Lindsay.

Preston Wilcox is another boycott leader in New York. During the student pull-out earlier this spring, he was in charge of the so-called Liberation Schools, set up to avoid running afoul of truancy laws. (Rev. Galamison was jailed in 1965 for doing so.) Recently, Lloyd K. Garrison, President of New York's Board of Education, announced that the program he was discussing with Harlem groups was based on proposals written by Mr. Wilcox.

BLACK POWER

The latter is Assistant Professor at the School of Social Work at Columbia University. The School has received $300,000 from OEO to train workers for Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) and an additional $93,000 to evaluate the effectiveness of the workers it has trained. A poster on the wall of his office at Columbia proclaims "black power." He says, "I just wish we had more Stokeley Carmichaels."

The aims of the boycotters, as he outlined them to Barron's, are essentially the same in New York as in Washington—control of the public schools. Asked if he thought parents were technically qualified to decide on school curricula and employment of teachers and principals, he replied that in a democracy, Negro parents should have the same opportunity to make mistakes as anybody else. He added that if given a choice between a Negro principal and a white one with much higher qualifications, he would choose the Negro without hesitation.

As noted, Mr. Wilcox is on the anti-poverty payroll. He is a paid consultant to OEO for the Upward Bound program, which is supposed to help impoverished high school students prepare for college. He also is a consultant to the Community Association of the East Harlem Triangle, Inc., (CAEHT), which receives federal anti-poverty funds. In addition he says he is "the author of two funded anti-poverty proposals, Massive Economic Neighborhood Development (MEND) and the United Block Association (UBA)." Both receive OEO money. So do the Manhattanville Community Centers, where volunteers conducted the "Liberation Schools." Moreover, school boycotters met in a UBA building.

A quick glance at others involved in the New York boycotts turns up one anti-poverty worker after another. Alice Kornagay, one of the leaders of the student strike at Public School 201, works for CAEHT. Babette Edwards, another boycott leader, is a paid worker for MEND. Helen Testamark, also a leader, is employed as a teacher aide under a program financed with Federal anti-poverty funds.

Asked if he is concerned about the role of anti-poverty workers in the boycotts, Mitchell Sviridoff, New York's Human Resources Administrator, replied, "The top leaders are not anti-poverty people." He added that many of those in the ranks of boycotters may be community organizers under the federal anti-poverty program.

Several New York public school officials are unable to emulate Mr. Sviridoff's cool or conceal their concern over the activities of anti-poverty workers. Says one official who has been intimately involved, "I am sure that the boycotts never would have occurred without the War on Poverty."

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM HAS WORKED WELL IN HAWAII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as we continue consideration of H.R. 1318, the bill to amend and extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very timely article which appeared in the May 11, 1967, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, and which gives a first-hand observation on how the food stamp program has operated in the State of Hawaii. I believe this report on the operation of the food stamp program in Hawaii will afford considerable insight into the manner in which the program is assisting eligible needy families in many other parts of the Nation.

The extension of the food stamp program is necessary to insure the continuance of what I consider to be the best program thus far instituted to provide needy, low-income families with a better balanced and more nutritious diet. However, the effectiveness of the program should not be impaired by the amendment requiring a 20-percent participation by the States in the purchase of bonus coupons. As I pointed out in the floor debate on May 15, 1967, the claim that the amendment intends to bring in the States as cost-sharing participants in the program is not altogether a valid one, and to require the States to pay an additional $40 million annually would surely kill the program in States that may not be able to provide the matching funds.

The Hawaii State Department of Social Services has done an outstanding job in making the food stamp program work effectively in our State, and in the words of Miss Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the department:

This isn't simply a welfare program. It's a program that helps these people help themselves.

In view of the vote this week on this important legislation, I urge my colleagues to read Barbara Milz's article which outlines the success of the food stamp program in the 50th State:

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM TURNS OUT QUITE A TASTY DISH

(By Barbara Milz)

Food stamps issued under a joint Federal-State program added more than $42,263 worth of food to the tables of low-income Hawaii families last month.

"I just wish we could tell everybody about this," said Christina Lam, food stamp coordinator for the State Department of Social Services.

"All our lower income families should be able to eat better, and through this program, we can help them do so."

When the food stamp started in Hawaii a year ago, only 300 families signed up. The rolls now list 1,911 families—7,412 individuals.

"This isn't simply a welfare program," Miss Lam said. "It's a program that helps these people help themselves."

Miss Lam explained that while many of the food stamp plan members are on welfare, some are not. "We even have student families, families where the couple is attending the University and getting by on very little income," she said.

"We couldn't aid them in any other way, but with this food stamp program, we're seeing well fed, healthy babies.

"Tomato puree is much cheaper than canned tomatoes. Mainland eggs are just as good as Island eggs, and they're much cheaper. And we're teaching our participants things like this."

"This is an educational program, too. We have an obligation to teach the people to make better use of food, to serve better meals with what they have."

Miss Lam named with obvious pride members of the advisory committee of nutritionists who work out low-cost menus and recipes for the food program participants.

Participating members in the program receive a new recipe or a shopping hint each month. "They complain if they don't," Miss Lam said.

"And this is the first time many of our people using the program have been in banks.

"The people who qualify for the program come in here to the Social Services Department and are certified for the program.

"They receive an authorization to purchase food coupons and an identity card.

"Then, the person goes to the bank once a month with his authorization, and buys the food coupons there. Only, he gets more coupons than he pays for."

Miss Lam pulled out a chart to explain. "Say for instance you are living alone and your net income is $100 a month. You would be paying about $20 for food items alone If you spend that $20 for food coupons, you'd get $26 worth of coupons."

Miss Lam pointed to another line in the chart. "Look at this one. If a five-member family has a net income of $275 a month, they can spend $84 for food stamps. For this amount they will receive food stamps worth $112. That's an increase of $28 they can spend for food."

"Mamas like this plan. Papa can't use the food stamps for beer."

Miss Lam switched back to banks and the food stamp plan.

"The First National Bank, all but in some places on the Big Island, is where our people go to buy their food stamps. The banks have been cooperating beautifully.

"For many of our people this is the first time they've ever been in a bank. It's one of those things we're doing that's educational.

"The banks get a tiny service fee for handling this, but we think it's important to get our people into banks, get them used to things other people are used to.

"When people first come into our program, some are disappointed because they think we are going to give them money.

"We don't. They have to make that first investment on their own. They have to use their own money to buy the stamps, but then they get so much more for their money that way."

April figures show that the 1,911 families in the program here spent $106,758 of their own money for food. For this they received $149,200 worth of groceries in the stores.

The Federal government will pay the

grocers for the stamps the stores accept instead of cash.

"It's so much better than the old surplus food program," Miss Lam said.

"Under that, the people got only what happened to be in surplus at the time. Our local people might not like too much beans, corn meal, that sort of thing. But that's what they got under the old program.

"And the butter we used to get," Miss Lam remembered, shuddering slightly. "It would come in by ship, and there wouldn't be room for it on the docks, and it would get all melting, and we'd have to scurry around trying to find a place to store it until we could get it to the people. This program is even so much better.

"But so many of the people remember the old program, and they may think the new program is like that. They need to be convinced that the program is good before they'll sign up.

"It's a long, slow process, getting all the eligible families told about the program. Please help us get them the word!"

Miss Lam also wanted people to be told that if they can't get to the department to sign up, it's possible a worker can visit them at home.

"We know it's difficult for some people to come in here," she said. "Ask those in rural areas to call us at 507-711, ext. 262, and we'll take the applications in the field.

"We'll also call at the homes of people who are too elderly to get around easily, or who otherwise just can't get to our office.

"On the Neighbor Islands, the low income families can get the same service by calling their Social Services office there."

Miss Lam is armed with comments from people who like the food stamp program.

"A telling statement from a mother of 10 children sums up the feeling: "I wish they had it when I was a child."

CHARLOTTE KANDA ADJUDGED WINNER IN LEGION ORATORICAL CONTEST

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Miss Charlotte Kanda, a junior at Hilo High School, has been chosen as one of the two district winners from the Island of Hawaii in the American Legion's 30th annual national high school oratorical contest.

The Legion, long recognized as one of our Nation's most patriotic organizations, cited Miss Kanda for her speech entitled "Our Constitution: Worth Having—Worth Defending," and I have found it to be one of the most mature and thoughtful speeches that I have had the opportunity to read.

A significant portion of her discussion on how she feels about the Constitution, and now this great historic document relates to our democratic society today, is found in this sentence where she says:

> "We" are the people who constitute this nation. The largest responsibility is placed in our hands—that of adhering to the principles of the Constitution and carrying them out to the fullest. It is our responsibility to give life to our American ideals and incorporate them in our everyday life.

This statement is an encouraging reminder that the young people of the United States should not be judged by the vociferous, maladjusted minority. Our country builds its future on young citizens like Charlotte Kanda, and I believe we can take heart from the responsible thinking that is reflected in her speech, that our future is in good hands.

It is with pleasure that I extend my congratulations to this outstanding young citizen of Hawaii, and in order that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read Miss Kanda's speech, I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of her award-winning speech, "Our Constitution: Worth Having—Worth Defending":

OUR CONSTITUTION: WORTH HAVING—WORTH DEFENDING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the text of a speech by Charlotte Kanda of Hilo High School, one of two Big Island district winners of the 30th annual National High School Oratorical Contest sponsored by the American Legion. The text of the speech by the other winner, Nelson Enriques of Kohala High School, will be published next Sunday.)

William Gladstone, the great English statesman, once referred to the Constitution of the United States as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at one time by the brain and purpose of man." There is no doubt today, that the Constitution is one of the most important documents in our history. It is considered as the supreme law of the land and establishes the framework of the United States government. The Constitution formed the rights and liberties of the American people and made the United States a nation shielded by democracy.

Certainly, it has been noted that there was never a group of men, more anxiously devoted to the purpose committed to them, than were the members of the Constitutional Convention. On May 14, 1787, fifty-five delegates of the confederation congress met for the "sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation". Those who attended the convention accomplished far more than they had intended to do. Instead of merely revising the Articles, they drew up a remarkable form of government, the United States Constitution. This new, strong government was not formed by military leaders, but by citizens acting for the good of their nation and submitting their work to their countrymen.

The Constitution was issued by representatives of the people and ratified in conventions called by them. The Constitution was devised to serve the interests of all the people and, because of this, the great principles involved have been in accordance with the beliefs and hopes of an expanding democracy.

Fifty-five men created the Constitution and We, Americans, live to execute it. Yes, the United States Constitution—Our Constitution—Worth Having—Worth Defending. What makes it so precious? Not only does it protect our basic freedoms but our individual rights as well. Man is considered to have rights that are inborn, and no government may deprive him of these rights. In this document everyone is guaranteed the freedoms of our democracy—freedom of speech, religion, the press, and the right of assembly. Even in our everyday social conversations we are guaranteed the freedom of speech in voicing our opinion. Freedom of speech is essential to people living under a free government and definite limits to the exercise of this right have been established. Freedom of the press has been a topic of controversy since the invention of printing. The printed word can be a great power. Books, magazines, and newspapers strongly influence many people. Publishers have tried to obtain and keep a great deal of their freedom to print what they like but the problems of restricting it to some degree still prevails. The government must respect these freedoms in all but extreme circumstances. The Constitution assures us of these basic freedoms and describes the fundamental liberties of the people.

Today, the Constitution's purposes have become wider than in 1789. The federal government tries to "establish justice" in ways never dreamed. The rights of the prosecuted person have been greatly improved in carrying out justice. When Americans today "provide for the common defense," they are defending not only their own American shores, but also those of their allies all over the world. The Constitution also protects us today, as a great industrial nation in "promoting the general welfare," for the federal government represents the vast majority of the people and must provide for the complex needs of the nation. Thus, it has grown to become a pattern of life for us; a heritage which has been handed down through the ages since the time of its birth.

How many people today just live their lives without any realization of the existence of the Constitution? How many people depend on others to defend it for them by fighting their battles for freedom and justice? Too many. When the phrase, "We the People," was printed on this important document, it meant You and Me. No man is an island and we have to stand united for "We" are the people who constitute this nation. The largest responsibility is placed in our hands—that of adhering to the principles of the Constitution and carrying them out to the fullest. It is our responsibility to give life to our American ideals and incorporate them in our everyday life. The late John Fitzgerald Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

The expressed feelings of our forefathers for a new form of government were defended for the good of mankind. There is no justified reason for a sudden standstill—we should go on defending the principles of democracy. In many of the current issues, the Constitution's role has become evident. We can't all be fighting soldiers in Vietnam and sacrifice our lives for our country, but we can do our part in substantiating these principles right here, at home. We can help by developing our patriotism in support of our fighting men in Vietnam rather than demonstrating and rioting in protest. The Civil Rights issue has plagued many parts of the United States in the last few years. Many demonstrations have been staged by Negroes and whites alike because of racial discrimination. But the Constitution in its Bill of Rights underlines the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence: that the purpose of government is to protect individual rights. We should, in protecting individual rights defend the rights of others also. The rights of an individual are not unlimited for a citizen's rights end where his abuse of them hurts other individuals or threatens public safety. We should bring the true meaning to our democratic principles by securing the foundations of the ideals insured in our Constitution.

William Pitt said in reference to the Constitution of the United States, "It will be the pattern for all future constitutions and the admiration of all future ages". The future admiration of the Constitution will depend largely on the people. The making of the great Constitution took years but it proved worthy of all it stands for and will continue to thrive in American cities and its people.

"We, the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The United States Constitution—Our Constitution—Forever Worth Having—Worth Defending.

THE TIME HAS COME TO APPROVE CONGRESSMAN PEPPER'S MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH ISRAEL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the holocaust of world war III may burst upon our country and the world if war develops in the Middle East. The only way such a danger can be avoided effectively is for the peace-loving countries to act decisively, and to act now.

The United States should immediately lay before the United Nations the situation in the Middle East and insist on the restoration of the United Nations peacekeeping force to the Israel-Egyptian border and decisive action on the part of the United States to prevent war. This is almost the last chance of the United Nations to retain the respect of the world as a peacekeeping body. If it fails in this crisis, the great cause of the United Nations will suffer immeasurable loss.

If the United Nations Security Council cannot, or will not, act, the United States should go into the Assembly and ask that body to act, where no veto is possible. If the Assembly cannot, or will not, act, then the United States, in the Assembly, should probably call for volunteers to support the peace principles of the United Nations Charter.

We should let the aggressors know the United States and the peace-loving nations will stand by the side of Israel and, if necessary, hurl back the attackers, if the "Little Hitler," Nasser, aided and encouraged by the Communists, should attack. Delay is dangerous.

The last two Great Wars could have been avoided if the United States and the peace-loving nations had acted in time, and acted courageously and firmly.

I regret that the United States has not, as I have repeatedly urged, entered into another defense pact with Israel. Then there would have been no doubt in the minds of the "Little Hitlers" as to where we stand.

Mr. Speaker, I have been proposing for some time that the United States enter into a mutual defense treaty with Israel. In all of the foreign aid bills, I have endeavored to have adopted amendments that would absolutely forbid any benefits under those bills to be offered to the United Arab Republic. My mutual defense treaty legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 353, is a very simple proposal and I have permission at this time to have this resolution reprinted in the RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 353

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States will join and assist any victim of aggression in the Middle East; and it is the sense of the Congress that, since the only aggression which is seriously threatened in the Middle East is Arab aggression against Israel, it would be in the interest of peace if the United States enters into a mutual defense treaty with Israel.

AND EVERYBODY SAID "AMEN"

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress enjoys seeing his constituents distinguish themselves in their chosen profession. When a man is responsible for significant contributions to his field of endeavor, it is fitting and proper that he should be recognized and his success acknowledged.

I was recently furnished a copy of the address by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., president, Sioux Empire College, Hawarden, Iowa, the principal speaker at the Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood banquet held at Skyhaven Cafe, Warrensburg, Mo., on Saturday, April 22, 1967, exactly 1 month ago. Warrensburg, Mo., is the home of Central Missouri State College where Dr. Wood served for so many years. It is most fitting that Dr. Warren Lovinger, president of that great college, appeared on the program to bring greetings from Central Missouri State College. Missouri's secretary of state, the Honorable James C. Kirkpatrick, served as toastmaster for the evening. It was with great regret I could not accept the invitation to be present to honor Dr. Wood. It was our privilege to submit a letter which was incorporated in a book of letters the R. F. Wood committee presented to the honoree at the banquet.

Dr. George Reuter, in an address entitled "And Everybody Said 'Amen'," pointed out that Dr. Wood as professor emeritus of history and political science, Central Missouri State College, had stood for certain fundamental principles which have served as guideposts not only at Central Missouri State College but have been a significant contribution to the progress of education throughout the country. As a great educational statesman, Dr. Wood has contributed extensively to the entire academic community of America.

The address of Dr. Reuter contains so many stimulating thoughts which come from the heart of one who remembers the honoree as his teacher that I decided these thoughts should be shared with my fellow Members and made a part of the permanent RECORD in tribute to such an outstanding American as Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood.

The following are the remarks of Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., entitled "And Everybody Said 'Amen'."

A charming bit of rhyme is attributed to Robert Burns. While the original meaning of the rhyme related to an entirely different situation, it is appropriate here. Burns wanted to provide his sister a suitable retort when her youthful swain derided her for her small stature. It is used in this illustration to indicate the size of mankind in relation to God's world, and the moral is that a gem is small but mighty. Burns wrote:

"Ask why God made the gem so small
And why so huge the granite?
Because God meant mankind should set
A higher value on it."

Mankind is indeed small in God's world but extremely important. We recognize that every nation needs her heroes. Every nation needs her men of courage and daring for the battlefield. Every nation needs her men of discretion and integrity to sit on the seats of the bar of justice. Every nation needs her men who are filled with deep religious faith and conviction, men who will stand for God, men whom God will use as the prophets and the teachers of that nation in the days ahead.

We recognize the greatness of our beloved country. America is one nation, one people. Yes, it is one blood! The welfare, progress, security and survival of each of us reside in the common good—the sharing of responsibilities as well as benefits by all our people. Democracy in America rests on the confidence that people can be trusted with freedom. Peace must be the first concern of all governments, as it is the prayer of all mankind. Our task is to make the national purpose serve the human purpose; that every person shall have the opportunity to become all that he or she is capable of becoming. The variety of our people is the source of our strength and ought not to be a cause of disunity or discord.

The American free enterprise system is one of the greatest achievements of the human mind and spirit. The roots of our economy and our life as a people lie deep in the soil of America's farm land. America's bountiful supply of natural resources has been one of the major factors in achieving our position of world leadership, in developing the greatest industrial machine in the world's history, and in providing a richer and more complete life for every American. Our future must rest upon a national consensus.

We should praise the Lord for the progress witnessed in our time. By almost any measure the 20th Century has been a time of dynamic technological and economic change. Since the turn of the century, we have witnessed a 200-fold increase in the speed at which man can travel. Over the same time span, such break-throughs as radio, television, and the communications satellite have revolutionized man's ability to communicate. Advances in such fields as medicine, psychology, and chemistry, to name a few, have been so striking as to defy the comprehension of the average layman. And the development of nuclear energy has placed at man's disposal a source of power which could result in either unlimited good or immeasurable mischief.

Science and technology are, in the United States today, a part of the fabric of life itself. We have, in the past twenty years, entered a new phase of the great American adventure. Throughout the world, technology, and the science which supports it, have provided new means of education, new sources of power, new ways of processing data, and fast, reliable transportation and communications. Man is extending his reach beyond this earth and into the vast reaches of space.

These developments have been accompanied by substantial advances in economic welfare. Since 1914, the average weekly earnings of our workers have increased from about $10 a week to almost $110 a week. At the same time, the leisure of America's workers has been enhanced by a 20 percent cut in the average work week.

It has been predicted that by 1975 some three-fourths of our labor force will be producing goods and services that have not yet been developed. Unless educators—and other public and private policy makers—demon-

strate unusually keen foresight, our future economic and technological achievements could be tarnished by a large and growing reserve of inadequately or inappropriately prepared workers.

Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood, Professor Emeritus of History and Political Science of Central Missouri State College, has been honored many times and in many ways. One example was the article "Professor Wood and Missouri," which appeared in 1958, and which reviews his life and many of his educational and governmental achievements. As a salute to the R. F. Wood Memorial Fund and Dinner at Warrensburg, Missouri, on April 22, 1967, and the Committee I chair and the members—as follows: Hon. James C. Kirkpatrick, Secretary of State of Missouri; Dr. Earl O. Harding, Executive Secretary, Missouri Baptist Convention; Dr. Perry G. McCandless, Professor of History and Political Science, C.M.S.C.; Dr. Homer Clevenger, Vice President and Academic Dean, Lindenwood College; Dr. Ann C. Pfau of Whitewater, Wisconsin; Mrs. Iris W. Sturgis of Warrensburg, Missouri; and U.S. Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri—I will attempt to review Dr. Wood's career and its influence on mankind as viewed as fundamental principles. It is to be hoped these principles will become common guideposts. These are:

1. There is dignity in hard work and virtue in achievement.

A little sod house sheltered the James M. and Laura Rader Wood family from the extremes of hot and cold weather of the Nebraska prairies and Professor Wood was the eldest child. Yes, Dr. Wood symbolizes many characteristic American traits, perhaps most obviously the driving force to pull himself up by his bootstraps. His career reflects the central issues of the times. Like other men of mark in history, he had much to overcome, because great men are not gods—they have been gripped by the same all-too-human passions, repressions and encumbrances which afflict every other mortal—but they have achieved greatness because they fought through to their goals. The New Testament phrase, "He that overcometh," is personified in Dr. Wood.

To say that Professor Wood's career was strewn with obstacles is to put him in the general class of achievers. Regardless, he became the well-rounded and high principled educator with a spacious outlook. He has been a learner because of his desire to increase his effectiveness as a reformer and to improve the quality of life itself. The sense of personal responsibility is great. He did not believe in waiting for things to take a turn for the better.. He has not advocated a policy of "go-it-alone," but he understands what it is to become one's own spokesman.

2. There is opportunity for zealous Americans of all ages and in all seasons.

John Adams found the meaning of America in the scope it gave for the opportunity to excel—which, he said, "next to self-preservation, is ever the great spring of human action." Let us encourage the "rising generation in America," as Professor Wood would classify them; the brightest, best-educated, most highly-motivated generation of young people we have had since the founding of the Republic—when the 32-year-old Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, Henry Knox built an artillery corps at 26, Alexander Hamilton joined the independence fight at 19, and Rutledge and Lynch signed the Declaration for South Carolina at 27. Thus, there must not be conflict on the road to success because of age.

3. There is rejoicing in the pioneer educational progress of our country, but the urgent need for further and greater governmental participation in public education at all levels is now.

On March 2, 1867, the Act to establish a Department of Education was signed into law by President Andrew Johnson, and Henry Barnard was appointed to serve as the first head. As prescribed by the bill, the first executive assumed office at an annual salary of $4,000, with a staff of three clerks under the aegis of the National Government. Barnard's administration, which lasted only 3 years, nevertheless set a high level of purpose and performance for the new Office of Education for the 100 years that have followed.

Dr. Wood realizes that the growth of public facilities and public services in America has not measured up to the needs of a steadily growing, increasingly urban population. Despite a stepped-up effort in recent years, there is still a sizable backlog of unmet needs. In a real sense, the pressure for expanded public facilities and public services stems from technological progress.

Not only does a substantial backlog of sorely-needed facilities exist, but population must be considered. The population, which totalled under 195 million in 1965, is expected to reach 230 million by 1975 and the proportion of the population crowding into urbanized area will continue to increase. And, finally, by 1975 the total output of the nation's economy, assuming continued high levels of employment, will be in the vicinity of $1,250 billion per year—as against $680 billion in 1965.

In the postwar period, there has been a tremendous upsurge in enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools. In contrast to the 25 million pupils who attended public schools in 1947, enrollments in 1965 reached 42 million. The estimate for 1975 is 48 million.

4. There is recognition of the need of large and small institutions of higher education that will provide quality education.

The economics of small scale education may be against us now; the idea that an educational experience is only acquisition of knowledge, a form of social and private capital to be received like an injection, the sheer weight of the numbers of people who must have more knowledge than they can gain in high schools has released forces that work against small colleges. Because of training and experience, Professor Wood knows that if the small colleges should fall before these pressures, it could only mean we no longer cared about the development of the total individual personality which must be held sacred.

5. There is need for academic freedom for the entire academic community.

Academic freedom is a modern term for an ancient idea. The struggle for freedom in teaching can be traced at least as far back as Socrates' eloquent defense of himself against corrupting youths of Athens.

Dr. Wood realizes that by ousting Dr. Clark Kerr as President of the University of California, Governor Reagan and the Board of Regents have taken a long step toward effecting what two years of disruption by Mario Savio and his fellow-wreckers of the New Left failed to accomplish—the undermining of one of the country's most distinguished institutions of higher education.

6. There is need for recognizing the shifting of status and population in our world.

There has been a steady movement of people off the farms and into the growing industrial and commercial areas. The growing numbers that first crowded into the cities have overflowed into the suburbs—into one suburb after another, stretching the urban area far beyond the boundaries of the central city and leading to the suburban sprawl. A major step in closing this gap has recently been taken. Thanks to the efforts of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, there now exists a solid blueprint—projected to 1975—of state and local public facility needs.

It might have been Professor Wood but it was Lewis Mumford who wrote: "What makes the city in fact one is the common interest in justice and the common aim, that of pursuing the good life." He drew in turn upon Aristotle, who wrote that the city "should be such as may enable the inhabitants to live at once temperately and liberally in the enjoyment of leisure." If we add the objective of rewarding and satisfying work, we have a goal worthy of the efforts and work of this entire generation of Americans.

7. There is need to encourage greater American leadership in the world community.

"One of the great phenomena of the human condition in the modern age," Walter Lippmann said recently, "is the dissolution of the ancestral order, the erosion of established authority . . . Because modern man in his search for truth has turned away from kings, priests, commissars and bureaucrats. He is left, for better or worse, with the professors." Yes, much of our idealism came from Professor Wood.

America today occupies a most unique position, one that has perhaps never before been conferred upon any other world power. On the one hand, America is the leading power, the world leader in a hundred different fields of human endeavor. In terms of national prosperity, in terms of individual productivity, in terms of international philanthropy and commitment, in terms of concrete contributions to the advancement of mankind the world over, we stand alone, unmatched, unrivaled by the achievements or the capabilities of any other nation.

But to that story there is a parallel. In our determination to protect the national interests of South Vietnam, we also stand virtually alone. A mere handful of the world's free nations has stepped forward with tangible and moral support. And what of the rest of the world? They have chosen to follow one of two courses: the politically safe course of neutrality or the easy course of outright opposition. This is to be regretted.

8. There is need to make government service more inviting.

Dr. Wood inspired many of us to devote a part of our lives in government service, and the United States Civil Service, like the old French Foreign Legion, is an excellent place to lose one's identity, but its other virtues are less easy to discover. In the vast Sahara of government service the worker is beset by deadly conformity, conflicting loyalties and sniping from unseen enemies.

9. There is need for maintaining a sane dialog in life.

People have cited this to illustrate the problems one encounters in cross-cultural adaptation and the unwillingness of even the most scientifically oriented people to rely on empirically established fact. To Professor Wood a sane dialog is possible if the person maintains an open mind and operates in a democratic fashion.

Dr. Wood has stood for the important principles of life that have relevance for our times. His social insights are remarkable. He recognizes that America's dedication to freedom and equality can not be taken for granted. I shall always treasure the memory of the years that he was my teacher. I feel I can say with Kipling:

"I have eaten your bread and your salt
I have drunk your water and wine
That death shall die once beside
The lives you lived have made mine."

Also, just before Adlai Stevenson died, he was in New York prior to embarking for Geneva and London. On his bedside table was found a printed page which he had marked. It was entitled Desiderata and was found in Old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, dated 1692.

I can think of nothing more appropriate for you of this generation, three centuries later, than this passage from Desiderata:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste and learn what peace there may be in silence . . . Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they too have their story . . .

If you compare yourself with others you may become vain and bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

"Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time. Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

"Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is as perennial as the grass. Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness. Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear to you no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

"Therefore be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be. And whatever your labor and aspirations in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world."

In his beloved *Walden*, Henry David Thoreau must have had Dr. Wood in mind when he wrote many years ago a statement which I treasure and which I hope is one you will recall throughout your lifetime:

"I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestionable ability of man to elevate his life by conscious endeavor. It is something to be able to paint a particular picture, or to carve a statue and so make a few objects beautiful, but it is far more glorious to carve and paint the very atmosphere and the medium through which we look, which morally we can do. To effect the quality of the day, that is the highest of arts."

I have always found it stimulating to turn my attention to Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood, a great educational statesman, and it is especially gratifying to do so now. He is a figure of heroic proportions in education, one who contributed notably in making American democracy a visible force. He is destined to cast a long shadow. "And Everybody Said 'Amen!'"

CONGRATULATIONS, DR. BROOKS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 18, I paid a courtesy visit to Dr. Philip C. Brooks, director of the Truman Library, located in my home city of Independence, Mo.

To my surprise, I learned Dr. Brooks was in the city of Washington to become the recipient of the distinguished service award from the General Services Administration.

Since then I have had the opportunity to review the program of the annual honor awards ceremony. I have observed that my good friend, Lawson B. Knott, Jr., administrator, during the program quite rightly concluded that the reputation of GSA as an efficient and responsible arm of the executive branch is due to the capability, energy, and effectiveness of its employees.

From scanning the program, I learned there were several different classifications of service awards ranging from that of distinguished service award to such titles as meritorious service, commendable service, outstanding ratings, and superior performance.

I was pleased to note that my distinguished constituent, Dr. Philip C. Brooks, who has served as director of the Truman Library since 1957, which is a beautiful facility and part of the National Archives and Records Service, was one of the three recipients of the highest award granted at the annual honor awards ceremony.

Among the achievements accomplished by Dr. Brooks since his appointment as first director of the Truman Library was to make all of the 5 million manuscript pages of the Truman papers available to researchers within 2 years of the opening of the library. Dr. Brooks then proceeded to collect the papers of associates of President Truman which has added over a hundred manuscript collections and more than 2 million documents to the library's collection.

It is gratifying to know that our library in Independence, Mo., has gained a national reputation as a scholarly institution because of the Library for National and International Affairs which was launched by Dr. Brooks as a part of the Truman Library's research activities. Furthermore, Dr. Brooks has been the moving force in the development of the Truman Library Museum.

From personal experience, I know it is a fact that this outstanding facility in itself is one of the area's foremost tourist attractions. As a fellow citizen of Independence I can speak from personal knowledge rather than hearsay that Dr. Brooks enjoys the most excellent relations with the press and local government. His relations with the entire community are exemplary.

The citation presented carried the wording:

Distinguished service as Director of the Harry S. Truman Library, Independence, Missouri, since June 1957 constitutes a notable contribution to the program of the National Archives and Records Service.

I am most pleased to add my own words of praise to say he has handled with great skill all of the unusual problems of a manuscript depository. Because of his friendly and cordial relations with students at the library and visitors to the museum, he has contributed immeasurably to the success of the Truman Library. Congratulations, Dr. Brooks.

ELIGIBILITY FOR NATURALIZATION

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the country was recently faced with the distressing circumstance of a petitioner for naturalization who was fully eligible for that exalted privilege except for the fact that although she had fully complied with all of the requirements for naturalization as the spouse of a U.S. citizen, her eligibility failed suddenly because of the death, in action, of her husband in the Armed Forces, shortly before the final hearing on her petition.

Under the existing law, this unfortunate result must follow because the spouse of a U.S. citizen who applies on that basis, with the accompanying exemptions from the usual requirements of law, must be a "spouse" right up until the final hearing on the petition when citizenship is conferred by the court. There is no provision for a person in the situation I have mentioned who becomes widowed just before the final hearing.

In my view, provision should be made to permit the naturalization of the surviving spouse of a U.S. citizen who dies during the period the citizen spouse is in an active duty status in the Armed Forces of the United States. In that direction, last Thursday I introduced H.R. 10135, a bill to amend the existing law. My bill would permit naturalization of such a person, male or female, upon compliance with the usual requirements of the naturalization law, except that the petitioner will be required to have resided in the United States for only 3 years after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence and to establish that he has lived in marital union with the deceased citizen spouse from the date of marriage until the date of death of the citizen spouse.

My bill specifically declares that no specified period of physical presence within the United States, or residence within the State in which the petition is filed, or specified period during which the citizen spouse was a citizen, or specified period of marital union with such citizen spouse, shall be required in respect to a petition for naturalization under the amendment provided by my bill.

I believe that there can be no question that the surviving spouse of a citizen who dies while on active duty in the Armed Forces should be given these exemptions in order to permit naturalization.

FORCES OF DISCORD AT WORK IN THE MIDDLE EAST TODAY

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the forces of discord are at work in the Middle East today. Arab regimes, for reasons of their domestic politics, are seeking to remedy their own internal instability by adventures abroad. Inevitably, the target for their agression becomes Israel. Mr. Speaker, Israel is a peace-loving country. It has never made war without serious provocation, and I say that in full awareness of the events of 1956. Israel will not make war now unless it has absolutely no alternative. But we can be sure that, if called upon, Israel will respond to force with force—and will fight vigorously.

According to the latest dispatches,

Premier Eshkol of Israel has offered to the Egyptian Government to withdraw Israeli forces from the Israel-Egypt frontier if President Nasser does the same. I note, Mr. Speaker, that Nasser's apparent objective in these troubled days is to move to the brink of war, not to withdraw from it. I am hopeful that the Eshkol offer is accepted, but I am not optimistic.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it essential at this juncture that the United States make use of its power and influence to restore the equalibrium in the Middle East. We Americans are both feared and respected in that area of the world. We have a fleet with Marines at the ready to be introduced into areas of aggression if needed. We must be prepared to back up our words with deeds. Our warnings will not go unheeded, by one side or the other. I call on the President to make known at once that we will not stand for an invasion of one country by another in the Middle East. Our publicly stated commitment in 1950 against tolerating aggression by any nation in the Middle East must be publicly reiterated.

We have a commitment in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker. With Britain and France, we are committed to preserve the integrity of Israel. I am confident that we will not ignore that commitment. But, more important, I regard it as essential that there be no misunderstanding of our intentions.

Innumerable wars have begun by miscalculation. I fear that the Arab governments will misunderstand our silence. We must not convey the impression that failure to renew our commitment publicly means we will be indifferent to it. Once the aggressors recognize that the United States is serious, they will see how important it is for them to desist from their hostile behavior.

Finally, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the American Government make overtures to the Government of the Soviet Union to cool off the situation in the Middle East if we have not already done so. We all know now that this has become a theater of the cold war, where the two blocs contend quietly for power and influence. But, Mr. Speaker, we have good reason to believe that the cold war has receded into history. This Government should notify the Soviet Government at once that it will use its good offices to reduce the chances of conflict in the Middle East if Moscow will do the same. While our eyes are fixed on a crisis on the opposite side of the globe, it is not inconceivable that world conflict could erupt inadvertently in the eastern Mediterranean. The Soviet Union should be made to understand that possibility, along with the horrors that might ensue.

Our Government, Mr. Speaker, is in a unique position to influence events in the direction of peace. I call upon the President to act before it is too late.

IN A DIVERSE DISTRICT, THE PEOPLE SPEAK CLEARLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this House should have "an immediate dependence on and an intimate sympathy with, the people," according to one of Virginia's famous sons, James Madison, in the Federalist Papers. He spoke of "the scheme of representation as a substitute for a meeting of the citizens in person."

I believe we all agree that the House of Representatives is closest to the people of all the parts of Federal Government. We, as Representatives, are here to listen to the voices of the people, to understand, and to do their bidding.

We talk to the people who come in person to Capitol Hill. Some of us are fortunate enough to be able to go home each night to our districts, and to go out from our homes in the evenings and on the weekends to meet with the people. I have been grateful for the opportunity to meet a different group of people almost every evening of the week in the Eighth District of Virginia.

But try as we may, it is impossible to talk with every citizen of a congressional district and to learn his views. For that reason, many of us use the tool of the legislative questionnaire as a listening device.

This spring, I sent almost 150,000 questionnaires to homes in the district which sent me here. Answers have been received from more than 12 percent of these homes.

Before giving you their answers, let me tell you about the people I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

They are more than 525,000 citizens who live in a district which jumps rivers and fills three peninsulas. They are as diverse as America.

They are Government workers and military officers who may be your neighbors in Fairfax County. They are oystermen in Kilmarnock, beach-property owners in Colonial Beach, horsemen in Warrenton, insurance men in Leesburg, merchants in Fredericksburg, munitions workers at Dahlgren, menhaden fishermen in Reedville, farmers in Wheatland, civilian workers at Quantico, housewives near Mount Vernon. Some of them work at the jet age gates of the United States, at Dulles International Airport. Some live in that most contemporary of towns, Reston. Some live at the foot of the Appalachians and some at the rim of the Chesapeake. Some live near our State capital in Hanover, Goochland, and Louisa Counties. Ours is water sports territory, cattle country, a center of tourism, hunt country. It is borderland, where Virginia meets Maryland and West Virginia. It is piedmont, and it is tidewater.

In the Washington suburbs, many of the people of the Eighth District are welcome newcomers. More than 25 percent of my constituents have moved to Virginia during the last decade.

One family in the Eighth District lives in a great house bought by their ancestors nine generations ago, when it was already 60 years old. Many other families received their questionnaires during their first weeks in new split levels where the yards were still bare and seeded.

Nearly 22 percent of the people in the Eighth District are Negroes.

More than half of the people in the Eighth District are no older than 34.

People in the Eighth District have grown up with a concern for philosophies of government. This was the part of America which produced George Washington, born at Wakefield in Westmoreland County. Men from our part of Virginia were signers of the Declaration of Independence. One Eighth District county is the only one ever to send to Washington a President of the United States and the Vice President who succeeded him, William Henry Harrison and John Tyler.

A Fredericksburg councilman helped to establish this Nation in foreign affairs. He was James Monroe, who held more high public offices than any American before or since, all beginning as an attorney in Fredericksburg.

Religion was an early factor in the life of our counties, and continues so. We belong to many churches and are overwhelmingly a religious people. The Baptists and Methodists are the greatest in numbers.

We have a history of commerce and seafaring. John Paul Jones first lived in America with his brother in Fredericksburg, and pioneer oceanographer Matthew Fontaine Maury was born nearby.

Our district knows about war and defense. The soil of these 20 counties has felt the feet of many soldiers, of more armies than have been concentrated on any other part of America. We have known invasion and occupation.

Guerrilla warfare is not new to us. Indian massacres created a no man's land of part of our area, until the tough tenacity of the frontier men carried out what today we would call "pacification" of the area.

Men of my district marched with General Braddock and young George Washington in the French and Indian War. British soldiers camped on our soil during the Revolution and Benedict Arnold led an army ashore in Charles City County.

I might add that the flag burners' defiance toward patriotism is nothing new to us, either. As a gesture of insult toward patriotism, Benedict Arnold's men stacked and burned the family portraits of the patriotic Harrison family at Berkeley. The 18th century Berkeley violence was at a plantation in Charles City County.

We have known insurrection. Bacon's Rebellion sprang from our area.

The Civil War, fought when America had far fewer people, killed more Americans than have been lost in any of our other wars. That bloody conflict spilled its occupying armies across our counties, and its history is recorded at Manassas and elsewhere in our district.

But though we know what the past contributed to making the America of 1967, we do not live in that past. For the people of the historic Eighth District are

young people. The median age of my constituents is 25.1 years. These are people who will spend their maturity in a new America.

Now that I have described the people of the district I would like to tell you what they are saying.

The people of the Eighth District answered enthusiastically when I asked for their opinions. The questionnaire was made concise for their convenience in answering and I hoped that many would find time to make additional comment, and they did. A tremendous number wrote me detailed letters of their feelings of their concern. One man took the time to write 16 handwritten pages of cogent opinion.

A lady in Alexandria wrote:

This is the first recollection I have of such contact by a Congressman of this district.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full results of the questionnaire in the RECORD at this point:

Legislative questionnaire, spring 1967, Representative William L. Scott, 8th District, Virginia

[Figures are percentages]

	Yes	No
Do you approve of the administration's policy on the war in Vietnam?	58	42
Do you favor the increase in income taxes proposed by the President?	15	85
Should Government spending be cut?	93	7
If so, in what areas should cuts be made:		
Defense	20	80
Foreign aid	88	12
Space exploration	53	47
Welfare programs	80	20
Poverty programs	80	20
Highways	17	83
Agriculture	42	58
Education	19	81
Aid to cities	63	37
Beautification	70	30
Do you favor the principle of turning over to the States a fixed percentage of the returns from the Federal income tax with no strings attached?	68	32
Do you favor automatic increases in social security benefits whenever the cost of living rises by 3 percent?	70	30
Do you favor a tax credit for some portion of college tuition payment?	73	27
Do you favor the President's recent draft proposals?	52	48
Do you favor Federal gun control laws?	55	45
Do you favor the proposed Salem Church Dam on the Rappahannock River?	83	17
Do you favor the proposed Washington Country Parkway?	64	36
Do you favor the Potomac River Basin development plan?	73	27

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, some of the areas where opinion seemed strongest.

The greatest intensity of feeling was on the subject of Government spending. The question: "Should Government spending be cut? The answers: Yes, 93 percent; No, 7 percent.

A Vienna lady said:

I feel the single most important thing for the Government to do is cut spending.

Where should the cuts come? In foreign aid, said 88 percent. In welfare and poverty programs, said 80 percent. In beautification, said 70 percent.

Where should cuts not be made? Not in defense, said 80 percent. Not in highways, said 83 percent. Not in education, said 81 percent of these voters.

The Eighth District is in the part of the Nation where the American system of education began. Nearly 20 percent of its present population is in the school system. And in this district where education is of such concern, the people are distressed at the difficulties some counties are experiencing because of the harsh guidelines being laid down by the U.S. Office of Education.

Seventy-three percent of the people answered "Yes" to the question, "Do you favor a tax credit for some portion of the college tuition payment?" I agree, Mr. Speaker, that we should give an added incentive and encouragement to parents to send their children to college.

In answer to the question, "Do you favor the proposed Salem Church Dam on the Rappahannock River?" an overwhelming 83 percent said, "Yes." I introduced a bill to authorize this dam and the results indicate it is the most wanted Federal project in the Eighth District. Such a dam has been long needed and is recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army, and I certainly urge that it be given early consideration by this House. The request of 83 percent of the people of a congressional district should not be ignored, Mr. Speaker.

I joined with other Members of this body in introducing a bill to turn over to the States a fixed percentage of the returns from the individual Federal income tax with no strings attached.

The people endorsed this plan by 68 percent in favor to 32 percent opposed when asked about it on our questionnaire, justifying the position of the sponsors.

Eighty-five percent answered "no" when asked, "Do you favor the increase in income taxes proposed by the President?"

They replied that cutting of expenses rather than increasing taxes is the only answer.

The matter of taxation and inflation drew a great deal of comment from these civic-minded citizens, willing to pay a fair share of taxes, but finding it increasingly difficult to pay greater amounts.

One lady wrote:

The middle-income workingman today is far worse off than either the wealthy or the low income man.

Her family's answer, she said, had been for her to leave her children and go back to work.

A mother has to work to help make an honest living for her children and feed and clothe them properly. But when a mother works, her children do not get the attention they need from her.

A lady wrote from Alexandria:

Any country that does not have a prosperous middle class does not have a prosperous country. I am afraid that the middle class is on its way out.

Another woman wrote:

We, the poor, do not need extra taxes. It is appalling how little we actually have for the many years of taxation.

Many of the people wrote of their difficulties in making ends meet, not in a complaining way Mr. Speaker, but in a search to find the answers to the inflation in which we find ourselves.

Opinion was, interestingly, rather evenly divided on the question "Do you approve of the administration's policy on the war in Vietnam?" The complexity of the issue obviously makes a simple yes or no answer difficult, but most of those who answered made additional comment. I received a full range of thought, from one woman's "Do more bombing in the North" to an Army lieutenant's discussion of his deep concern for the moral issues involved.

The majority of comments would agree with those of a lady in Vienna who wrote:

The administration's policy in Vietnam has never been made plain.

A professor of law who lives near McLean wrote:

We cannot afford a defeat in Vietnam. The great criticism of the administration's policy is that it has never been succinctly stated to the American people.

A man in Alexandria wrote:

The greatest weakness of Administration policy in Vietnam seems to be the failure to answer the arguments of distinguished, responsible critics.

Instead, the attitude seems to be, "If you don't agree with us 90 percent, you are unpatriotic. Imposing this attitude on the country would be worse than losing Vietnam."

This man discussed the pros and cons in his answer and concluded:

If this answer seems disorganized, it is such because of the condition of my thinking on this issue.

A Marine combat veteran of World War II with a son of draft age wrote:

Fight or get out. If we are going to fight, let's fight to win.

The comment from a man in Lancaster was:

I don't believe we should have become involved in the first place, but we are. I believe we are so deeply committed that we have no choice but to fight to win.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the people of my district and the entire country are tired of the so-called peace demonstrators, the flag burners, and those who tear up their draft cards.

They are overwhelmingly in favor of an all out offensive to win the war, without the use of nuclear weapons.

I think these comments from the people deserve to be heard in the House, and I thank the people of the Eighth District of Virginia for giving me the benefit of their views and the membership of the House for permitting me to share them with you.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my district have spoken out clearly. It is a diverse district and I believe representative of the feeling of the people of the entire country. As the body of government closest to the people, I hope this House will respond and truly represent their wishes.

GROWING DANGER IN THE NEAR EAST

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, like so many of our fellow Americans, I am gravely concerned over the growing danger of war in the Near East, as a consequence of Syria's terrorism, the expulsion of U.N. expeditionary forces, and the massing of Egyptian military might on Israel's frontier. Regretfully the United Nations acted overhastily in pulling out its forces.

In this crisis Israel turns to the United States and asks us to fulfill our longstanding commitments. Our country should take a strong position that we will stand for no aggression and will oppose the threats to Israel from Syria, Iraq, the UAR and other Arab States.

I have called on the President and the Secretary of State to be consistent in adhering to our pronounced policy so frequently expressed by Secretary Rusk that "aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed."

FLAGRANT MISUSE OF POVERTY PROGRAM FUNDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUNT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, from the very inception of the 90th Congress it became evident that the money-spending programs of the present administration needed considerable investigation. It has been said many times that our Government should be operated on a businesslike basis. Early in the session the Congress was asked to raise the national debt ceiling by billions of dollars and now we are told again that another request to raise it by billions of dollars was in the offing. A $25 billion deficit is now estimated.

It would appear to me that the waste of taxpayers' money has become alarming and that we do not pay enough attention to the many varied and overlapping projects. Permit me to call to your attention a flagrant misuse of poverty program funds.

The New Jersey Community Action Training Institute, under the direction of Mr. Barry A. Passett, operates under a $451,000 Federal grant for the purpose of training antipoverty workers.

It now appears that a 10-page brochure, which Mr. Passett contemplates distributing to all community action programs, neighborhood centers, and other antipoverty organizations in New Jersey, represents the only accomplishment of this organization.

The brochure urges a letterwriting campaign in favor of increased social security, the model cities program, Teacher Corps, Headstart and other programs put forward by the Johnson administration.

I am extremely disturbed to learn that Federal poverty funds are being used to prepare a brochure which represents nothing more than a political action program in favor of the Democratic administration.

I would like to know just how this brochure serves to train antipoverty workers in New Jersey which is the reason the institute was created and funded with Federal moneys.

This brochure represents a very crafty attempt to muster support for Democratic programs and I resent the use of poverty funds for this purpose.

Naturally I am very interested in knowing how my constitutents feel about legislation and in this regard I have just completed a districtwide poll on key issues such as Vietnam, the proposed 6-percent surtax, the Post Office Department, and other policy matters. Incidentally, this poll was conducted at no cost to the Government.

However, the use of Federal antipoverty money to organize letterwriting campaigns in favor of administration-sponsored programs is an outright sham and an insult to the integrity of every Member of the Congress.

Every Congressman welcomes letters from his constituents. These letters serve as sensitive guidelines on programs under consideration. However, from the amount of mail that I receive each day and the amount of mail received by my colleagues, I can see no evidence that the people need a federally sponsored training course on how to write to your Congressman.

I feel very strongly about the war on poverty and I believe that we should do all in our power to help those who have been less fortunate. However, I fail to see how this particular program is helping the poor to help themselves. I am convinced that the money used in the preparation of this brochure, for printing and mailing, could be put to much better use than that proposed by Mr. Passett.

It is my judgment that this brochure represents nothing more than a club placed in the hands of poverty officials to be used indiscriminately against every member of the New Jersey delegation.

If the purpose of the Office of Economic Opportunity is the establishment of Democratic political action committees at the State level, then I believe Mr. Shriver should have the courage to say so.

This is just another case in the growing list of examples of how Federal—and I might add taxpayers'—money is being misused in the fight on the war on poverty.

Mr. Passett's action in this particular case is reprehensible and I believe that he owes every member of the New Jersey delegation—Democrats and Republicans alike—an explanation. To say the least, it certainly represents a classic example of bad judgment.

Let the RECORD reflect that I have been, and continue to be, in favor of various segments of the poverty program including the establishment of neighborhood centers and Headstart.

But I strenuously object to the use of poverty funds for the creation of a private lobby for the Johnson administration. If this program is permitted to continue, it will set a precedent for poverty workers in the other 49 States to follow.

If one has any doubts that this is nothing more than a poorly disguised attempt by the Johnson administration to obtain grassroots support with Federal funds for the President's program, then one only need examine the publication in question.

I believe Mr. Passett owes the entire New Jersey delegation an explanation and I am demanding an investigation into the affairs of the training institute. I am also requesting some type of explanation from Mr. Shriver as to why the institute was permitted to proceed with this program.

Taxpayers are entitled to know how their money is being spent. They have been told that the various poverty community action committees are private institutions but let it be known that all poverty commissions and committees can only function by appropriation of the Federal tax dollar. In my humble estimation this places them well within the Federal purview and they are accountable to all citizens who carry the tax load in this Nation.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION SHOULD BE GIVEN IN BLOCK GRANTS TO STATE GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, extension of the present education legislation will continue the practice of the Federal Government giving money directly to local school boards after their individual programs have received Federal approval. No concept is more dear to the bureau-

cratic heart. No concept is more susceptible to waste, inefficiency and redtape. No concept is more insidious in its steady encroachment upon State, county, and local authority.

We can turn from this path in the education bill now before the House and approve a system by which Federal funds will be given in block grants to State governments, which in turn will decide where the money is to go. This is alien to the bureaucratic dream, but is less wasteful and more in the American tradition of State and local control over education.

However, money alone is not the answer, and a prime example is found right here in the District of Columbia. On April 19, 1967, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy, blasted Congress for its neglect of Washington public schools over the last 20 and "perhaps 100" years. The situation, he said, was "one of the great scandals of this country."

Has Congress been so stingy? For 1964-65 the District was first in per pupil expenditure of all cities in the United States between 500,000 and 1,000,000 population. For 1965–66, the District was second in per pupil expenditure for all cities over 500,000; the first was New York. In 1967, District of Columbia per pupil expenditures are $558; this is a 24-percent increase over the 1964 level of $452.

Comparing the District and my home State of Indiana, on per pupil expenditures, we find the following: 1963–64, the District, $511; Indiana, $450. 1965–66: the District, $606; Indiana, $540. Estimated for 1966: the District, $578; Indiana, $512. Estimated 1966–67: the District, $705; Indiana, $580.

Indiana not only does more with less money but depends more on its own resources to raise the necessary revenue. The average real property tax rate for Indiana is over 7 percent; rates of 9 and 11 percent are not uncommon for many areas. The District's rate is 2.9 percent.

In fiscal year 1966, Indiana paid $1.56 in Federal taxes for every dollar it received from the Federal Government. The District, in contrast, paid 53 cents in taxes for every Federal dollar. Only 10 other States paid less.

District total elementary and secondary enrollment for 1965–66 was seventh from the bottom in ranking all the States. However, for the same period, in amounts received from the Federal Government for education, the District was 23d from the bottom.

There is no question but that there is an active, aggressive plan in the Federal bureaucracy to take over, from the people, community, and State, more and more control of our schools. This intention was well set out in an editorial in the New Republic, of January 9, 1961, and copied in the Washington Post of January 22, 1961, both of these periodicals being strong advocates of more Federal control.

This article accurately describes the thinking of those who call for more Federal control of education. After condemning "myopic local school boards" and "self-seeking State legislators" the editorial states:

> Americans are still shackled by the Jeffersonian untruth that the best government governs least, and that central government is worst of all. . . . The tradition of the New England town meeting which still haunts the national imagination whenever "local control" is mentioned bears little resemblance to the conventions of local fatcats to whom we are actually entrusting our children's future.

There is no elected school board in the District of Columbia that would be responsive to the wishes of local taxpayers. No parent has any authority over what is going on. The Washington school system should be the ultimate in every educational bureaucrat's dream. But something seems to have gone wrong: the District of Columbia school system is about as free from local taxpayer pressure as a Federal-control advocate could wish, but the same voices that call for more Federal control constantly deplore the results of the system. The District receives the most money per pupil, yet all that we hear is that Washington has the worst schools in the United States.

The proposed amendment to the committee bill, which would take effect in fiscal year 1969, would insure three major things. No State would receive less than it received in fiscal year 1968; in fact, all but New York and the District of Columbia would receive more. Indiana's share would go from $41.7 million, to over $76 million. Cities would continue to receive equitable treatment. Private schools are guaranteed as much assistance as they now receive.

Major inequities of present legislation would be removed. Indiana presently receives $38 per pupil from the Federal Government. The District of Columbia, with the highest per capita personal income in the country, receives $184. The part of the administration bill covering educational aid to the disadvantaged gives New York eight times as much money as Indiana, yet New York has only three times as many poor children.

And, perhaps most important of all, under the amendment's system of block grants to the States, with a minimum of strings attached, the money would be put directly into the hands of those who are most closely acquainted with the problems of their own areas.

However, we cannot solve the problem of education by money alone. Schools must be made places of instruction and learning. Pupils are there to be taught and not shuffled around as pieces in a sociological jigsaw puzzle.

State, county, and local officials must be given the support and backing necessary so they will not be inclined to bow to noisy demands of pressure groups. Terror tactics and rampant hoodlumism must be stopped. The lessons of discipline and respect for law and order must be an integral part of the education process.

Adoption of the amendment is the first step away from more Federal authority and control. It is turning away from concepts leading to busing, changing school districts to attain racial balance, tampering with textbooks, Government control of educational materials, Federal standards for teachers, and ultimate destruction of the neighborhood school.

It is turning away from a trend that can lead to complete and total regimentation of the young. The next thing we would hear would be Federal uniforms, Federal preschool registration, Federal assignment to a course of study, all based on Federal needs. Federal schools, to compete with local schools, have already been proposed. Where does it stop, unless we vote to stop it here today? If the States wish to turn every last bit of their authority over to the Federal Government, then following the administration's plan will mean exactly that.

As a boy, I looked up to and respected my teachers as sources of wisdom, guidance, and authority, second only to my parents. A teacher must be free to teach and a student must be free to learn. Unless we reject the administration's plan and restore education to its true purpose, we will risk educational chaos.

FOREIGN DIPLOMATS BEWARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House I thought we had disposed of the administration plan for an international center and chancery enclave in adopting H.R. 6638 on April 10, 1967, without a single opposition vote. However, we apparently failed to reckon with and fully to realize the resourcefulness of the Texas gas and oil interests which appear now to be engaged in a bold move to reverse the action of the House on that occasion.

Now I have a letter on White House stationery signed by Stephen J. Pollack, the President's Adviser for National Capital Affairs, which states that:

> It is my understanding that hearings in the House will start in the near future.

The letter is dated May 17, 1967.

It is high time this House took time to unmask and uncover the behind-the-scenes forces which are hard at work in a bold maneuver to overturn the earlier House action. Apparently there are no limits to the willingness of this administration to accommodate its friends and financial contributors. The move to overturn last month's action by the House establishes an unfortunate and undesirable precedent, so that any time the House acts on a matter in a way which touches the pocketbook of one of its more potent backers it will send up a new bill specifically designed to go to a committee which it controls and where the action it seeks to benefit its friends and supporters can be obtained. The point is, are we going to stand idly by and accept this new order of things without protest or are we going to maintain the historic authority of the House? I do not think we should permit or be a party to proposals and actions deliberately designed to circumvent and overturn the decisions of the Congress.

The administration should tell us not

only who is back of this effort to reverse the April 10 vote on the chancery issue and the administration plan to provide subsidized locations for international organizations, hotels, office buildings, restaurants, shops, and an international drinking club, but who the developers and operators of this complex will be. We have not been told, and the citizens have been brushed off by the administration when they have tried to find out. The Washington Post of May 16 reported, under the title "NW Residents Assail Plan for Chanceries," that one property owner in an area sought by the White House and the State Department had: "insistently queried NCPC—National Capital Planning Commission—Director Charles H. Conrad on who had advised the State Department on the plan. Conrad brushed him off during the regular question period and in an exchange afterward."

Recently a second site has won administration backing, according to a number of reports. A brochure prepared by the well-known Washington architect with White House and State Department connections, Chloethiel Woodard Smith, calls for the use of the McLean Gardens housing project "to provide suitable sites for chanceries and the headquarters of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Development Bank."

The questionable advantages of this site include the probability that Congress can be bypassed entirely and, in fact, ignored completely for, again according to the brochure—

> The owner proposed to offer the tract to the U.S. Government in exchange for the note now being held by the Treasury for $19,400,000, secured in part by McLean Gardens. It is believed that this transaction could be executed without special authorizing legislation by the Congress.

This particular proposal was explored in some depth by the Sunday Star of May 14, in a major article which reported that the use of this middle-income housing project for such purposes would result in the unwarranted displacement of 2,000 or more persons and demolition of much needed middle-income housing.

It now appears that a well-known and highly paid Washington lobbyist, with White House and Texas gas and oil connections of long standing, is a leading sponsor of the McLean Gardens site and has obtained the blessing and approval of the President for its use, which would help settle an estate. Needless to say, there may be some reason to doubt that the settlement sought would benefit the American taxpayers any more than does the oil depletion allowance. This particular lobbyist is not only interested in settling this estate to the maximum advantage of its heirs, but is also interested in blocking even the consideration of other sites with superior advantage by the Organization of American States and a number of foreign governments, despite the fact that the savings to American taxpayers of other sites may be very great and the advantages of other sites from the point of view of our Government may be many. This viewpoint was advanced in a recent letter included in these remarks, which says in part:

> Recently, the 20½-acre Tregaron Estate entered the picture when its owner offered it to the OAS. We have learned that an all-out effort within the Administration is being made to prevent the OAS from locating on the Tregaron Estate. This all-out blocking action is spearheaded by the Texas oil lobbyist who presented the McLean Gardens proposal to President Johnson, who has teamed up with the State Department with the blessing of the President. The American taxpayers will lose if this blocking effort succeeds. OAS use of Tregaron would eliminate the need for the chancery enclave at Washington Circle, as would the use of the sites provided in H.R. 6638. The Tregaron Estate could be acquired for $3,500,000, while the acreage sought by President Johnson at Washington Circle would cost about $4,000,000 an acre. Washington Circle would cost 20 times as much per acre as Tregaron or the sites provided by H.R. 6638.

There are equally disturbing reports that this Presidential emissary, with the backing of his Texas gas and oil bosses, has laid the law down to the OAS in no uncertain terms that the only sites it will be permitted to consider for the location of its headquarters are the Sealtest Dairy industrial site and the McLean Gardens housing project site.

The record revealed to date underscores the fact that the administration has been less than frank with the American people about the real factors involved in its proposed International Center. While we have been given lists repeatedly of the foreign governments the State Department hopes will either relocate into, or be forced into, the proposed International Center enclave, we have not been given even a hint of the international organizations for which it is seeking sites and supporting facilities, or who the developers and operators are who will build, develop, and operate the subsidized hotels, office buildings, restaurants, shops, and the international drinking club. The administration, in fact, has been unusually coy about this aspect of its proposal, and its failure to mention a single builder or developer gives weight to the views of those who think there is something shady and underhanded about the project which will be to the disadvantage of the American taxpayers who will be called upon to foot the entire bill.

THE INTERNATIONAL DRINKING CLUB AND THE PARKING FACILITIES TO BE PROVIDED IN THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER ARE KING-SIZED

Upon examination of the plans for the international drinking club and the parking facilities which will be provided by President Johnson's plan for the International Center, which appears on page 55 of the $8,000,000,000 comprehensive plan for the Nation's Capital prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission, it becomes clear that both are to be mammoth and king-sized in their proportions. The House, in adopting H.R. 6638, took a dim view of both. It was completely unpersuaded as to the need for such facilities, and failed to subsidize them. All of us have experienced difficulty in finding public parking space back home as well as in Washington, especially during the peak hours when everyone else is looking for parking space at the same time. But, then, of course, no reasonable person expects every car in the city to be able to be in the same place at the same time either in our own country or overseas.

It is high time we asked ourselves again, as we did when we adopted H.R. 6638, where the subsidies will stop if we are to subsidize parking garages, and international drinking clubs, hotels, office buildings, restaurants, and shops which already are established in abundant supply in Washington without benefit of subsidies or other taxpayer aids.

IMPORTANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROVIDING SITES FOR THE OAS AND CHANCERY USE IGNORED BY THE WHITE HOUSE AND STATE DEPARTMENT

Among the questions which this Congress should be asking the State Department and the White House are why they have failed to act on these significant recommendations which appear on page 53 of the comprehensive plan, which would not cost the taxpayers a single dollar, and which would not displace families, jobs, businesses, or result in major tax losses:

> Current regulations governing the location of chanceries should be reexamined to seek a means of providing a choice of locations for those foreign governments desiring to establish new chanceries.
>
> The representational offices of foreign governments, together with smaller offices of international organizations, could be suitable occupants of the large town houses close to the central employment area which have become too expensive for residential use but which should be preserved to lend diversity to the development character of the central area.
>
> Limited portions of the area between Massachusetts and Florida Avenues west of 16th Street are likely candidates for such designation.

These are precisely the provisions included in H.R. 6638 in which the White House and the State Department are now engaged in an intricate and highly costly maneuver to circumvent entirely.

GHETTO ATMOSPHERE OF ENCLAVES

The Congress should also ask the White House and the State Department why they, themselves, have refused to heed the sound advice given to the Congress by Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke in August 1962, when he denounced embassy and chancery enclaves for their "ghetto atmosphere." The Evening Star of April 13, 1967, accurately described, in an editorial, the International Center sought by President Johnson as "tightly controlled."

At hearings in 1962 on amendments to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke condemned all diplomatic enclaves on the sound grounds that they would "tend to unnecessarily confine us all around the world." He added:

> In the majority of cases we are not so confined in the enclave, and I think that it is better for us to be out among, and mix with, the people than to have a ghetto atmosphere for American personnel confined to a diplomatic area. That does not fulfill the objectives of our foreign policy, and I hope that we would not get into this situation by enforcing it here in the District of Columbia.

The historic practice of foreign governments in locating their chanceries,

embassies, and personnel throughout the Nation's Capital will be forcibly ended if the Congress adopts the "tightly controlled" diplomatic enclave sought by President Johnson.

THE HIDDEN COSTS IN THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CENTER

The visual details of the proposed International Center sought by the President will be resplendent indeed, and are set forth on page 52 of the $8 billion comprehensive plan where we find this priceless nugget of information:

The blocks between M and N Streets from New Hampshire Avenue to Rock Creek Park would form the heart of the center. Here there would be a central core of development on a raised plaza. As the focus of the core, several office buildings would house special missions and international organizations and could serve for interim chancery use. In addition, an international club might be established as a center for diplomatic functions, with meeting and reception facilities. Beneath the central plaza, underground garages would furnish ample parking for personnel employed in the center and for visitors.

It would be safe to say that even if the central core of development were to be placed on a raised plaza 50 feet high it could not lift this get-rich-quick land development scheme above the morass of financial intrigue which is its major reason for being. The commercial parking to be provided more than equals the amount of chancery parking to be provided, and it is readily apparent from this, and many other aspects of the plan which are now becoming known, that it is primarily commercial in nature, and that the chanceries are included in the main to provide the sweetener and the come-on needed to try and persuade the Congress to adopt and fund this boondoggle.

The administration plainly is not seeking a consensus among the American voters and taxpayers regarding this International Center proposal, or levelling with them as to its costs, its deficiencies, or the merits, or lack of such, of the promoters and developers who will benefit from it immediately, the operators who are already lined up to manage it, or the political party whose coffers will ultimately benefit from it if the Congress enacts it into law.

It is up to the Congress to get definitive answers about who the shadowy characters are in the background with their fingers in this pie, and who the fast-buck boys are who are promoting this plan and stand to be enriched by it. The Congress should demand answers, and make it perfectly plain to the administration that it does not intend to be brushed off, put off, denied answers, or to buy this gold brick.

It is clear, in any event, that the trumpeted needs of the OAS are the key to this project, and that there is an underhanded and unworthy effort underway to deny the OAS any opportunity to locate where it would go if given a free choice of sites. The administration is exerting pressure, with the export aid of the Texas oil lobby, both overtly and covertly, to keep the OAS in line and to force it to accept either the industrial Sealtest Dairy site or the somewhat less expensive McLean Gardens site for its headquarters building.

The Congress should insist on knowing all there is to know about this project immediately. If we are provided all of the information, instead of just that part of the information which supports the administration view, we will find that there is no justification at all for further hearings, or further action by the House on behalf of this high handed, enormously expensive, and unprincipled plan which seeks to impose on foreign governments the ghetto atmosphere of a diplomatic enclave here which they have never imposed on us in their countries. A District of Columbia citizen-leader has suggested that the principal motive, or one of the principal motives, of the plan's proponents may be to obtain campaign funds. In view of the several weeks' efforts in the Senate to provide funds for partisan political purposes at the expense of the American taxpayers there would seem to be valid grounds for this point of view. This citizen-leader writes:

We have heard about pay-offs and hidden funds for the political party in power in the D. C. Stadium, the Rayburn House Office Building and the other structures which have been built in recent years and we understand these hidden funds are enormous. The Rayburn House Office Building was originally estimated at $60,000,000 and has actually cost so far over $125,000,000. It isn't completed yet.

The International Center was originally estimated by the Federal Government to cost $50,000,000 for land alone, but is sure to end up costing the American taxpayers $170,000,000 for land alone, and as much as $500,000,000 to complete. For instance, the plan calls for 10-acres of underground parking. The Washington Circle site is located on a solid rock base. It cost in excess of $40 a cubic yard to blast and remove the rock for the Washington Hilton Hotel site a few years ago, and the costs have risen sharply since then along with all other construction costs. The completed cost of the underground parking and the substructure will be in the range of $200 to $300 a square foot, according to knowledgeable leaders in the construction industry who are experts in these aspects of construction.

We ask your help in our fight to save homes and jobs and small businesses of citizens of the Nation's Capital, and to save the American taxpayers the hundreds of millions of dollars which are involved in this Administration boondoggle.

The National Capital Planning Commission is required to present its comprehensive plan to the citizens of the Nation's Capital, but it has signally failed to present the plan for the International Center to the 40 employers and the 5,000 employees in the Washington Circle area it would displace, or even notify them of the presentations it has made, and has significantly held some of its presentations at out-of-the-way places far removed from the Washington Circle area most affected by the International Center plan. Could it be because some of the facts about this bizarre matter are now coming to light?

I include the following letters as part of my remarks:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 17, 1967.

Mr. JOHN R. IMMER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. IMMER: President Johnson asked me to thank you for your letter of May 13, 1967 with respect to various locations for the proposed center for location of foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations.

Your letter reaffirms the position of the Federation in opposition to the proposed location north of Washington Circle and in addition expresses concern over a proposal that the location of the present McLean Gardens Housing project be considered as a possible site.

So far as the site of McLean Gardens is concerned, I know of no consideration of that site by the White House. The President in his message on the Nation's Capital recommended legislation which would specify an area north of Washington Circle to be available for chanceries and the offices of international organizations. Pursuant to this recommendation, the Department of State transmitted implementing legislation to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The proposed legislation has been introduced by Senator Fulbright (S. 1301) and Congressman Kenneth Gray (H.R. 7415). It is my understanding that hearings in the House will start in the near future. The position of the White House continues to be that stated by the President in his message.

I am transmitting your letter to the National Capital Planning Commission and the Department of State for their consideration since you present views concerning the International Center legislation which is a direct concern to those agencies.

Thank you for expressing your views on this important matter.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. POLLAK,
Advisor for National Capital Affairs.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
May 18, 1967.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: We are writing to you because you are a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and because you have spoken several times on the subject of sites in the Nation's Capital for chanceries of Foreign Governments, and a headquarters building for the Organization of American States (OAS).

Our Federation has long been interested in a just, sound, and reasonable solution to the problem of providing such sites in our crowded city with its very high land costs at a time when we are faced with a housing crisis long recognized by the Federal Government and President Johnson. We have supported H.R. 6638 which passed the House of Representatives April 10 without a single opposition vote. We also support the companion bills introduced in the Senate by Senator Peter H. Dominick (R-Colo.) and Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S. Car.). We oppose the Administration Plan set out in S. 1301 by Senator J. W. Fulbright, and H.R. 7415 by Representative Kenneth J. Gray, which would provide sites near Washington Circle and north of Pennsylvania Avenue for OAS and chancery use. This Administration Proposal, which President Johnson sent to the Congress recently, would displace 300 low- and moderate-income Negro and white families, cause the loss of 5,000 well-paid jobs, cause the displacement and ruination of forty small and medium-sized businesses, and cause the loss of many millions of dollars in taxes to the Federal and District of Columbia Governments—at the very time President Johnson has called for (a) 20,000 jobs in private employment to head off violence and prevent crime, and (b) an increase from $40 million to $60 million in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

We are enclosing herewith a copy of a let-

ter we wrote President Johnson on May 13 expressing our opposition to the Administration Plans for an International Center at Washington Circle to provide sites for the OAS and chanceries, as well as a copy of a letter we wrote the *Evening Star*. We also enclose a copy of the White House reply, and we call your attention in particular to the third paragraph which begins with this sentence: "So far as the site of McLean Gardens is concerned, I know of no consideration of that site by the White House." The McLean Gardens is a second site being studied by, and promoted by the Administration but for which no legislation has as yet been presented to the Congress. We have learned, to our amazement, that the McLean Gardens site was proposed to the White House and the OAS by a well-known Washington lobbyist with long-standing White House and Texas oil connections within the past week and that President Johnson personally gave it his blessing.

Frankly, we are disturbed that the White House, and the State Department, have apparently decided to ignore the Congress completely and are acting as though the House did not pass H.R. 6638 overwhelmingly on April 10. We are astounded that, despite this House action, the Administration is now pushing for hearings in the House and, as pointed out in the White House letter, a copy of which we attach, "that hearings in the House will start in the near future." Doesn't this set a precedent and a most unfortunate one, so that at any time in the future that President Johnson or the Democratic leadership in the Congress are dissatisfied for any reason with the action of the House on specific legislation they can simply send up a slightly revised measure and have it referred to a friendly or controlled committee where the results they want can be obtained?

Recently, the 20½-acre Tregaron Estate entered the picture when its owner offered it to the OAS. We have learned that an all-out effort within the Administration is being made to prevent the OAS from locating on the Tregaron Estate. This all-out blocking action is spearheaded by the Texas Oil lobbyist who presented the McLean Gardens proposal to President Johnson, who has teamed up with the State Department with the blessing of the President. The American taxpayers will lose if this blocking effort succeeds. OAS use of Tregaron would eliminate the need for the chancery enclave at Washington Circle, as would the use of the sites provided in H.R. 6638. The Tregaron Estate could be acquired for $3,500,000, while the acreage sought by President Johnson at Washington Circle would cost about $4,000,000 an acre. In other words, the land sought by the Administration at Washington Circle would cost 20 times as much per acre as Tregaron or the sites provided by H.R. 6638.

As a leading member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee you are morally bound to defend the American people from this astounding raid on the public purse. We request you to take immediate steps to bring before the Congress, and the nation at large, the full details of this amazing and unprincipled $500,000,000 boondoggle. The 43-acres of the Washington Circle site, costing $4,000,000 an acre, will cost a total of (approximately) $172,000,000 for land alone. When you add to this the cost of the present improvements, the relocation costs to move the 40 plus small businesses, and the construction cost of the proposed international hotels, office buildings, shops, restaurants, and the international drinking club—all described in detail by the National Capital Planning Commission in its new $8-billion dollar Comprehensive Plan for the District of Columbia one can see that there are enough hidden funds involved in this project to finance and keep the Democratic Party in power for the next twenty years.

Whether the final choice is the Washington Circle site, or the McLean Gardens site, the developers and the Texas oil lobby will benefit enormously, but the cost in taxes and in human terms will be enormous and prohibitively expensive. H.R. 6638 would provide vacant, undeveloped land at $5 to $7 a square foot for embassy and chancery purposes on the prime Henderson Castle and Shapiro tracts; the Tregaron acreage would cost about $4 a square foot. The Administration's lack of interest in these tracts can only be explained by the fact that they do not provide the kind of funds for partisan political purposes which are concealed within the Administration-favored plans for Washington Circle and McLean Gardens sites.

It is abundantly clear that the White House and the State Department have been less than frank with the American people, and that this land-grab and get-rich-quick development scheme is one thing on which President Johnson is not seeking a consensus. The State Department has told us which nations are expected to locate in the chancery enclave at Washington Circle, although there is a very real reason for doubting the accuracy of their lists. For one thing, the lists are obviously designed to support the State Department sought enclave at Washington Circle, and newspaper reports have given proof that many nations are actually interested in locating elsewhere than in the enclave.

We are sending you herewith a number of these newspaper articles for your information and use.

It is also known that the OAS is not interested in locating in the enclave. What the State Department and President Johnson have not been frank with us about, or with the Congress, is who the developers of choice are who will build and operate the international hotels, office buildings, restaurants, shops, and the international drinking club if the Administration Plan is adopted. Will it be Mr. McCloskey, Mr. McShain, the Rockefellers, or some other builder, perhaps someone with a Texas background?

We have heard about pay-offs and hidden funds for the political party in power in the D.C. Stadium, the Rayburn House Office Building and the other structures which have been built in recent years and we understand these hidden funds are enormous. The Rayburn House Office Building was originally estimated at $60,000,000 and has actually cost so far over $125,000,000. It isn't completed yet. The Kennedy Center was originally estimated to cost $50,000,000, but the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, who are responsible for the release of the funds appropriated by the Congress, have already approved contracts for $7,200,000 for steel alone, a figure which indicates a minimum construction cost of $70,000,000 to $100,000,000, and they haven't even started construction of this facility which was originally conceived by the Congress in 1958 as not costing the taxpayers a dime.

The International Center was originally estimated by the Federal Government to cost $50,000,000 for land alone, but is sure to end up costing the American taxpayers $170,000,000 for land alone, and as much as $500,000,000 to complete. For instance, the plan calls for 10-acres of undeground parking. The Washington Circle site is located on a solid rock base. It cost in excess of $40 a cubic yard to blast and remove the rock for the Washington Hilton Hotel site a few years ago, and the costs have risen sharply since then along with all other construction costs. The completed cost of the underground parking and the substructure will be in the range of $200 to $300 a square foot, according to knowledgeable leaders in the construction industry who are experts in these aspects of construction.

We ask your help in our fight to save homes and jobs and small businesses of citizens of the Nation's Capital, and to save the American taxpayers the hundreds of millions of dollars which are involved in this Administration boondoogle.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

May 13, 1967.

In Re International Center.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our Federation, and its member citizens association, has taken a constructive interest in providing suitable space for the OAS and chancery purposes. However, we do not believe that the proposed location north of Washington Circle is consistent with the best interests of the United States, or of the citizens of Washington because this location is (1) a commercial and industrial site; (2) is terribly expensive, and unnecessarily so; (3) would displace 300 low- and moderate-income families, 40 businesses, 3,000-plus jobs; and (4) further restrict the tax base at the very time you have asked for a larger Federal contribution, and the House District Committee is holding hearings on legislation to provide an enlarged Federal contribution.

Now, we learn with dismay, that the White House and the State Department have been seriously considering a plan, prepared by Chloethiel Woodard Smith & Associates, to utilize the McLean Gardens Housing Project site for the International Center. There are a number of things wrong with such use, they are: (1) it would displace 720 families in McLean Garden Apartment units and the occupants of 1,200 rooms, in the face of a housing crisis of long duration and major proportions widely recognized by the Federal and District Governments; (2) it is needlessly expensive; and (3) it ignores the large tracts of undeveloped, under-utilized land in the District, such as Tregaron's 20½-acres, the Wolman Tract, the Henderson Castle and Shapiro Tracts provided by the House-passed H.R. 6638 plus 25-acres of undeveloped land north of the Shapiro Tract suitable for OAS and chancery use. Again, the White House and the State Department seem determined to fight the House-passed H.R. 6638, and the Senate companion measures sponsored by Senators Dominick and Thurmond, and to do so at the expense of the District's citizens.

It is well-known that the OAS and a number of South American nations are deeply interested in the Tregaron Tract, and the Henderson Castle and Shapiro tracts, yet they are being denied their use, while the Sealtest and McLean Garden sites are being actively promoted by the White House and the State Department. At the same time, because of Federal and District Government public projects, such as highways, urban renewal, schools, etc., there is less housing and less people in the District today than when the Democrats took over the White House from President Eisenhower in 1961. Both the Washington Circle and McLean Garden sites are further proof of the utter disregard of the needs of our citizens on the part of the White House and the State Department.

Respectfully,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

May 15, 1967.

Re International Center.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are sending you photo-copies of articles which appeared in the *Sunday Star* and *Sunday Post* on May 14.

The *Washington Post* article reports: "A proposal to use the McLean Gardens tract in northwest Washington for the controversial proposed Chancery enclave has been presented to the State Department, a Department spokesman said yesterday."

The *Sunday Star* reported that: "An official of the National Capital Planning Commission said the agency also could be expected to oppose location of the center on the apartment tract on the basis that such use would result in, among other things, the unwarranted displacement of 2,000 or more persons and demolition of much-needed middle-income housing."

We wrote you May 13 protesting the use of McLean Gardens for OAS and chancery international organization purposes on the grounds that it would: (1) displace 720 families and the occupants of 1200 rooms, many of whom are students at our universities, in the face of a housing crisis of long duration and major proportions widely recognized by the Federal and District governments; (2) it is needlessly expensive; and (3) it ignores the large tracts of undeveloped, under-utilized land in such tracts as Tregaron, Wolman, Glover, the Henderson Castle, and Shapiro plus some 25-acres adjacent to the Shapiro acreage.

It is well-known that the OAS and a number of South American nations are deeply interested in the Tregaron tract, and the Henderson Castle, and the expanded Shapiro site of some 30-acres which is just across the ravine from the Shoreham and Sheraton-Park Hotels, the excellent restaurants on Connecticut Avenue, and the town houses and apartment houses adjacent thereto.

In view of the fact that there are reports that a well-known Washington lobbyist with White House and Texas connections has succeeded in presenting the plan to use the McLean Gardens proposal to the State Department, the White House, the OAS, and to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would it be asking too much to have you point out that the displacement of the families and single occupants at McLean Gardens is not consistent with your February 27 Message to Congress on the International Center?

Respectfully,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

May 15, 1967.

Mr. NEWBOLD NOYES,
Editor,
Star Letters Column,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I would appreciate the *Star* giving me space to correct the impression left by the editorial, "Why Not Tregaron" (May 6) which said: "John R. Immer, president of the Federation of Citizens Associations, says he has polled citizen groups that would be affected and has encountered no objection" to the use of Tregaron by the Soviet Union for embassy-chancery purposes. The point I wish to emphasize is that my statement was taken out of context, and that the Federation will probably oppose Russian use of Tregaron on the basis (1) that 20½-acres in land-short Washington is too much acreage to devote to a single government, and (2) the intensive use of Tregaron by the USSR for embassy-chancery purposes would destroy the park-like qualities of the site.

The editorial had the effect of advancing the purposes of the State Department to (a) keep the OAS out of Tregaron, (b) confine OAS to the definitely inferior industrial "Sealtest Dairy" site on Pennsylvania Avenue proposed by Senator Fulbright.

The *Star* was accurate when it reported (April 17) me as saying the move "to use large areas as chanceries appears to be the only way these sites will retain their park-like quality." The alternatives are high-rise apartments, or public housing. The *Star* was accurate, too, when it reported (May 14) that I had protested to President Johnson the plan to use McLean Gardens which would displace 720 families and the occupants of 1200 single rooms. The *Star* was not accurate when it claimed in its editorial, "Poor Substitute" (April 13) that the Henderson Castle site "requires no federal legislation to authorize a chancery use under existing zoning" when the fact is that, as the NCPC pointed out in a letter to the House District Committee, the tract is zoned R-5-B along much of Florida Avenue.

Our Federation supported H.R. 6638 adopted overwhelmingly, and without a single opposing vote, April 10. We would welcome the addition of the Tregaron site to this Bill in the Senate, and the addition of the 25-plus acres of undeveloped land adjacent to the Shapiro Tract—which would provide a site to balance the sites occupied by the Shoreham and Sheraton-Park Hotels, fine restaurants, shops, apartments and town houses a block to the West.

We oppose the legislation to locate the chancery enclave and the OAS at Washington Circle, because it will displace people, jobs (some 5,000), small businesses, many of which will fail, and drastically reduce the tax base when the President and the House District Committee are working for a larger Federal contribution to the District. We agree with Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke in opposing enclaves here and abroad because of their "ghetto atmosphere".

Sincerely,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

May 18, 1967.

Mr. CHARLES H. CONRAD,
Executive Director,
National Capital Planning Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONRAD: We are deeply disturbed over the presentation of the International Center plan to a handful of people at the National Gallery of Art on May 15, and the obvious failure to notify the businessmen and the employees of the affected area. This failure is totally unjusified in a matter of such vital significance to thousands of District citizens in the affected area.

We request that you make arrangements immediately to present this plan in the detail you gave it at the National Gallery, and that you do so at the Francis Junior High School in the affected area. This would be a very important place to present it, in view of the fact that the Francis Junior High School is one of the buildings which will be razed if the plan is adopted.

We think there has been a conscious effort by the NCPC not to present the International Center plan to the total community, and that the presentation at the National Gallery was deliberately made in order not to present it to the businessmen and employees of the area north of Washington Circle who would be displaced if the plan is adopted.

Since the NCPC has presented the plan to the Lincoln Civic Association, and some of the other citizen groups in the area, we think it is high time that it presented the plan to the businessmen and employees of the area at a time they can attend. We think this would best be done during an afternoon, from 1 to 5 PM, and we request that the NCPC make such a presentation, and that maximum notice be given to all of the employers, businessmen, property owners, and employees in the affected area at the earliest possible moment, but, in any event, within two weeks from today, and the plan presented to them before the end of May.

We fully support the attached request from the Joint Committee of Citizen Associations, Businessmen, and Property Owners for the Best Location of the International Center, for a full presentation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION—COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATNAM. Mr. Speaker, today I have the high honor and privilege of introducing a bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion, the world's largest veterans organization with over 2.5 million members in over 16,500 posts in the United States and some foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, soon we will observe Memorial Day in appropriate ceremonies throughout the Nation in memory of those who made the supreme sacrifice that we might forever have the blessings of liberty and freedom. Fifty years have gone by since the American Doughboy first set foot upon the shores of war-torn France, and 23 years have elapsed since the largest and most powerful invasion force ever assembled was required to return once again on D-day, June 6, 1944, to combat the most ruthless aggressor the world had known until that time. Too soon thereafter, Fascism was replaced by the Communist enemy which led to fighting in Korea and now the present conflict in Vietnam. American youth fighting in Vietnam today are the grandsons of men who knew Chateau Thierry, and the sons of men who fought the forces of evil in virtually every corner of the world during World War II.

We can all be grateful that there were men who, in March 1919, had the foresight and strength to establish and build a strong American Legion dedicated to the service of God and country. The American Legion continues to serve our country today, as it has during its entire 50 year history, in peace and in war. The American Legion is a frankly patriotic organization. It is also the conscience of America marking the path from our great historic beginning through periods of conflict and danger, always looking toward the goal of a strong and free America. The Legion certainly deserves the cooperation of the Congress in authorizing the issuance of commemorative medals.

The preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion is as follows:

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION

For God and Country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America;

To maintain law and order;

To foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism;

To preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars;

To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, state and nation;

To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses;

To make right the master of might;

To promote peace and good-will on earth;

To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy;

To consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

A copy of the bill introduced today is as follows:

A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding in 1919 of the American Legion, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the American Legion not more than one million medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the American Legion subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the American Legion in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1969. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such costs.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such various metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the American Legion.

WE SHOULD STATE PRECISELY OUR NATION'S CONTINUED SUPPORT OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, U Thant leaves tonight for Cairo; our prayers for success go with him, and I wish to say nothing today that would make his mission more difficult.

I do believe, however, that American political leaders should reaffirm in most precise language our Nation's continued support of Israel and our absolute determination that she will prevail as a nation.

Prime Minister Eshkol has suggested the mutual act of reducing troop concentrations at the Gaza Strip by both Israel and the United Arab Republic.

This would seem prudent.

No human being is wise enough today accurately to appraise all of the factors which brought us to our present position in South Vietnam.

But it might be fair to assert that a factor in the current problem was our own failure to make clear at an early time our sense of emotional commitment to South Vietnam's territorial integrity.

I would not like this error to be repeated.

I am hopeful that it will not be.

But I feel that I do not wish again to bear the burden of silence when momentous decisions are being made in the field of foreign policy.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday was the 153d anniversary of Norwegian Independence Day, May 17, 1814. On that eventful day a constituent assembly—composed of 112 delegates representing the Government, farmers, and businessmen—convened and wrote the Norwegian Constitution. The meeting was at Eidsvoll, some 35 miles from the present capital of Oslo.

On that day the Norwegians declared their independence from Sweden. They served notice that Norway would establish its own Government—its own democracy, constituted in the shadow of American independence. In drafting the Norwegian Fundamental Law, delegates to the assembly were influenced by British political traditions, ideas of the French Revolution, principles of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, and the provisions of other European constitutions.

This Constitution has served and guided the people of Norway through decades of free, responsible government. It has inspired decades of progress and growth.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Norway have made an outstanding contribution to human understanding, the freedom of all peoples, individual dignity, and international peace.

Indeed, these characteristics of the Norwegian people have had considerable influence on this Nation, and particularly on the upper midwest States of Minnesota, Montana, and the Dakotas. Thousands of the sturdy, determined, and courageous immigrants who came to this Nation over the past century helped to carve out our own Sixth Congressional District.

These men and women broke through the American frontier to build settlements, pushing west the borders of the American Nation. In Minnesota they found a land very much like their homeland: tall pines, rugged terrain, sparkling lakes and rivers, and a temperate climate.

The lands that these people helped to tame are now feeding half the world, and producing vital iron, nickel, coal, and timber resources.

Norway has also been a leader among nations in seeking world peace by working through the United Nations. Trygve Lie, former Secretary General of the United Nations, worked tirelessly to make the U.N. an effective force for international peace.

Mr. Speaker, Norway has good reason to look back upon her 153 years of independence with pride and satisfaction for her role in the development of nations. Her contribution to our people and society has been great indeed.

WALTER REUTHER ON THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the 1967 Economic Report of the President, which were held last February, Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president, International Union, UAW, appeared before the committee, and in response to my question asking for his opinion of the Human Investment Act he expressed interest in the proposal. I subsequently wrote to him on the subject and supplied him with a substantial amount of material on this plan to grant a 10-percent Federal income tax credit toward the costs of training employees and prospective employees for available job openings demanding additional skills.

Mr. Reuther's letter to me discussing the questions which the plan had raised in his mind and my response on the points which appear to be of major concern to him are inserted below:

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA–UAW,

Detroit, Mich., March 30, 1967.

Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RUMSFELD: Thank you for your recent letter and the material on the Human Investment Act enclosed with it.

An examination of that material indicates that the essential purpose and effect of the Human Investment Act are entirely different from those of the British Industrial Training Act of 1964 and from that of the UAW proposal made to the President's Automation Commission with regard to use of the investment tax credit to protect workers against the impact of technological change. The fact that all three measures depend on the use of the tax system seems to me irrelevant.

The real question is whether the Human Investment Act is designed to train workers who most need training, and to train them in ways which will benefit both them and the economy as a whole.

I do not believe the Human Investment Act meets this test. It seems to me it would provide a tax credit for employers for doing what most of them are already doing without it: providing training to the most likely workers in order to obtain specific, limited skills which the employer currently finds in short supply.

The Human Investment Act serves primarily the interests of employers, not the needs of workers. Except for apprentice training, there would appear to be no standards for judging the quality and scope of employer training programs. Each employer would be in full charge of his own program, and would be free to select the cream of the crop of potential training candidates—those already best prepared—while rejecting those who stand most in need of training.

In the absence of government standards,

the individual employer will normally be exclusively interested in limited training for specific skills immediately needed in his own operations, and will have no inclination or incentive to invest in the kinds of broad and general training which would enable workers to adapt themselves readily to the changing job and skill requirements of the economy. The Human Investment Act does nothing to encourage the latter course.

The Act is clearly viewed by its sponsors as an eventual substitute for present government training programs which *do* attempt to a degree to meet the job-training needs of the more disadvantaged workers. One sponsor told the House that if the Act became law the federal government could greatly reduce what he called "its questionable efforts in the area of actual job training". The intent is not only to pay employers out of federal revenues to do what they are already doing, but also to set the stage for a dismantling of federal training programs which are now doing what the Human Investment Act will not do and what most private employers are not particularly interested in doing: training the most disadvantaged of the unemployed or working poor. It is true that the bill's sponsors claim that the Act will help the disadvantaged, the theory being that jobs will be opened at the bottom of the employment "ladder" as workers already on the ladder train for and move up to higher-skilled employment. The theory is excellent, but in practice there is nothing in the Act to assure such a happy outcome—and nothing to help the disadvantaged while they wait, patiently and indefinitely, for "something to turn up". Such a conception has nothing to do with a sound and compassionate manpower policy. What might well turn up, given the rapid pace of advances in technology and productivity, is that the jobs that were supposed to open up at the bottom of the ladder would instead be automated out of existence.

The effect of the Human Investment Act would be to reduce, rather than augment, what is now a far from adequate federal training effort. Its effect would be particularly iniquitous if, as was suggested by one of its sponsors in the House, it were to replace efforts under the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Centers, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which are wholly directed at the disadvantaged. The American training effort should be greatly expanded, not reduced. Sweden has been training or retraining one percent of its adult labor force every year, and is expanding its program to accommodate two percent. Our adult training program under the MDTA—both institutional and on-the-job—had only 273,000 trainees in fiscal 1966 and will have only an estimated 250,000 in 1967, out of a work force of over 75 million.

Some of the sponsors in their remarks on the Act alluded to the need to enlist cooperation from labor if the Act were to be successfully administered. This is a truism; yet the Act, as drafted, provides no role for labor (except insofar as labor is already involved in apprentice training) in the development and administration of training programs. In contrast, labor and employers are equally represented on the industrial training boards that administer the British program.

These fundamental flaws in the Human Investment Act reflect a failure to understand the requirements of a modern manpower policy. There can be no question of *either* private employers *or* government having training responsibilities. Both have such responsibilities. Nor are the virtues and advantages of private-on-the-job training at issue. Employers, as we have indicated, see these virtues and advantages immediately when there is a skill shortage, so there is no point in giving them a prize out of the public purse for doing what comes naturally.

The point missed by the Act is that we live and work—or search for work—in a national economy and a national labor market, in which no one employer or group of employers can command an overview of the rapidly shifting job and skill requirements. Even the federal government at present lacks the full means to see this economy and market whole and to react quickly and effectively to its rapidly changing needs and possibilities. Yet the federal government is better equipped to do it than the private sector, and therefore cannot abdicate to private employers the responsibilities of administering national manpower programs, of which training programs form an integral part. On-the-job training is obviously important; its importance is increasingly recognized in MDTA programs. Yet government must set standards to assure that on-the-job training serves rather than works at cross-purposes to the general needs of the labor market. The government has a responsibility, as well, for creating employment opportunities for those who are most at a disadvantage in the labor market. And it has an interest in assuring that all workers receive not only training in specific job-related skills but also the more basic, general training that will make them resourceful and adaptable in a rapidly evolving economy.

A bill drafted to meet the needs of workers would have to take such matters into account. Like the British program, instead of paying employers to do what employers do naturally when the shoe pinches, a sound bill would penalize employers who fail to do what is in the public interest because at the moment they are not feeling the pinch.

I hope this letter makes clear the UAW's position with respect to the Human Investment Act. And inasmuch as Senator Prouty used my name in the *Congressional Record* (Feb. 2, 1967) in reference to the Human Investment Act in a way that may suggest to some that the provisions of the Act accord in some way with my thinking, I would appreciate your inserting this clarifying letter in the *Record*. I am sending a copy of it to Secretary of Labor Wirtz for his information.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1967.

Mr. WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, International Union, UAW,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. REUTHER: I have received your letter on the Human Investment Act and appreciate the comprehensive discussion of the questions which the proposal has raised in your mind. In return, I would like to comment on the points which appear to be of major concern to you, as follows:

1. *The Act would not result in training for those who need it most.* It is true that the legislation is not designed specifically and exclusively for the hard-core unemployed worker, and for good reason. It does little good to train the least skilled workers for higher-skill jobs unless those jobs are open. By encouraging the training of workers all along the line, there is a continual process of upgrading the labor force in a sound and practical way.

The alternative is to train unskilled persons for nonexistent vacancies, making unemployed janitors into unemployed welders; or to leapfrog the hard-core unemployed over those already working, who in fairness deserve the first opportunity to acquire the skills needed to move up to a better job.

You admit this "skill ladder" theory is excellent, but claim there is nothing in practice to assure such a happy outcome. However, to my knowledge, you do not propose any solution to this purported uncertainty which many would suggest is more fictitious than real.

Obviously, much remains to be done to equip today's hard-core unemployed to be productive members of society. Also, the basic responsibility for meeting their employability needs lies with the public and private educational system. But once educated to the point of being able to profit from job training, the hardcore unemployed will have to begin at the bottom of the skill ladder and work their way up—as others did before them—a process the Human Investment Act would seek to accelerate.

2. *The Act would assist the employers in providing "quickie" training, which would do little to equip the worker with the skills needed by a changing economy.* One of the major virtues of the Human Investment Act approach is that it would encourage training of workers for jobs that are open and for which the economy has an immediate need. It is hard to see how workers would prefer to be trained according to some theoretical plan unless there is some assurance that the additional skills would have an immediate market value.

The important point to the worker-trainee is not whether he qualifies for a hypothetical diploma, but whether he qualifies for a job with higher pay, more security, and enhanced responsibility.

The important point to the employer-trainer is not whether he is serving the economy in general, but whether his investment in a trainee will produce a qualified man for a job that needs filling.

In the last analysis, the fact that the employer is paying for much of the training costs, even allowing for the Human Investment credit, entitles him to train workers to fill jobs that need workers. It is suggested that training workers in any other way raises serious questions of economics as well as good sense.

3. *Individual employers cannot be expected to know what the economy's skill needs are or are likely to be.* This contention raises the question of who knows best what skills are needed in the economy, private employers or government officials.

The philosophy of the Act is that those who know best are those who sign the checks and take the risk of profit and loss. The sponsors of the Act are satisfied that this choice meets the test of experience and common sense.

4. *The Act provides no role for labor in the development and administration of training programs (other than apprenticeship programs).* Actually, the Act provides for a tax credit to a taxpayer who has contributed to an organized job training program conducted by a "joint labor-management apprenticeship committee, or any other similar nonprofit association, group, trust fund, foundation, or institution." (Paragraph 52 (a)(8)). This language was recommended by certain union representatives and is expressly designed to cover training jointly or wholly developed and administered by a union when paid for in whole or part by a taxpayer.

While under paragraphs 2–7 of section 52(a) there is no requirement of union participation in the development and administration of training programs, there is no language precluding it. Certainly it would seem to make good sense for an employer to consult with labor representatives in the course of designing and administering training programs, but it was not felt wise, in view of the essential management responsibility for paying the costs of training and in view of widely varying local conditions across the Nation, to require the participation or approval of labor organizations for every kind of training covered by the Act. Presumably such participation, in a unionized plant, could be a subject for discussion in the course of negotiating a union contract.

Paragraph 52(a)(1). dealing with regis-

tered apprenticeship programs, would of course directly involve union participation and approval, as in these programs the union must agree with the training standards and qualifications. One advantage of the Act, it is felt, is that it would strongly encourage the upgrading of presently low-quality training into registered apprenticeship programs, complying with nationally prescribed quality standards.

5. *The Human Investment Act is essentially different from the proposals of the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress and the British Industrial Training Act.* You point out that although there is an obvious similarity among these measures, inasmuch as each involves the use of the tax system to promote job training and retraining, the purpose and effect of the Act make it entirely different.

The proposal advanced for consideration by the National Commission suggested that part of the 7% investment tax credit for equipment and machinery be diverted into a special fund. This fund would then finance the retraining of workers displaced by automation, and provide them with supplemental unemployment benefits, relocation payments, and other aid.

The Human Investment Act, particularly paragraph 52(a)(8), would differ from this proposal only in these ways:

1. It would divert into a joint fund not part of the 7% investment tax credit, but a separate 10% tax credit.

2. It would permit a credit only for organized job training conducted by such a fund, and not for relocation, supplemental benefits, etc.

3. It would be far broader in scope than the Commission proposal with respect to training conducted unilaterally by taxpayers not participating in such a fund.

The British Industrial Training Act of 1964 permits industry-wide labor-management-public boards to assess the training needs of the industry and to levy a payroll tax on employers. Firms conducting training programs certified by the board as meeting the industry's needs are reimbursed from these proceeds. Thus, as you point out, the firms that train are paid for their efforts and those that do not are penalized by having to pay for training conducted by others.

Adaptation of the BITA to the United States would pose severe constitutional problems, inasmuch as entities other than Congress would have the power to levy taxes. In addition, there is wide agreement that little additional burden may be imposed on the payroll, in view of the recent increases in social security and medicare payroll taxes. Thus, while an interesting example of the use of the tax system to encourage job training, the BITA would seem to be inapplicable to the United States.

6. *The purpose of the Act is to reduce or dismantle existing Federal job-training programs for the disadvantaged.* First, it should be pointed out that among the 140 Representatives and 29 Senators sponsoring this legislation, there is bound to be a wide divergence of viewpoint on the value of existing Federal programs. Some Human Investment sponsors can be found who believe that the Act should entirely replace Federal programs; others, including both of the Act's principal sponsors, have consistently supported sound Federal training programs.

As drafted by Senator Winston Prouty and Representative Thomas B. Curtis, the Human Investment Act is complementary with such Federal programs as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (which Senator Prouty, as ranking Republican member of the Senate Education Subcommittee, strongly supported) and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (which Representative Curtis was instrumental in drafting.) The provisions of sec. 52(a)(2) allow a tax credit toward the wages of employees participating in an On-the-Job Training program under MDTA, which clearly indicates that the Human Investment Act is intended to supplement and not replace that program. Paragraph 52(a)(3), relating to the wages of trainees participating in cooperative education programs, explicitly refers to the Vocational Education Act and is likewise intended to supplement its provisions.

Whether the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps and many of the OEO programs are in fact "training programs" is open to question. Many training experts feel that whatever their general educational and social value, these programs do not produce trained workers measuring up to any standard acceptable to either management or union training specialists. Many sponsors of the Act thus raise the question as to whether these programs should not be justified on some basis other than their job training value, and if such justification cannot be adequately made, whether funds currently devoted to them might not be more profitably spent on on-the-job training by employers who offer gainful employment to the trainees.

It is recognized by the sponsors of the Act that the Act by itself cannot meet the needs of those prospective workers who lack sufficient educational background and work habits for taking advantage of regular job training. Other programs, both public and private, at the national, State and local levels, must be designed to help these people find a productive place in the economy. But at the same time, the sponsors argue that the taxpayer deserves an assurance that the tax dollar spent in training actually leads to effective training and thence to actual employment, through which the taxpayer's investment may eventually be repaid through additional taxes paid and reduced unemployment and welfare costs.

In conclusion, several points come to mind on which I would appreciate having your comments:

A. To what extent is organized labor supporting or sponsoring programs to train the disadvantaged and unemployed to acquire the job skills with which to compete with present union members in the job market?

B. Is the UAW more concerned with expanding the opportunities for training, and thus better jobs and higher economic rewards, for present UAW members who have jobs, or for persons who are not UAW members and do not have jobs?

C. Why is it that the UAW feels that the Federal Government best knows the labor skill needs of the economy but resists the proposition that the Federal Government best knows the needs of the economy when serious strikes curtail production and transportation and thus endanger the national welfare?

D. Does common ground remain for a limited proposal for a tax credit for taxpayers who pay the wages of apprentices in registered programs and who contribute to a training or retraining fund jointly administered by representatives of management and labor?

As you have requested, I will insert your letter, and also my response, in the Congressional Record next week and will send you a copy of the issue. I will also forward a copy of my letter to you to Secretary of Labor Wirtz.

I appreciate your taking the time to set forth your views, and look forward to a meeting of the minds on the important question of how best to meet the problem of the hard-core unemployed and of increasing the skills of the labor forces who play so great a part in the progress and development of our Nation.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,
Representative in Congress.

THE DUBIOUS NEED FOR A DRAFT

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in my testimony before the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate, I indicated my deep concern that the alternatives to the draft had not been sufficiently explored by the several Presidential commissions and other manpower study groups.

The Marshall Commission, for example, dismissed the possibility of moving to volunteerism in two pages of loose argument, backed by two graphs. A report to the House Committee on Armed Services, prepared by a civilian advisory panel headed by Gen. Mark Clark, disposed of a volunteer army in one paragraph, without even one graph.

An extensive manpower study by the Department of Defense, requested by the President in response to growing criticism of the draft, was withheld upon its completion, then revised in light of the escalation in Vietnam, and finally reported to the Congress in 1966 by Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris in brief summary form only. The study and working papers on which the conclusions were based have never been made public.

Dr. Walter Y. Oi, a manpower expert who was with the Department of Defense in the early stages of the manpower study and is now professor of economics at the University of Washington, has conducted a comprehensive study of the costs of an all-volunteer force. I inserted in the RECORD of March 9 a paper presented by Dr. Oi at the University of Chicago conference on the draft in December 1966. In this paper, a careful documentation of the costs of an all-volunteer force by Dr. Oi reveals that an estimated $4 billion per year military pay increase would sustain a force of 2.7 million without conscription.

In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee in April of this year, Dr. Oi outlined his approach for ending conscription. As this House is scheduled to consider late this week the extension of selective service for another 4 years, I commend to my colleagues Dr. Oi's thorough investigation.

I insert for the RECORD, "The Dubious Need for a Draft," by Dr. Walter Y. Oi:

THE DUBIOUS NEED FOR A DRAFT

(By Walter Y. Oi, University of Washington)

The Selective Service System through compulsion and coercion has supplied the Armed Services with personnel for over twenty-five years. In times of war when nearly all qualified men must serve, Americans willingly accepted the compulsion of a draft as a practical short-run means of obtaining enough men to insure the defense of the nation. However, as the draft became more selective (due to smaller demands by the Armed Forces), the inequities of involuntary military service became apparent. The Marshall and Clark Commissions were both estab-

lished in the last ten months to study these inequities and to recommend possible changes in the draft law. The reports of both Commissions conclude that a military draft is *needed*. In previous papers (some of which have been reproduced in the Congressional Record),[1] I have argued that the economic cost of a draft is substantial, and the inequities are largely borne by men in the lower-middle classes of the socioeconomic strata. Moreover, my studies of the military manpower problem lead me to the conclusion that conscription is *unnecessary*. In the light of the postwar population growth, military manpower needs can be fulfilled on a voluntary basis.

The first issue is to identify and estimate the real economic cost of the draft. If a draft is continued into the decade ahead, a minority of youths will be forced into involuntary military service. The hidden tax which is placed on them is conservatively estimated to be three times greater than the Federal income tax burden placed on all citizens. The inequity of this hidden tax could be mitigated by enacting pay legislation to raise the entry-level pay of enlisted men.

In Part IV, attention is directed to the feasibility of meeting our military manpower needs without the compulsion of a draft. Pay, living conditions, and fringe benefits would all have to be enhanced to attract enough recruits to sustain prescribed military manpower objectives. I estimate that the cost of staffing an active duty force of 2.7 million men is around $4 billion a year.

The lower personnel turnover of an all-volunteer force has two salutary effects. One is that fewer men are in a "training" status; consequently, the same effective strength (of men not in training) can be achieved with a smaller overall strength. The other benefit is that fewer initial recruits are demanded to maintain a given strength. Under a draft, with its high personnel turnover (only 7 per cent of draftees reenlist), it is estimated that 27.0 per cent of all males must be demanded by the Armed Forces. However, a voluntary force with greater personnel retention will demand only 19.3 per cent of all youths. In Part V, we briefly examine how adoption of the lottery system of induction is likely to influence the involuntary participation rate of youths in active military service. Finally, Part VI presents some recommendations for a military manpower procurement bill.

I. DEMAND, SUPPLY, AND A SIMPLE MODEL OF THE MARKET FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

The manpower needs of the Department of Defense (DOD) are described by force strength objectives—the number of men in the active duty forces or the stock demand for labor. A more meaningful concept of demand is, however, provided by the gross flow demand for new accessions A_t to replace losses during the year L_t and to achieve prescribed changes in force strength $(F_t - F_{t-1})$.[2]

$$(1.1)\quad A_t = L_t + (F_t - F_{t-1}).$$

The losses L_t are determined by personnel turnover and the size of the force F_{t-1}. Changes in strength objectives $(F_t - F_{t-1})$ also account for variations in the gross flow demand. The demand A_t is tacitly assumed to be completely inelastic; that is, the price or cost of military service has no effect on the number of men demanded.

Military service can surely be regarded as one of the occupational pursuits available to qualified youths. The motives which prompt individuals to enter particular occupations are varied, but an important factor is the pay of an occupation in relation to the pay in competing jobs.[3] The supply of new recruits would surely be larger, the higher the level of first term military pay M. Other things equal, the relation between the supply of recruits and first term pay M can be described by a supply curve S as in Fig. 1. The demand for new accessions in year 0 is indicated by the vertical line at A_0. At the current low level of first term pay M_0 (estimated to be around $2,500 for the first 3.5 years of service), the supply of regular enlistments B falls short of requirements A_0. The gap BA_0 is filled by inducting that number of draftees. A higher demand meaning a rightward shift of A_0 would thus entail a larger gap to be supplied with involuntary inductions.

The supply curve of recruits S depends on four factors: (1) the population base of qualified youths, (2) alternative civilian pay C, (3) the unemployment rate U, and (4) draft pressure. As the population base of qualified youths grows, the entire supply curve is shifted to the right.[4] Such a shift moves the point B to the right thereby reducing the deficit BA_0.

The financial attractiveness of military service vis-à-vis civilian employment is measured by the relative pay of the two, namely M/C. A rise in civilian wages tends, therefore, to shift the supply curve to the left. The availability of jobs as well as the civilian pay C which is received if a job were available, is an equally important factor. The unemployment rate U provides a measure of job availability. According to DOD projections, if civilian unemployment rates were to fall from 5.5 to 4.0 per cent, voluntary enlistments are expected to fall by 16 per cent.

Finally, the coercive threat of a draft affects the supply curve in two ways. Spokesmen for the Selective Service System have testified before Congress that the uncertainty created by a draft liability accounts for substantial numbers of volunteers. College graduates volunteer for officers' commissions because they might be drafted into the Army enlisted ranks. Other youths enlist as regular enlisted men in order to avoid the uncertainty of possibly being drafted. The extent to which the draft motivated men to volunteer was gauged from a survey administered in the fall of 1964 to men on their first tour of duty. The following percentages responded that they "definitely" or "probably" would *not* have volunteered if there had been no draft obligation:

First-term regular enlisted men	38.0
First-term officers	41.3
Enlistments to Reserves	70.7

If the draft were abolished, it is probable that the Armed Services would lose the draft-motivated enlistments. Put in another way, the supply curve of new recruits to enlisted ranks in Fig. 1 would fall from S to S'—a 38 per cent reduction.

There is a second way in which the pressure of a draft affects the short-run supply of recruits. The time series data show that high draft calls are associated with larger flows of voluntary enlistments.[5] When the likelihood of induction climbs as it does in times of strength build-ups to meet brushfire wars or international tensions, many youths elect to discharge their draft obligations by enlisting in a Service or component of their choice. Indeed, these rightward draft-induced shifts in supply are largest for the non-combat Services, the Air Force and Navy.

According to Fig. 1, military manpower requirements A_0 could be supplied with true volunteers (the curve S') if first-term pay were raised to M_2. The necessary pay increase $(M_2 - M_0)$ will, of course be smaller, the smaller is the demand for new recruits. The demand for new accessions in an all-volunteer force is analyzed in Part V where I estimate the necessary pay increase.

II. THE INCIDENCE OF INVOLUNTARY MILITARY SERVICE

The draft and its attendant military service obligation have affected the lives of nearly all Americans. Some men have been involuntarily inducted into the Army while still others reluctantly volunteer for service in enlisted and officer ranks of the active-duty forces as well as for positions in Reserve and Guard units. This is not to deny that there are many men who of their own volition choose military service over civilian employment. However, through coercion and compulsion, the draft law has exacted two or more years of involuntary military service from the draftees and reluctant volun-

---

[1] The papers which I have written include (a) "The Costs and Implications of an All-Volunteer Force" (Congressional Record of March 9, 1967, pp. 6087–6098); this paper was read before the Draft Conference at the University of Chicago, Dec. 6, 1966, and is to be published by the University of Chicago Press (May 1967); (b) "The Economic Cost of the Draft," Papers and Proceedings of the American Economic Association (forthcoming, May 1967); this paper was presented to the meetings of the American Economic Association on Dec. 27, 1966, San Francisco, California; and (c) "The Hidden Tax of the Draft," a comment on an article by Congressman Thomas B. Curtis; my comment appears in the daily edition of the Congressional Record of March 13, 1967, pp. A1236–7.

[2] Losses from the active duty strength arise because of failure to reenlist upon termination of obligated tours; discharges for medical/unsuitability reasons; retirement; and death. Voluntary separations at the end of the first term of service account for the largest part of these losses.

[3] In the Hearings before the House Armed Services Committee in June 1966 (hereafter referred to as *House Hearings*), the Department of Defense presented data from a survey of civilian males in the draftable ages. According to the DOD survey (confer *House Hearings*, p. 10047), only 8.6 per cent of the surveyed youths indicated that pay was "the most important factor" in choosing a career. The research staff of DOD seems to place considerable weight on these responses when they conclude that pay hikes would not elicit sufficient flows of new recruits. I most heartily disagree with the DOD staff. Survey questionnaires on monetary matters are highly unreliable because people are embarrassed to admit to acquisitive traits. Most teachers would, in all probability, insist that "higher" motives rather than pay attracted them into the teaching profession. Interestingly enough, when the pay of elementary and secondary teachers was sharply advanced in the early 1950's, the supply of new teachers rose dramatically. As I shall argue later, available evidence suggests that the supply of recruits is responsive to pay changes. DOD is, however, reluctant even to give higher entry-level pay a try.

[4] Over the last fifteen years, the Armed Forces have varied the mental fitness standards requisite to qualify for military service. When supplies of enlistment applicants were large in relation to demands (meaning that draft calls were small), mental standards were raised to ration the available billets to the more highly qualified males. An upgrading of mental standards operates to reduce the supply by denying enlistment to men with low mental-test scores. I shall, in this paper, assume that the Armed Services will maintain constant qualification standards in the years ahead.

[5] An analysis of the time series data can be found in an unpublished paper by Anthony Fisher, Institute for Defense Analysis, Arlington, Virginia. Fisher's study shows that voluntary enlistments in mental groups I to III are positively related to draft calls, unemployment rate, and relative military/civilian pay. He obtains a higher elasticity of supply with respect to pay than we do with the cross-sectional data.

teers. The incidence of involuntary military service has not been uniform, nor is it likely to be so under virtually any draft scheme short of all-out universal military service. The question posed in this section is, "Who will be chosen for involuntary service in the years ahead when only a small fraction of all youths will be demanded by the Armed Forces?"

If the present Selective Service System is extended for four years I have estimated the probable age and educational distribution of reluctant service participants.[6] To avoid duplication, I shall not describe the methods used to arrive at the distribution shown in Table 1. The current deferment policies, which the Marshall Commission has shown to be so blatantly unfair and arbitrary, favor men with college education. The high school graduates who are bright enough to qualify for military service are the ones who bear the brunt of involuntary military service. They are less informed about the ways in which to beat the draft and reluctantly volunteer before they are drafted.

The Marshall Commission recommended the adoption of a lottery system for selecting draftees. The lottery will produce yet a different composition of involuntary military service. My preliminary analysis of the Marshall lottery reported in Part V indicates that the number of reluctant volunteers will decline. However, the increase in draft calls will more than offset the fall in reluctant volunteers, so that the total of reluctant service participants (draftees plus reluctant volunteers) will rise quite substantially. The difference in voluntary service participation across educational groups is likely to be smaller.[7] The Marshall Commission's lottery entails a higher overall involuntary participation rate because the loss of one regular enlistment (who serves an initial tour of 3.5 years) necessitates drafting at least two more men.

III. THE HIDDEN TAX OF THE DRAFT

In his statement before the House Armed Services Committee, Assistant Secretary of Defense T. D. Morris stated that the additional budgetary cost of an all-volunteer force of 2.7 million men would be between 4 to 17 billion dollars per year. This is just another way of saying that the present low level of military pay (M_0=$2,500 per year in Fig. 1) is too low to attract enough men on a voluntary basis. The implication of Morris's statement is that we as a nation *cannot afford* the additional cost of a voluntary force and must instead rely on conscription to meet our military manpower requirements.

At sufficiently high levels of military pay, a majority of youths could be induced to become true volunteers for active military service. There is, in principle, some minimum supply price for each individual M′ at which he would be willing to volunteer for the Armed Services even without the threat of a draft. The supply price M′ would clearly be higher the greater is the individual's aversion for the discipline and related conditions of military service life. Moreover, the higher is the alternative civilian pay C which he could command, the higher will be his minimum supply price M′. The supply curve of Fig. 1 is a convenient way of summarizing the schedule of supply prices.

To fix ideas, attention is directed to projections of future manpower demands and supplies. According to DOD projections, if the present draft is extended into years ahead, 1970–75, the annual demand for new accessions to enlisted ranks will be 472 thousand men (assuming a force strength of 2.7 million men and an unemployment rate of 5.5 per cent.) Given the threat of being drafted and the growth in the population base, it is estimated that B = 416.7 thousand men will volunteer as regular enlistments. However, CB = 153.7 thousand regular enlistments can properly be regarded as draft-motivated enlistments who would not have enlisted in the absence of a draft. In a sense, these men were coerced to enlist at the low level of military pay M_0. If we assume that these reluctant volunteers had the lowest supply prices in the absence of a draft (i.e. they were next in line above the point F in Fig. 1), the cost of involuntary military service for these men is given by the triangle FEG. To amplify, Mr. X might have been willing to volunteer even without a draft liability if first term pay were M′ = $3,000. However, with a draft liability, he is coerced to enlist at a pay of $2,500 lest he be drafted. The differential of $500 = $3,000 − $2,500 is the cost to X of involuntary military service. If these costs are summed for all reluctant volunteers, a lower bound estimate is given by the area FEG in Fig. 1. Using a liberal estimate of the supply elasticity, the area FEG is seen from Table 3 to be $141 million. This cost is surely an implicit or hidden tax that is levied against those reluctant volunteers who were coerced to serve by a draft liability.

The implicit cost of involuntary service by draftees is harder to assess. The Selective Service System does not overtly try to draft men with the lowest supply prices. Hence some individuals with high alternative civilian incomes C or with a great aversion for service life pay a substantial implicit cost when they are inducted. A lower bound estimate of this implicit cost can, however, be obtained by assuming that draftees had the lowest supply prices above the point G in Fig. 1. The annual implicit cost borne by draftees is thus given by the quadrangle GEDH or 175 million dollars.

The pay raises legislated by Congress over the last fifteen years have mainly applied to the career force. Entry level pay for the first two years of service was kept low because the draft could guarantee an adequate supply of new accessions. As a result, the military pay profile as a function of years of service exhibits a sharp discontinuity; confer Table 2.[8] Annual military income rises by 39.6 per cent between the second and third years as compared to an average annual percentage increase of only 4.7 per cent between the fifth to eighth years. The inordinately low levels of first term pay magnify the size of the hidden tax that is paid by reluctant service participants.

The hidden cost of involuntary military service can thus be measured by the difference between M′, the supply price at which the individual could be induced to become a true volunteer, and M_0, the current level of first term pay. If these hidden costs or taxes are summed, we obtain the annual implicit costs of $141 million for reluctant volunteers and $175 million for draftees. The reluctant service participants from an age class (a cohort born in a specific year) are obliged by the draft obligation to serve from two to four years. The aggregate implicit costs shown in the third panel of Table 3 are obtained by multiplying the annual costs by the average length of involuntary service.[9] The aggregate hidden tax of $826 million assumes that each reluctant service participant would be compensated in a discriminatory fashion, thereby neglecting the rents that would otherwise have been earned by the true volunteers. Thus, if the hidden cost of involuntary service were $1,000 for a particular reluctant volunteer, this $1,000 would not be paid to true volunteers as it would be if labor were procured in a competitive labor market. Hence, failure to compensate the reluctant volunteers entails a foregone income loss for the true volunteers who enlist at the low first term pay of $2,500 per year.

The magnitude of the hidden tax that is levied against each reluctant volunteer and draftee is shown in the last two panels of Table 3. The financial inequity of the draft is truly shameful when these hidden taxes are compared to the burden of the Federal individual income tax. Table 4 presents the data on income tax receipts by the Internal Revenue Service in relation to four populations. The burden of the Federal income tax was only $646 per year for each adult over 18 years of age, while the hidden tax that was implicitly paid by each draftee was $3,169 per year. The draftee is thus compelled to pay a hidden tax that is 4.9 times as large as the tax burden placed on all citizens.

It should be remembered that my procedure for estimating the hidden tax of involuntary service tends to under-estimate the real cost since it assumed that reluctant service participants had the lowest supply prices in the absence of a draft. Moreover, the costs of Table 3 apply only to men in the enlisted ranks. Fully 41 per cent of newly commissioned officers and 71 per cent of enlistments to reserve units were estimated to be draft-motivated volunteers. These men also were coerced to serve at below market rates of pay because of the draft obligation.

The inequity of draft is accentuated by the absurdly low levels of entry level pay. Even including the imputed value of board and keep, the typical private earns a monthly income of $158 per month—far below the minimum wage legislated by Congress. In 1964, the typical reluctant volunteer could have earned $287 per month in the civilian economy, while the draftee who is older could have earned $317 per month. If a draft must be continued, I strongly recommend that entry level pay be sharply advanced to eliminate the financial cost of involuntary military service. When only a fraction of all youths must be involuntarily put into military service (and bear the risks coincident with such service), why should we insist that they also suffer financial losses during their period of service? That the entry level pay of an American soldier is below that of the Canadian and Australian recruit, is, in my opinion, inexcusable.

IV. THE COST AND FEASIBILITY OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

Recent discussions on the draft question have devoted little attention to the basic issue of the *need* for a draft. The Marshall Commission in its 219-page report allotted two pages to establish the *need* for extension of some form of draft law. The transcript of the House Hearings in June 1966 suggests

---

[6] See my paper in the Congressional Record of March 9, 1967, pp. 6087–6098. The figures appearing in Table 1 assume an active-duty strength of 2.65 million men and an unemployment rate of 5.5 percent. If the average unemployment rate in 1970–75 should fall to 4.0 percent, draft calls are projected to climb from 55.3 to 101.7 thousand men per year.

[7] The percentage of involuntary service participants in relation to the base of qualified males indicates the incidence of involuntary service. Under a continued Selective Service System draft, these percentages will be:

	Percent
Less than high school graduate	36.4
High school graduate	54.2
Some college no degree	28.6
College graduate	18.9
Total	38.5

[8] The annual military incomes of Table 2 include the following pay items: (1) base pay, (2) quarters and subsistence allowances if received in money, or their imputed value if provided in kind, and (3) an implicit tax advantage due to the fact that some pay items are regarded as non-taxable income.

[9] Because of attrition during the first term, the average length of service is only 1.9 years for draftees and around 3.5 years for regular enlisted men.

that the members of the House Armed Services Committee are not terribly interested in studying the cost and feasibility of meeting our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis. The arguments against an all-volunteer force can be put in capsule form as follows:

1. It would be too costly.

2. It could not achieve the *requisite flexibility* in force strengths to insure the defense of the nation and to meet our international obligations.

3. It would have possibly undesirable social consequences such as a military class or an all-Negro army.

4. It is inconsistent with the American heritage of a citizen militia. The reader could undoubtedly supply other arguments against the adoption of a voluntary manpower procurement system. The last two criticisms listed above can, I believe, be more forcefully refuted by others—Congressman Thomas Curtis and Professor Milton Friedman for example. I shall briefly examine the flexibility issue in Part VI below. In this section attention is directed to the cost of an all-volunteer force.

Under any procurement system, the demand for new recruits A_t is determined by the losses during the year L_t and planned changes in force strengths (F_t—F_{t-1}). If peacetime force strength objectives are stabilized, F_t—F_{t-1} will be equal to zero. Hence demand A_t will depend only on losses L_t which, in turn, are determined by personnel turnover and the size of the active duty force. The losses due to personnel turnover can be estimated from a retention profile describing the proportion of men remaining in service N years after initial entry. The retention profile for a mixed force of conscripts and volunteers (38 per cent of whom were reluctant volunteers) was estimated from the experience of the late 1950's and is shown in the first two columns of Table 5. A perusal of Table 5 reveals that voluntary separations upon completion of the first term of three to four years account for the largest part of personnel turnover. Over the period FY 1957–64, the average first term reenlistment rate of voluntary enlistments was 25.6 per cent, while that of draftees was only 7.7 per cent. The retention profile of the mixed force implies an annual turnover rate of 18.9 per cent for enlisted men; this turnover rate climbs as the fraction of two-year draftees increases.

If all initial accessions were true volunteers, the Armed Services would enjoy a substantially lower turnover rate. The first term reenlistment rate of Negroes is around 49 per cent as compared to a Regular Army reenlistment rate of only 22 per cent. The reason for this large difference is apparent. Negroes do not suffer from pay discrimination in the Armed Services. In the civilian economy, they earn substantially less than their white counterparts because of job and pay discrimination by civilian employers. Military service is a far more attractive alternative to the Negro who can meet the mental qualification standards. They are more likely to volunteer, and once in service, far more likely to reenlist. If all initial inputs were true volunteers (as indeed most Negro volunteers presently are), we could expect a similar climb in reenlistment rates especially if recruits do not suffer from the wage exploitation that they now do. I estimate that the first term reenlistment rate in an all-volunteer force would be 36.6 per cent as compared to an average of only 25.6 per cent in the preceding eight years. Hence, the retention profile of enlisted men should shift toward greater retention as indicated by the last two columns of Table 5. From the estimated retention profile applicable to a voluntary force, I estimated the required accessions for alternative force strengths. The required accessions for a mixed force were taken from the Marshall Commission report, p. 14.

Required accession to enlisted ranks in voluntary and mixed forces

Active duty force strength (millions)	Enlisted strength (thousands)	Voluntary force	Mixed force [1]
2.5	2,175	314	452
2.65	2,310	334	500
3.0	2,658	384	609
3.3	2,937	426	732
3.5	3,115	452	812

[1] Figures for the 2,500,000, 3,000,000, and 3,500,000 strengths were taken from the Marshall Commission report, p. 14. The estimates for the strengths of 2,650,000 and 3,300,000 were interpolated.

The mixed force which includes inputs of draftees and reluctant volunteers has a higher personnel turnover accounting for the larger flows of required accessions. The required accessions to the voluntary force contain an upward bias, since I have not adjusted the data for the savings which obtain from lower personnel turnover. These savings derive from fewer men being in a training status. Men engaged in training others can be reassigned to other duties, and the total force strength can be cut while retaining the same number of men in an effective (non-training) status.

The required accessions of 334 thousand recruits to sustain a voluntary force of 2.65 million men is far smaller than the required accessions of 500 thousand for the mixed force. Hence, the line A_0 in Fig. 1 is to the left of where it is now drawn. To determine the necessary pay level M to attract 334 thousand recruits on a voluntary basis, we had to estimate the supply curve S'. I shall not, in this paper, repeat the methods by which we estimated this supply curve. The supply curve which I used in my calculations is essentially the same as that used in the DOD study.

If the estimated supply curve is juxtaposed to the demand, I estimate that first term pay must be raised by 68 per cent, from $2,500 to $4,200 per year. The entry level pay of recruits in their first year of service would climb from $1,900 to $3,900 per year, or a monthly pay hike of $167 per month. The sharp projected rise in first term pay would, moreover, create a pay inversion wherein men in their fourth and fifth years of service would be earning less than new recruits. To prevent such pay inversions, the pay of the career force was raised by 17 per cent. In addition, the pay profile of officers was adjusted to eliminate the low level of entry pay; this adjustment raised the pay of newly commissioned officers by 21 per cent.

The pay schedules that would be needed to attract enough recruits on a voluntary basis were applied to the anticipated age structure of the voluntary force. For an active duty force strength of 2.65 million men, I estimate that income payments to active duty military personnel would have to rise by $4 billion per year.

The methods by which I arrive at an estimate of the cost of an all-volunteer force can be criticized on several grounds. Some of the more important criticisms which I have received include the following:

a. Steady state requirements: The demand for new recruits presumes a steady state in which the retention profile of a voluntary force applies. During the transitional period, losses will be larger with a corresponding rise in required accessions. My failure to acknowledge the transitional demands thus imparts a downward bias to my cost estimate. However, if force strengths are to be reduced to 2.65 million (from their FY 1966 level of 3.1 million), the transition poses only a minor adjustment in my cost estimates.

b. Army requirements: The shortfall between voluntary supplies and demands is projected to be largest for the Army. In estimating the necessary pay increase of 68 per cent, I used the deficit in Army requirements. As a consequence, the other three Services are projected to enjoy excess supplies of enlistment applicants. If there is any spillover of enlistment applicants across services (i.e. if a man who is denied entry into the Navy tries later to enlist in the Army), my procedure overstates the cost of meeting military demands on a voluntary basis.

c. Method for implementing the pay increase: I have tacitly assumed that the 68 per cent pay increase will redound to recruits in the form of higher base pay. The annual base pay of a private in his first year of service is projected to rise from $1,200 to $3,200. That is, his pay climbs from $100 per month now to $267 per month. Some critics have correctly argued that this is a rather inefficient means of distributing higher pay, especially when the other Services have too many enlistment applicants. A system of variable enlistment bonuses or pay differentials across Services could produce substantial savings, thereby lowering my cost estimate of $4 billion.

d. Savings from lower personnel turnover: I have completely ignored the savings from lower personnel turnover resulting in fewer men in a training status. If the active duty force can be cut by as little as 5 per cent because more men are in an effective, non-training status, the military pay budget would fall by $0.8 billion. Inclusion of this saving thus lowers the cost of an all-volunteer force from $4.0 to $3.2 billion.

e. Civilian substitutions: Many jobs which are presently staffed with uniformed personnel could be equally well performed by civilians. If military pay is sharply advanced (as I estimate it will be), it becomes economical to substitute a civilian for a Serviceman thereby lowering total labor costs. In addition to the direct reductions in labor costs, the Armed Services will realize an indirect savings namely fewer recruits will be demanded. Hence, the necessary pay increase to attract recruits can be lowered. The potential savings from the substitution of civilians for uniformed men could be substantial.

f. Validity of the cross-sectional complement supply curve: The supply curve S' which was used to estimate the necessary pay interest was derived from cross-sectional regional data on voluntary enlistment rates for men in mental groups I to III. It is essentially the same supply equation as that used in the DOD study.[10] The underlying data pertained to the enlistment experience in calendar year 1963, the only year for which such data were available. I agree with the skeptics that it is a slim piece of evidence. There are, however, some other bits of evidence which confirm the implications of the estimated supply equation. An economy which is quite similar to ours, namely Canada, has sustained a voluntary military establishment that is roughly half the size of the U.S. in relation to the population base. The entry level pay of the Canadian recruit is around 20 percent higher than that of the U.S. soldier. Given the growth in the population base, the force strength of 2.65 million men corresponds to a force that is between 25 and 33 percent larger than Canada's on a per capita basis. We should be able to staff a force of that size if pay is increased by 68 percent. Until we raise entry level pay, there is no real test of whether our estimated supply curve is correct. I have reasonable confidence in it because of my observations of the Canadian experience and of the enlistment behavior of Negroes. If the pay of military service can be

[10] A fuller discussion of the methods by which this supply curve was estimated can be found in "The Supply of Military Personnel in the Absence of a Draft," by A. Fechter and S. Altman (to be published in Papers and Proceedings of the American Economic Association, May 1967).

put on a footing comparable to pay in the civilian sector, it should not be difficult to attract one man in five—and that is all we need to staff a force of 2.65 million men.

Only one of the six criticisms listed above implies that my cost estimate is too low. The DOD estimates of $17 billion imply that we would have to pay men over $7,000 per year to attract but one man in five. I grant that the cost estimate may contain some random error, but not an error of +$13 billion.

I have made some rough calculations on the cost of sustaining an active duty force of 3.0 million men—the active force strength as of 30 June 1966. According to the complement supply curve, the necessary pay increase climbs from 68 to 94 percent. The average annual first term pay (over three years of service) climbs from $4,200 to $4,850. Defense expenditures for active duty military personnel would, of course, be higher for both the voluntary force and the mixed force of conscripts and volunteers. The budgetary cost to sustain a voluntary force of 3.0 million men is estimated to be $6.7 billion higher than that of a mixed force.

In closing this section, it should be repeated that the budgetary cost of military personnel is *not* the *real* economic cost of labor resources allocated to the defense establishment. With a force strength of 3.0 million men, the incidence of involuntary military service climbs dramatically. More men from each age class are coerced or compelled to serve against their wishes. The real cost is high for those who are selected to serve, while those fortunate or slippery enough to avoid military service are subsidized by the inordinately low pay awarded to the draftee.

IMPACT OF THE LOTTERY ON VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

The lottery (fair and impartial random selection system) has been recommended by the Marshall Commission as the most equitable means of conscripting men. Equity here is construed to mean that every individual bears the same risk of involuntary military service. In evaluating the desirability of the Marshall Commission's lottery, I would like to raise the question of "How will the adoption of a lottery influence the *need* for a draft?" Equity meaning equal probability of induction can surely be achieved by a lottery, but what will be the level of that probability or risk? This issue was only briefly raised in the Commission's report and never answered.

The larger is the flow of voluntary enlistments, the smaller is the need for draftees. A rough estimate of the impact of a lottery on voluntary enlistments can be obtained from the age distribution of enlistments and the extent of draft-motivated enlistments. Special tabulations prepared by the DOD statistical office provide estimates of the age at entry of voluntary enlistments in FY 1960–64; these are shown in Table 6. Fully 32 per cent of all enlistments were nineteen years of age, and 71.5 per cent were nineteen or older at the time of enlistment. There is a slight trend toward older ages in periods of high draft calls, but the trend is slight. The uncertainty of being drafted motivates many of these men to enlist for tours of three to four years. According to the 1964 DOD survey, the percentage of draft-motivated enlistments who were 20 or older at time of entry was 59.5 per cent as compared to only 31.3 per cent for men who were 17 to 19 years of age.

According to the Commission's lottery proposal, men would be examined at age 18.5. Qualified males reaching the age of nineteen would then be arrayed into an order of call by some random selection system. We can imagine that each man is assigned a number, say from 1 to 2 million if there were 2 million men in the pool. The lowest numbers would be called first. The status of student deferments has not been resolved, but for the sake of this paper, I shall assume that they are put into the qualified I–A pool and assigned numbers.

The size of the draft call in any year, D_t, is determined by the gap between requirements A_t and voluntary supplies of enlistments E_t. Personnel turnover will, moreover, influence requirements A_t. The loss of one regular enlistee who serves for three or four years, necessitates the induction of two or more men each serving only two years. By eliminating the uncertainty of being drafted, the Armed Services are likely to lose some of the draft-motivated enlistments who must be replaced by two-year draftees. If men with low numbers are permitted to volunteer, some fraction of them will do so.

Under a continued Selective Service draft, the DOD projections for FY 1970–75 indicate annual flows of 416.7 thousand voluntary enlistments, of whom 71.5 per cent, or 298 thousand men, will be nineteen or older. At most, only 15 to 20 per cent of the qualified pool will be affected by the lottery if peacetime force strengths revert to their pre-Vietnam levels. Hence, we can conservatively estimate to lose 80 per cent of the draft-motivated enlistments who were 19 or older.[11] This loss of 112 thousand enlistments would result in a rise in the size of the draft calls from 55.3 to 279 thousand men per year.

By reducing the uncertainty of being drafted, the lottery is anticipated to result in larger draft calls. The decline in voluntary enlistments could be offset if pay were advanced to make military service competitive with civilian jobs. Such a pay increase would have the added merit of mitigating the financial inequity of involuntary service for those who are drafted by the lottery.

VI. SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT BILL

The expiration of the present draft law on June 30, 1967, means that Congress must enact legislation within the next six weeks. The Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951 and its subsequent extensions are almost exclusively concerned with the problem of manpower procurement. There is little if any attempt to integrate the manpower procurement system into an overall military manpower policy of the Department of Defense. The reports of the Marshall and Clark Commission are guilty of this same myopia. I have argued in the preceding section that the adoption of the lottery implies a greater need for the draft because it entails higher personnel turnover. That younger men are more desirable for the combat positions is not being questioned. However, one should also inquire about the supply of men for the highly technical positions which require long training periods. The voluntary force with its greater retention can achieve this latter objective more efficiently.

All proposals which have been put before Congress entail radical changes in military manpower procurement practices. The Vietnam War is not a global conflict requiring the services of nearly all qualified males. The manpower procurement bill which Congress enacts should not, therefore, be dominated by short-run considerations. Instead, it should address itself to the peacetime military manpower needs of the defense establishment. In the light of these considerations, I would like to make some recommendations with the following objectives in mind:

a. to design a system of military manpower procurement which places maximum reliance on volunteers;

b. to raise first-term pay, thereby alleviating some of the financial inequity of involuntary military service;

c. to examine the overall military manpower policies of the Department of Defense with the aim of achieving greater efficiency in the utilization of the nation's scarce labor resources.

With these objectives in mind, I propose the following recommendations to be considered for possible inclusion in the military manpower procurement bill which will replace the present draft law.

1. *Two-year Extension of a Draft.* A draft law which includes as a minimum recommendations 2 and 3 below, should be extended for a period of only two years rather than the four years proposed by the Marshall Commission.

Since all the alternatives proposed to date entail radical changes in the nature and implementation of a draft liability, Congress should exercise some caution and allow for possible revision in the light of experience under any new draft law. During the first year, data on its operation can be assembled. In the second year, these data can be studied to determine its strengths and weaknesses. If the law operates in an efficient and reasonably equitable fashion, Congress could easily extend it in 1969. On the other hand, if serious shortcomings are uncovered, youths in the vulnerable draft ages need not be subjected to four years of an inequitable draft law. The two-year extension is sufficiently long to permit compilation and analysis of relevant data while not causing a prolongation of a badly conceived law.

2. *Lottery of the 21-year-olds.* Under the current draft law, an individual can remain in a draft-vulnerable status for seven and one-half years. To alleviate costs to the individual arising from the possibility of his being drafted, the Marshall Commission has proposed a lottery of 19-year-olds to shorten the period of draft uncertainty. However, as argued in Part V above, the uncertainty of a draft is not an unmitigated evil. To eliminate nearly all such uncertainty (as the present lottery proposal would do) leads to the loss of substantial numbers of voluntary enlistments. This loss necessarily entails a more than twofold increase in draft calls, thereby increasing the fraction of each age class that must be subjected to involuntary military service. The objective of placing maximum reliance on volunteers suggests an intermediate method of selecting draftees which would entail a smaller loss of reluctant volunteers, thereby lessening the need for a draft. Its essential features can be summarized as follows:

a. All qualified youths are to be classified at the age of 18 into three draft classifications: (1) I–A and available for service, (2) II–S student deferments, and (3) hardship and conscientious-objector exemptions. Hardship deferments will be granted on an individual basis, using criteria similar to those of eligibility for the poverty program.

b. Men who obtain a student deferment are placed in a state of suspended animation at a draft age of 19. Upon termination of their student deferments, they are returned to the I–A pool and assigned a draft age of 19. Thereafter, their chronological age is ignored, and their draft status within the I–A pool is entirely determined by their draft age.

c. The period of maximum draft vulnerability will be limited to two years. Men whose draft age exceeds 21 are placed into a lower order of call for five years and can be called only when the I–A pool is depleted.

d. The order of call within the I–A pool will begin with the oldest. Recall that the oldest men in the I–A pool have a draft age of 21. If monthly requirements are less than

[11] The DOD survey of first-term enlisted men indicates that the pressure of a draft liability accounted for 46.9 percent of voluntary enlistments who were 19 or older at the time of entry. In the projection years 1970–75, it is estimated that 298 thousand volunteers will be 19 or older. Multiplying $.469 \times 298$ yields 140 thousand draft-motivated volunteers. Since 80 percent of these will be bypassed in the lottery, $0.8 \times 140 =$ 112 thousand is the estimated loss of voluntary recruits.

the pool of men reaching their 21st "draft birthday" in a particular month, a random selection of birthdates determines the ranking within that month.

e. All occupational and dependence deferments (other than hardship) will be discontinued.

This lottery of 21-year-olds has the advantage of retaining the flows of reluctant volunteers in the 19- and 20-year-old groups. Hence, the loss of reluctant volunteers in this system of induction is only 42 thousand men per year as compared to the estimated loss of 112 thousand enlistments under the Marshall Commission proposal. If the pay hike of recommendation 3 is adopted (and I hope that it is), the financial cost of involuntary service by the reluctant volunteers will be far smaller. Indeed, the pay raise will attract larger flows of volunteers, so that there may not even be a loss of voluntary enlistments under this proposal.

3. *Overdue Adjustments in Military Compensation.* That the absurdly low levels of first-term military pay are an embarrassment, is manifest in the myriad of post-service veteran benefits. The G.I. Bill, subsidized home mortgages, medical care, and life insurance policies for veterans all exemplify attempts to remedy the financial burden of military service. The high time preference of youths suggests that these post-service benefits are highly discounted in any calculation of the financial rewards of active military service. I strongly recommend that the military pay profile be adjusted upward according to the schedule proposed below:

Proposed adjustments in the compensation of enlisted men

Years of service	Present pay [1]	Proposed pay	Percentage increase
1	$1,830	$3,130	71.0
2	2,143	3,380	57.7
3	2,991	3,630	21.4
4	3,344	3,880	16.0
5	4,130	4,130	----------

[1] Figures represent annual military incomes consisting of (1) base pay, (2) quarters and subsistence allowances, and (3) implicit tax advantage. The data pertain to the pay scales as of fiscal year 1963.

If these pay increases are adopted, the budgetary payroll cost for an enlisted strength of 2.31 million men (corresponding to a total strength of 2.65 million) would climb by $1,368 million. Moreover, the pay increase is estimated to increase Army enlistments in the absence of a draft by 48 per cent. Finally, the hidden tax of the draft would be sharply reduced, thereby lessening the financial cost of service for the reluctant service participants. Whatever else is done, this one recommendation deserves serious consideration and, I hope, adoption.

4. *Flexibility and the Role of the Reserves.* A professional voluntary army has been severely criticized on the ground that it does not have the requisite *flexibility* to meet short-run demands for active-duty personnel. What amount of flexibility is required of a voluntary force has never been specified. Within FY 1954–65, the largest year-to-year increase in the active-duty strength has been under 350 thousand men. In the recent Vietnam build-up when *no* reserves were activated in significant numbers [11] the active-duty force strength climbed by 438 thousand men.

During the Berlin crisis of FY 1962, substantial numbers of reserves were recalled to active duty. The political aftermath of that incident seems to have neutralized the Reserve and National Guard as a source of manpower for the active-duty forces. Presently around 1.3 million men are on a ready, paid-drill, reserve status. If this reserve strength were reduced to 700 thousand men who were paid competitive wages, they could provide the needed flexibility for an all-volunteer force. The present organization of reserve units defies rational explanation. A careful study of the role and function of reserve units should, I believe, be undertaken as part of an integrated study of military manpower utilization. It should, moreover, be linked to the initial procurement policies. A truly ready reserve can, in my opinion, supply the desired degree of flexibility.

5. *Toward an Integrated Military Manpower Policy.* The procurement, retention, and utilization of manpower should logically fit into an integrated military manpower policy. To the best of my knowledge, there is no overall conceptual framework within which one can evaluate specific policy proposals. The draft, for example, is largely examined with only passing reference to the utilization and retention of uniformed personnel. The techniques of systems analysis, which have been so widely used in cost-effectiveness studies of weapons systems, have not been carried over into manpower problems. In evaluating alternative manpower policies with these techniques of systems analysis, care must be taken to use the appropriate cost of labor resources. Because of the low levels of first term pay, the DOD budgetary costs are *not* the real economic costs of labor resources allocated to the Armed Services. I believe that further studies should be made of (a) qualification standards for enlisted men, (b) qualification standards for junior officer ranks, (c) adjustments in the retirement program to permit separation bonuses after ten to twelve years of service, (d) variable enlistment bonuses for men who sign for longer initial tours of duty, and (e) possibilities of substituting civilians for uniformed personnel, especially in the para-medical and clerical fields.

In order to maintain a large defense establishment, the nation must allocate substantial flows of labor and material resources to the Armed Services. The Department of Defense has followed a policy of acquiring its material resources (armaments, ships, planes, etc.) via the free market through a system of defense contracts. Only in wartime and periods of true emergency has the Department seen fit to requisition strategic materials at noncompetitive prices. However, when it comes to recruiting labor resources, the Department of Defense assumes an altogether different posture, refusing to place greater reliance on the competitive labor market and continuing to pay servicemen at below market rates of pay. Conscription and coercion (the counterparts to wartime requisitions) thus persist in peacetime. The *need* for a peacetime draft has *not* been established, nor is likely to be established. The facts of the matter are that we do not need a peacetime draft. Our military manpower needs can be met on a voluntary basis if we as a nation are prepared to pay competitive wages to new recruits, rationalize the role of the reserves, and initiate efficient manpower utilization practices.

(Figure 1, referred to above cannot be reproduced in the RECORD.)

TABLE 1.—*Projected accessions to enlisted ranks under a continued draft, fiscal years 1970–75 (by age at entry, education, and draft motivation)*

	Years of school completed					
	Total	0 to 8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16 and over
Voluntary enlistments under a continued draft:						
17 to 19 years	328.5	15.0	107.2	188.0	18.3	0
20 years and older	88.2	1.4	12.9	42.8	25.8	5.3
All ages	416.7	16.4	120.1	230.8	44.1	5.3
Reluctant volunteers:						
17 to 19 years	102.4	3.0	23.0	68.3	8.1	0
20 years and older	51.3	.4	5.3	24.7	17.8	3.1
Reluctant volunteers—Con.						
All ages	153.7	3.4	28.3	93.0	25.9	3.1
Inductions	55.3	4.3	15.2	21.9	10.5	3.4
Reluctant military service participants:						
17 to 19 years	102.4	3.0	23.0	68.3	8.1	0
20 years and older	106.6	4.7	20.5	46.6	28.3	6.5
All ages	209.0	7.7	43.5	114.9	36.4	6.5

TABLE 2.—*Annual military incomes of enlisted men*

[Pay scales of fiscal year 1963]

Years of service	Total income, Department of Defense	Army			Base pay as percent of total income
		Total income	Taxable income	Base pay	
1	$1,830	$1,900	$1,058	$1,055	55.5
2	2,143	2,304	1,359	1,382	60.0
3	2,991	3,247	2,199	2,002	61.7
4	3,344	3,711	2,392	2,433	65.6
5	4,130	4,248	2,691	2,575	60.6
6	4,462	4,465	2,792	2,725	61.0
7	$4,649	$4,596	$2,937	$2,858	62.2
8	4,741	4,797	3,037	3,003	62.6
9 to 12	5,235	5,377	3,409	3,280	61.0
13 to 16	5,926	6,043	3,918	3,885	64.3
17 to 20	6,387	6,414	4,245	(1)	----------

[1] Not available.

TABLE 3.—*The hidden cost of involuntary military service*

	Low estimate (β=0.402)	Middle estimate (β=0.315)
Annual 1st term pay (for 3.5 years):		
M_0	$2,500	$2,500
M_1	4,700	5,600
M_1'	5,900	7,450
Annual cost excluding rents (millions):		
Reluctant volunteers	141	192
Draftees	175	243
Aggregate cost for members of an age class (millions):		
Reluctant volunteers	493	672
Draftees	333	462
Total	826	1,134

	Low estimate (β=0.402)	Middle estimate (β=0.315)
Total per capita cost excluding rents: [1]		
Reluctant volunteers	$3,208	$4,372
Draftees	6,022	8,354
Total	3,952	5,426
Annual per capita cost: [2]		
Reluctant volunteers	917	1,249
Draftees	3,169	4,397
Total	1,317	1,809

[1] The per capita cost assumes that there were 153,700 reluctant volunteers and 55,300 draftees.

[2] The annual per capita cost is the total per capita cost divided by average length of service; 3.5 years for reluctant volunteers and 1.9 years for draftees.

TABLE 4.—*Federal individual income taxes, 1962–66*

	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Aggregates:					
Individual income tax receipts ... millions	$63,358	$67,992	$71,593	$70,765	$81,534
Number of tax returns filed ... thousands	62,487	63,679	65,154	66,965	69,724
Civilian labor force ... do	71,854	72,975	74,233	75,635	77,041
Population 21 years of age and over ... thousands	110,876	111,513	113,133	114,224	[1] 115,355
Aggregates—Con.					
Population 18 years of age and over ... thousands	119,206	119,824	121,280	123,387	[1] 126,151
Per capita Federal income taxes:					
Per return	1,014	1,068	1,099	1,057	1,169
Per member of labor force	882	932	964	936	1,058
Per adult over 21	571	610	633	620	707
Per adult over 18	532	567	590	574	646

[1] Estimated by extrapolation.

Sources: Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, Annual Report of the Commissioner and Statistical Abstract of the United States.

TABLE 5.—*Retention profiles of enlisted men in mixed and voluntary forces* [1]

Years of service, N	Mixed force		Voluntary force	
	Survival rate	Cumulative percent	Survival rate	Cumulative percent
0	1.0000	18.9	1.0000	13.9
1	.9149	36.1	.9161	27.7
2	.6494	48.4	.8326	38.2
3	.4710	57.3	.5742	46.2
4	.1631	60.4	.2868	50.2
5	.1563	63.3	.2673	53.9
6	.1456	66.1	.2490	57.4
7	.1407	68.7	.2406	60.8
8	0.1365	71.3	0.2334	64.0
9	.1281	73.7	.2191	67.0
10	.1125	75.8	.1924	69.7
15	.1002	85.7	.1703	82.1
20	.0818	94.5	.1391	93.1
25	.0283	98.1	.0481	97.7
30	.0150	100.0	.0255	100.0
Sum	5.2981		7.1875	

[1] Data are based on the experience of the late 1950's. The survival rate is the proportion of men remaining in service N years after entry. The cumulative percent of men with N or fewer years of service in a steady state is shown in the 2d and 4th columns.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of voluntary enlistments by age at enlistment* [1] *(total DOD, fiscal year 1960–64 in thousands)*

Age at enlistment	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Average
Number of voluntary enlistments:						
17	19	15	14	13	13	14.8
18	88	85	81	65	68	77.4
19	99	114	115	98	91	103.4
20	50	60	66	61	61	59.6
21	21	28	32	30	39	30.0
22 and over	24	33	54	31	49	38.2
Total	301	335	362	298	321	323.4
Percentage distribution:						
17	6.3	4.5	3.9	4.4	4.0	4.6
18	29.2	25.4	22.4	21.8	21.2	23.9
19	32.9	34.0	31.8	32.9	28.3	32.0
20	16.6	17.9	18.2	20.5	19.0	18.4
21	7.0	8.4	8.8	10.1	12.1	9.3
22 and over	8.0	9.9	14.9	10.4	15.3	11.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] The age at time of enlistment is estimated by year of birth. Men who were born in calendar year 1940 and who enlisted in fiscal year 1960 were classified as being 20 years old. However, because of the 6 months' overlap between calendar and fiscal years, they could have been between 18.5 and 20.5 years of age.

UNITED STATES HAS PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY TO SETTLE VIETNAM DISPUTE THROUGH U.N. MACHINERY

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Joint Resolution 856 to refer the Vietnam dispute to the International Court of Justice for adjudication. If North Vietnam and South Vietnam refuse to submit their dispute to adjudication, I suggest that the United States ask the General Assembly to request of the Court an advisory opinion of the violations of international law in Vietnam by both sides.

At my request the Department of State has furnished me with a memorandum entitled "U.S. Efforts To Obtain U.N. Action on Vietnam." It shows that on only two occasions has the United States requested the Security Council to convene to consider the Vietnam conflict.

The first request was in August 1964. The last in January 1966, was over a year and a half ago. The memo contains a number of statements by administration leaders expressing hope that the U.N. would act.

Since neither North Vietnam or South Vietnam is a member of the U.N. it is the responsibility of the United States to continue its efforts to seek a solution through the United Nations. Our lack

of action in seeking U.N. support in this war is one of the principal reasons our war position has become so lonely. We appear to have used the United Nations as an arena in which to fight the cold war, not end it. In place of settlement of the U.N. conflict on the basis of the rule of law we have substituted over optimistic predictions, constant escalation, secret decisions, and diplomatic overtures intended more for domestic political consumption than foreign capitals.

The memorandum clearly shows that at no time has the United States sought to refer this dispute to the International Court of Justice. Yet the United States was eager to have the Court rule on the legality of U.N. peacekeeping expenses in the Congo and the Middle East.

Under the Eisenhower administration the United States referred a number of international disputes to the Court, but the present administration obviously lacks interest in settling this dispute within the established framework of international law.

The gap between our professed commitment to the principle of resolving political conflict through the United Nations and the International Court of Justice and our actions to honor the commitment is surely one of the most tragic aspects of the war. It represents a distressing commentary on our present foreign policy.

Text of the State Department memorandum follows:

U.S. EFFORTS TO OBTAIN U.N. ACTION ON VIETNAM

The following is a summary of the major U.S. efforts to obtain UN action on Viet-Nam and the responses thereto.

I. RESORT TO SECURITY COUNCIL: 1964

On August 4, 1964, the United States requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation created by North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on US destroyers in international waters. When the Council met, it agreed to invite both North and South Viet-Nam to participate in the discussions. Whereas South Viet-Nam offered the Council its "full cooperation" North Viet-Nam not only refused the Council's invitation but also rejected UN competence to consider the question of Viet-Nam and declared that any decision by the Council would be null and void. Largely as a result of this attitude, the Council adjourned after only two meetings without taking further action.

II. SEEKING A UN CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE IN VIETNAM

Despite this experience, the United States continued to seek ways whereby the United Nations could contribute to peace in Viet-Nam. At his speech to the United Nations Commemorative Session in San Francisco on June 25, 1965, the President called upon ". . . this gathering of nations of the world to use all their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the tables those who seem determined to make war. We will support your efforts . . .".

The President recalled this statement in a letter to the Secretary-General on July 28, 1965. In his first official communication to the Security Council, on July 30, 1965, Ambassador Goldberg noted that the responsibility to persist in the search for peace weighed especially upon members of the Council. He expressed the hope that Council members "will somehow find the means to respond effectively to the challenge raised by the present state of affairs in Southeast Asia." He also gave an assurance that the United States stands ready "to collaborate unconditionally with members of the Security Council in the search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security" in Southeast Asia.

In his general debate speech to the UN General Assembly on September 23, 1965 Ambassador Goldberg reaffirmed our willingness to enter into unconditional discussions looking toward a peaceful settlement. He declared that ". . . we have asked the members of the United Nations, individually and collectively, to use their influence to help bring about such discussions. We have asked the members of the Security Council and the Secretary-General to help get negotiations started."

On October 1, in another speech, Ambassador Goldberg appealed to members of the United Nations to use all their "ingenuity, wisdom and influence" to join in the search for peace.

III. RESORT TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL: 1966

On January 31, 1966 the United States again requested an urgent meeting of the Council to consider the situation in Viet-Nam. The Council met to consider the question of Viet-Nam on February 1 and 2. After considerable debate, during which inscription of the item on the Security Council's agenda met with strong resistance, the Council voted 9 in favor, 2 opposed (USSR, Bulgaria), with 4 abstentions (France, Mali, Nigeria, Uganda) to inscribe the item. This bare majority was possible only on the informal understanding that the Council, instead of proceeding immediately to a substantive debate, would adjourn for consultations. The results of the consultations were summarized by the Council's President in late February. He noted three main points:

a. It was "impossible to reach agreement on a proper course of action for the Council to follow";

b. There was "a general feeling" that no further debate should be held at the time; and

c. There was a "certain degree of common feeling" on two points: concern and anxiety over the continuation of hostilities and a strong desire for their early cessation; and a feeling that an end to the conflict should be sought "through negotiations in an appropriate forum in order to work out the implementation of the Geneva Accords."

Even this mild letter from the President of the Council gave rise to objections by the USSR, Bulgaria, France and Mali.

In response to recent suggestions in the U.S. Senate that the United Nations become more involved in Viet-Nam, Ambassador Goldberg stated (May 16, 1967) his full agreement that the "UN has a continuing responsibility to follow any path leading to an honorable settlement of the conflict in Viet-Nam. Noting that the Security Council had been "unable to act because of the resistance of certain members," the Ambassador reaffirmed that the United States "would welcome Security Council consideration of the matter and would hope that the objections that have been made to such consideration would be withdrawn."

IV. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, JULY 1966

On July 7, 1966 Ambassador Goldberg, responding to a Soviet attack on U.S. policy in Viet-Nam, described U.S. efforts to obtain a just and peaceful solution and concluded: ". . . we would hope that, in the proper political forums of the UN, concrete steps could be taken, with the cooperation of the Soviet Union—which we would welcome—to bring this matter to the negotiating table where it ought to be and where a fair and just settlement can be reached."

V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND VIETNAM, 1966

Although Viet-Nam was not on the agenda of the 21st General Assembly (September-December 1966), the conflict was extensively discussed in the general debate. The U.S. statement, delivered by Ambassador Goldberg on September 22, contained a statement of U.S. views regarding a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam. The Ambassador stated that the United States: (1) was prepared to stop bombing North Viet-Nam "the moment we are assured, privately or otherwise, that this step will be answered promptly by a corresponding and appropriate de-escalation on the other side"; (2) stood ready "to withdraw its forces as others withdraw theirs" and favored "international machinery . . . to ensure effective supervision of the withdrawal"; and (3) as President Johnson has said, did not consider the question of the place of the Viet Cong in negotiations "an insurmountable problem."

He continued: "The only workable formula for a settlement will be one which is just to the basic interests of all who are involved. In this spirit, we welcome discussion of this question either in the Security Council, where the United States itself has raised the matter, or here in the General Assembly, and we are fully prepared to take part in any such discussion. We earnestly solicit the further initiative of any organ, including the Secretary-General, or any Member of the United Nations whose influence can help in this cause. Every Member has a responsibility to exercise its power and influence for peace; and the greater its power and influence, the greater is this responsibility."

Nearly every other general debate statement also touched upon Viet-Nam. The statements by the Eastern Europeans again demonstrated the continuing opposition of the Communist states to any United Nations involvement in Viet-Nam. Among the statements made by non-communist members in the general debate, only a few expressed the view that the United Nations could play any immediate role in bringing about negotiations or a cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam.

In his closing speech to the Assembly on December 20, General Assembly President Pazhwak (Afghanistan) also touched upon Viet-Nam. After stating his view that "it is obvious the United Nations cannot intervene in any way in the war in Viet-Nam," Pazhwak made a personal appeal to all the parties directly involved to declare ". . . not only a statement of their positions with reservations but also as a commitment to all the nations of the world and to humanity as a whole their unconditional willingness to seek only a peaceful solution and their readiness to establish appropriate contacts for discussions about the terms of negotiations."

Ambassador Goldberg issued a statement the following day welcoming this appeal and "affirming strongly the unconditional willingness of the United States to seek a peaceful settlement and to engage in discussions to this end."

There was no response to the President's appeal from other members of the United Nations, or other parties to the conflict.

VI. VIETNAM AND THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

In the face of the unwillingness of two permanent members of the Security Council (the USSR and France) to take formal action in the Council, we encouraged the Secretary-General to take steps to bring about discussions which could lead to a mutual cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam, requesting him to "take whatever steps you consider necessary to bring about the necessary discussions which could lead to such a cease-fire" and pledging the full cooperation of the United States Government.

We also welcomed the Secretary-General's suggestion of an extended cease-fire in Viet-Nam; expressed our belief that the temporary truces already arranged for the holidays offered opportunities for initiatives in this regard; and stated that such a cease-fire would obviously include a cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam, as well as an end to all hostilities and organized violence

in South Viet-Nam. In a letter to the Secretary-General of December 31, 1966, Ambassador Goldberg stated that the U.S. is "ready to order a prior end to all bombing of North Viet-Nam the moment there is an assurance, private or otherwise, that there would be a reciprocal response toward peace from North Viet-Nam". Ambassador Goldberg reiterated his hope that the Secretary-General would use every means at his disposal to determine "what tangible response there would be from North Viet-Nam in the wake of such a prior step toward peace on our part." The United States, he concluded, was heartened by the Secretary-General's assurance that he would continue to explore every avenue toward a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam.

VII. NEW PROPOSAL BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, MARCH 1967

On March 14, 1967, the Secretary-General presented to the parties directly involved in Viet-Nam, including the United States, a three-step proposal—a proposal made public by the Secretary-General at a press conference on March 28.

In his March 14 Aide Memoire, the Secretary-General said he: ". . . has now in mind proposals envisaging three steps: (a) a general stand-still truce; (b) preliminary talks; (c) reconvening of the Geneva Conference. In the view of the Secretary-General, a halt to all military activities by all sides is a practical necessity if useful negotiations are to be undertaken. Since the Secretary-General's three-point plant has not been accepted by the parties, he believes that a general stand-still truce by all parties to the conflict is now the only course which could lead to fruitful negotiations."

An interim reply to the Secretary-General's proposal was delivered by Ambassador Goldberg on March 15, and the definitive U.S. reply was given to the Secretary-General by Ambassador Goldberg on March 18.

The U.S. reply of March 18, after recalling approaches made to Hanoi over a period of months to end the conflict in Viet-Nam, stated:

". . . the United States accepts the three-step proposal in the Aide Memoire of the Secretary-General of 14 March 1967 envisaging: (a) a general stand-still truce; (b) preliminary talks; (c) reconvening of the Geneva Conference.

"The United States believes it would be desirable and contributory to serious negotiations if an effective cessation of hostilities, as the first element in the three-point proposal, could be promptly negotiated.

"It would, therefore, be essential that the details of such a general cessation of hostilities be discussed directly by both sides, or through the Secretary-General, the Geneva Conference Co-Chairmen or otherwise as may be agreed. The United States is prepared to enter into such discussions immediately and constructively.

"The United States is also prepared to take the next steps in any of the forms suggested by the Secretary-General to enter into preliminary talk leading to agreement as to the modalities for reconvening of the Geneva Conference.

"Of course, the Government of South Viet-Nam will have to be appropriately involved throughout this entire process. The interests and views of our allies would also have to be taken fully into account.

"The United States again expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his untiring efforts to help bring about a peaceful settlement and an end to the conflict in Viet-Nam."

TIME OF FAMINE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, several members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have had the opportunity to read the book "Famine, 1975" by William and Paul Paddock. This book will soon be available in book stores and deals with the food population crisis.

Prof. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research of State University of New York at Buffalo, at my request has written to me commenting on the facts and conclusions of the book. I am presenting the text of his letter at this point in the RECORD:

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N.Y., May 17, 1967.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: Following upon our conversation in the Rayburn Building on May 15, I am about 95% in agreement with the facts and conclusions in the soon-to-be-published book, "Famine—1975!" by William and Paul Paddock. I am quite familiar with many of the countries discussed in this book, including India, Pakistan, Philippines, Egypt, Peru and others, and I believe the Paddocks' conclusions are sound and as accurate as looking-into-the-future can be.

The basic conclusion in this book is that widespread starvation is coming in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America within the next 5 to 10 years and that it is already too late to prevent this. The best that we and the affected countries can do at this stage is to try to reduce the impact of this developing situation by speeding up agricultural production programs and population control programs during the years immediately ahead.

The Paddocks call the period beginning about 1975 the Time of Famines. This may sound somewhat melodramatic, but I believe it is an accurate description of what lies ahead. As the Paddocks point out, the Time of Famines is likely to last for several decades and be accompanied by widespread political turmoil. The United States foreign aid program and the countries' own self-help programs cannot be expected to have any massive impact on this situation for the next five, or even ten years, but these programs could have an important effect in making the 1980's and the 1990's less turbulent than they otherwise would be.

The parts of the book that I am not in complete agreement with the Paddocks are (1) that India is beyond saving and (2) the inevitability of the United States having to apply the "triage" concept to our foreign aid. India is going to have a very tough time for the next 5 to 10 years. India's present programs of population control and agricultural development do not seem likely to prevent this. But if these programs are accelerated in the near future, India could begin to improve her situation significantly some time between 1975 and 1980. This will take a much larger volume of aid from the industrialized countries than they have been receiving during the past few years.

To illustrate: I understand our total foreign aid to Taiwan has been something like $3 billion. Since the population of India is 40 times the population of Taiwan, a proportional amount in India would be $120 billion. But our total foreign aid to India has been only $8 billion, including the heavy food aid of the past two years. Other countries have given a good deal of aid to India also. But altogether it hasn't been enough in relation to the magnitude of India's problems.

The "triage" concept is a brutal approach, and I hope and trust that the United States will never have to apply this concept to our foreign aid program. But our resources, great as they are, are nevertheless limited, and it is possible that we may come to this some day. There is still considerable scope for increasing the agricultural output of the United States as also there is in Canada, Australia, Argentina, U.S.S.R., and some other countries. But if we ever do have to apply "triage," my prediction is that it would lead to a degree of political turmoil never before seen in modern history.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND EWELL,
Vice President for Research.

THE TRUTH IS EMERGING FROM THE FOG OF FALSE CHARGES

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this body is debating an historical issue, the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

As the American people have learned the past month, the issue has been purposely hidden under a smokescreen of false assertions about my amendment, issued by the administration. Despite the false issues injected into this fundamental debate, the main issue is this: Will the Nation continue to vest more and more power in Washington, or will be begin to return some control of our destinies to State and local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert a few of the many letters, newspaper articles, and newspaper editorials that have come to my attention. Their tenor is that the block-grant approach, embodied in my amendment to ESEA, is superior to the present approach.

The following letter appeared in the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch for May 13, 1967:

QUIE'S APPROACH

ST. PAUL.

Why are many of the proponents of the so-called "creative federalism" complaining so loudly about Rep. Quie's proposal to let the states decide (with final government approval) where the federal funds for education should be spent? If they would read a recent speech by Rep. MacGregor. I would think that they could even be convinced that Rep. Quie's bill makes sense.

According to MacGregor, under the present bill, the 10 wealthiest counties in the U.S. receive 3.3 million more in aid for education than the 10 poorest counties. Even more incredible the poor counties contained 48,000 "impoverished" children, 12,000 more than the wealthiest. The school districts in MacGregor's district, even though getting 20 per cent of the total state aid which is allotted according to income, received only three per cent of the federal aid paid to the state. Equally amazing were such situations as Wayzata and Hopkins which ranked 13 and 18 in priority for state aid being ranked 3 and 4 for federal priority.

Rep. Quie should be congratulated for his constructive approach in solving the present chaos existing in federal aid to education, which Rep. MacGregor has characterized in the title of his speech—"Robin Hood in Reverse."

T. W. CARLSON.

A growing number of newspapers are presenting a balanced view of the debate. Among them is the Minneapolis, Minn., Star, which published the following article on May 5, 1967:

QUIE SAYS PLAN WOULD NOT SHORTCHANGE PAROCHIAL OR DEPRIVED PUPILS

(By Walter Johnson)

Could a state shortchange parochial school pupils and teachers, if the "Quie plan" revising federal aid to education were passed?

No, says Rep. Albert Quie, R–Minn., whose proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is giving heartburn to the administration.

Actually, says Quie, the administration is deliberately distorting his suggestions. He says, for instance, that the amendment would not reduce the program for deprived children, as is claimed. Quie says this about his proposal:

"At least 50 per cent of the funds in any state must be used for special programs for educationally deprived children in which arrangements for the participation of children enrolled in private (parochial) schools must be included; in fact, our amendment spells out the extent of such arrangements more fully than does the language of the present ESEA . . .

"Also, at least 7 per cent of such funds must be used for the provision of textbooks and other instructional materials for the use of pupils and teachers in both public and private schools. Under our amendment, unlike ESEA, such materials could include laboratory and other instructional equipment on a loan basis for the use of private school pupils and teachers."

Against the claim his plan would run into state constitutional barriers, Quie says it provides a "by-pass" mechanism, similar to that in the school lunch program, in which the U.S. commissioner would arrange for such loans of textbooks, materials and equipment in the state on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to that state.

The block grants, in the Quie plan, would include Title I, special programs for educationally deprived children; Title II, textbooks and library resources; Title III, supplemental educational centers, and Title V, aid to state educational agencies (Title VI—assistance for the education of handicapped children—would be continued as a separate program exactly as proposed in the committee bill, Quie says. Title IV is an amendment to the Co-operative Research Act and is also unaffected).

So instead of discontinuing the programs authorized by these titles, Quie says, the amendment would extend authority for them on a continuing basis, rather than for a year or two as proposed in the committee bill, but "each state would be free to establish its own priorities for the use of funds among these programs, and have added flexibility to devise new programs to meet needs not anticipated in ESEA."

This would be done through a single state plan submitted to the U.S. commissioner of education, rather than through a whole series of separate applications.

He scoffs at the idea that the inner city schools of some major urban areas, or of impoverished rural schools, might be treated unfairly. Actually, he claims, the distribution of funds within each state would be far more responsive to urgent educational needs than under the existing act "which tends to scatter funds into every school district."

The amendment, he said would require that the state plan for the use of the funds "contains assurances that the highest priority in the use of the funds will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and geographic isolation and economic depression in certain areas of the state."

The U.S. commissioner of education would have final approval, and, says Quie, simply would not approve a state plan which ignored such factors in the distribution of funds.

Quie also makes the point that this isn't any particularly new approach. The state plan device has operated for 40 years, he says, in distributing funds under the Vocational Education Act, and for nearly 10 years under the National Defense Education Act, as well as under a host of other federal programs. Actually, he points out, it is the device used under ESEA for Titles II, V and VI

As my colleagues are well aware, for a time some weeks ago the attacks on my amendment by national columnists reached unusual proportions. For example, in a single day I was attacked by no less than three columnists. Despite these often personal attacks, I believe the truth has been transmitted to the people of the Nation through such articles as the following, which appeared on May 14, 1967, in the Chicago Tribune:

REPRESENTATIVE QUIE LEARNS THAT A JOHNSON "TORNADO" IS A REAL ARM TWISTER—CALLED SABOTEUR OF EDUCATION LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, May 13.—A dairy farmer from Minnesota has suddenly found himself thrust into the eye of a violent tornado that is bringing the first real test of administration strength in the 90th Congress.

The almost frightening power of an agitated White House, obviously fearful of defeat, has been brought to bear against Rep. Albert Quie (R., Minn.), the author and sponsor of the Quie amendment to the administration's elementary and secondary education act.

Attacks against Quie by President Johnson and top administration officials were joined this week by several syndicated columnists and network commentators.

DESCRIBED AS CRAFTY

One described him as "crafty" and characterized his amendment as a "ripper amendment" to the education act. Another accused him of "trying to sabotage federal aid to education," and a third described the Quie amendment as "a booby trap."

Quie, a mild-mannered man of 43, whose first love was soil chemistry before he became interested in politics, is not bothered by the attacks.

"These people don't want to look at the merits of the legislation, but are just interested in discrediting us personally," he said.

AMENDMENT IS SUBSTITUTE

Quie's amendment, in effect a substitute for the administration bill, would consolidate four categorical aid programs for elementary and secondary schools into one single grant with each state handling the money and dividing it among its school districts.

The administration plan would extend present programs, which provide aid directly from the federal office of education to the individual school districts.

Floor action on the bill has been delayed by the Democratic leadership three times. But it will be brought to the floor May 22. Democratic leaders had admitted they were "not sure we have the votes."

CITES ADMINISTRATION MUSCLE

Quie, a political realist, is not boasting of a sure victory. "When you see the kind of muscle they [the administration] display, it's impossible to be too confident."

The attack against the Republican measure, and against Quie personally, has been led by President Johnson, who accused the Republicans of playing partisan politics with the education of our children and of "reviving ancient and bitter feuds between church and public school leaders."

The President's attack was supplemented by similar charges from top cabinet level officials and from Harold Howe, commissioner of education.

Rep. Charles Goodell [R., N.Y.] is Quie's ally on the House education and labor committee. Quie has been "subjected to the full force of the Johnson juggernaut," he said.

CALLS IT UNSETTLING

"To come under the full blast of the . . . Johnson juggernaut is an unsettling experience to say the least," said Goodell.

Republicans have denied charges that the legislation would cut off aid to parochial schools and insist it would actually remove some restrictions now imposed against providing funds for private institutions.

Quie, a navy pilot during World War II, said he is "anxious to get out there and fight the battle" on the floor of the House. "It's hard to get any of my other work done anymore," he complained. "I seem to spend all my time putting out fires of misinformation that the administration starts."

RISES IN RANK

Quie has risen steadily among Republican lawmakers during his 10 years in the House and now is the second ranking Republican on the education committee. His amendment, and its apparent chances for success, has made him the symbol of resistance to the Great Society, a program that President Johnson is not about to see damaged without a fight.

Altho active on the education committee since 1959, Quie tasted his first national fame in 1965, when he exposed a program, hailed by the administration as a chance for poor students to work in the post-office department, as actually an opportunity for more political patronage.

He revealed that about one-third of the 8,000 hired came from well-to-do families with political connections.

But that scrap couldn't compare with his present battle.

CHANGES HIS MAJOR

Quie had little idea of the road that lay ahead when he was first exposed to politics as a student at St. Olaf college in Northfield, Minn. He became active in the Young Republicans group there and changed his major from soil chemistry to political science.

After college, he returned to the family farm near Dennison, a farming community of about 150 persons, 60 miles northwest of Rochester. He stayed on the farm, even after being elected state senator in 1954, and moved off only after being elected to Congress in a special election in February, 1958.

"We still milk 48 cows on the farm," he said. "We have a renter living on it."

While still in college, which was only 17 miles from his home, Quie was named to the board of a one-room rural school district. He was the prime mover in getting it consolidated with an adjacent district to provide better educational facilities for the students.

"Education has always been my main interest," said Quie, a remarkably candid legislator who could hardly be called "crafty" by anyone who knew him. "I really believe we'll solve more of our problems in the world thru education than any other way.

"And education is, of course, the respon-

sibility of the government, at some level," he said.

UPROAR SURPRISES HIM

Quie admits surprise at the uproar that his amendment has caused. "I offered practically the same amendment to the education bill last year," he explained. "It was defeated on the floor. But there was no great uprising about it."

"Of course, we did have an election last fall, which showed that the mood of the country has changed," he continued. "Now that we have a chance to get this basic philosophy of state control written into the law, I suppose we should have expected the administration to oppose it on all fronts."

The following article appeared in the Washington Star for May 14, 1967:

LEADS FIGHT ON SCHOOL AID BILL: GOP'S QUIE—A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

(By Shirley Elder)

Al Quie is either a scoundrel or a savior; either out to wreck the Johnson administration's massive school aid program or to preserve the educational integrity of the states; either a political opportunist or a devoted worker for the spread of learning.

He says he's a farmer.

But he also says he has been interested in both education and politics since college days when a chance meeting with campus Young Republicans drew him away from soil chemistry and into political science.

Quie, a Minnesotan in his sixth House term, does look a little like a farmer. He could just as easily be an oarsman for the Harvard crew. He is tall and lean and tanned and sort of earnest-looking.

LEADS THE CHARGE

And he is, right now, in the middle of one of the hottest congressional fights of the year, leading the charge against President Johnson's proposed $3.3 billion extension of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Quie has offered an amendment to the bill that would change the direction of the entire program. Existing projects still would be financed, he is quick to explain, but basic decisions would be made by state schools officials instead of the federal government's Office of Education.

The "Quie Bill," formally unveiled April 20, attracted so much attention and support so quickly that House Democratic leaders were fearful.

The President attacked the Quie bill. Majority Leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma attacked the bill. Rep. Carl Perkins of Kentucky, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Educational associations attacked it. The Catholics attacked it. And still, at the end of three weeks, there was some question of which side had the votes, Quie or the administration.

"Finally," Quie said, "they had to resort to personal attacks."

Quie came to Congress in 1958 at the age of 34. He served three years in the state senate and, while still commuting between the Quie family's 240-acre Long Furrow Farm and St. Olaf College, he was a member of the local school board. It was not too demanding an assignment, he says. There was only one school with one room, but it was a start.

His home district in the southwest corner of Minnesota is largely rural although it contains some suburbs of Minneapolis. The largest city is Rochester and the Quie farm, now run by tenants, is near Dennison. The farm has 48 cows.

As if to keep contact with his farm background, Quie has an oversized calendar from the Farmer's State Bank in Hope, Minn., on a wall of his office. It is curiously out of place among the fine modern paintings done by the congressman's wife, Gretchen.

Quie's congressional life these days is a frenzy. There are strategy meetings, an avalanche of mail to answer and a series of denials to be issued.

For instance, Quie denies that his bill is designed to attract Southern Democratic votes with a subtle promise that the administration's tough desegregation guidelines would not be enforced. The Civil Rights Act still would be in effect, Quie says, no matter which party's education plan is enacted. In the quiet of his office, however, Quie says he expects the Southerners to stick with him.

CITES BYPASS PROVISION

Quie also denies his bill would cut off funds to private and parochial schools by channeling federal grants through state agencies, which are sometimes inclined (and sometimes legally-bound) to limit public funds to public schools. Quie says his proposal contains the same "bypass" language as the administration bill. In both cases, money for private and parochial schools would be handed out by a local agency acting as an intermediary between the federal government and the private school.

Quie denies his bill would mean less money for many states and for poor children anywhere. On the contrary, he says, the bill provides more money for everyone.

Quie says his bill would ease the "burdensome paperwork" demanded by existing federal programs. Basic decisions would be made at the state level, not in Washington, although projects now underway would continue.

Education aside, the Quie bill offers Republicans a first real chance to challenge President Johnson's Great Society.

Republicans already are eyeing the antipoverty program, labor bills, federal-state tax sharing and Opportunity Crusade. The "crusade" is a plan drafted by Quie and Rep. Charles Goodell, R-N.Y., to involve private industry in the antipoverty effort.

"If we win this first fight," Quie says, "it will set a pattern for the 90th Congress. People flock to join a winner."

I also wish to include an editorial from my hometown newspaper. It appeared in the Northfield, Minn., News for May 11, 1967:

QUIE'S EDUCATION PROPOSAL MAKES SENSE

The educational proposal of Minnesota's First District congressman, Albert H. Quie, has been attacked from several sources, most notably by the Johnson administration—but the House bill makes sense to us.

The bill would extend the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but there would be some changes made. The Quie plan would grant federal aid to states in blocks—general aid—rather than for specific purposes—categorical aid with certain guidelines. The state departments of education would then pretty much determine how the aid would be distributed within the state, Congressman Quie and his Republican supporters feeling that the state departments have far more insight into the actual and comparative needs within their states than can anyone in Washington.

A check with John H. Longstreet, superintendent of Northfield schools, revealed that he believes the plan would operate well. "It's the fair way of doing it," he said, and added that the plan would eliminate great amounts of "red tape" in addition to being more fair to small districts within a state.

Northfield's city engineer, Karl Burandt, who has been involved in applying for different types of federal grants for the city of Northfield in the past few years, heartily endorsed the principle of the Quie proposal.

He drew a parallel, showing how effective Northfield's efforts have been in obtaining grants for necessary utilities and city planning when federal funds have been allocated through the state's Department of Health; and how difficult, even impossible it has been to obtain a federal grant for a necessary sanitary sewer when the grant would be of the categorical type.

The Minnesota Department of Education supports the Quie proposal, the commissioner evidently feeling that the department could do an adequate job with the funds. The Minneapolis school administration firmly opposes the bill, clearly expressing the opinion that the metropolitan schools would not receive as much aid as they now get should the Quie bill be adopted. Large cities can, of course, afford to lobby effectively for hunks of the federal pie. Minneapolis claims to be in dire financial need, but so are some of the outstate areas.

Although the bill has been under the attack of some church groups, Mr. Quie has repeatedly asserted that it would in no way reduce federal aid to private school students.

In a statement made Monday, Mr. Quie said that the primary purpose of the bill is "to save local educators from the deluge of paper work which now engulfs them. It would give states and local communities a voice in setting priorities of their own educational needs, rather than depending as much on the United States Commissioner of Education."

He said that the amendment would not reduce aid to needy large school districts or to needy small school districts. "It would not weaken civil rights guide lines nor does it strengthen civil rights guide lines. It does not reduce aid for private school children," he asserted.

I also want to include an editorial which gets to the heart of the debate as it states:

At issue is a simple question: Who shall decide how Federal funds for education will be spent in each state? The Federal government or the State Government?

The editorial appeared in the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer for May 4, 1967:

WHO CONTROLS SCHOOL AID?

The future course of state and federal authority in this nation could well be determined by a debate now going on in the U.S. House.

At issue is a simple question: Who shall decide how federal funds for education will be spent in each state? The federal government or the state government?

President Johnson strongly opposes a Republican effort to change his federal school aid law so that states would assume control of how the federal money is spent.

Harold Howe, U.S. commissioner of education, whose office supervises the funds at present, says the Republican amendment "raises serious questions about the continuity of major reforms in education launched by the Congress two years ago."

The Office of Education naturally wants to retain control. Its spokesmen say that if control passed to the individual state legislatures, there would be no assurance that disadvantaged children would receive the bulk of benefits; no guarantee that special programs such as the Teachers Corps and Head Start would be continued; and that it would even be possible for the states to reduce their own education budgets and substitute the federal money, with the schools realizing no additional funds.

Catholic leaders also oppose the state control bill because they fear some states would refuse to share federal funds with parochial pupils as is being done under the present supervision.

Rep. Albert Quie, Republican of Minnesota is sponsoring the state control amendment, and he has overwhelming backing from his own party, plus considerable support from Southern Democrats.

His proposal provides that the federal government make "block grants" to each state,

with the only requirement being that at least 50 per cent of funds be spent on "deprived" school districts.

Commissioner Howe charges that the "block grant" method would reduce the amount of money going to the poorer states, particularly those in the South, because a smaller percentage of the total amount would be earmarked for "deprived" districts.

The National Education Association, which was instrumental in securing passage of the first federal education fund act, and strongly supports federal financing, has expressed mixed emotions about the Quie amendment.

The Republican bill would not repeal the education act, NEA pointed out in its weekly news bulletin, "but it would severely limit the role played by the federal government in its administration.

"The states would be required to continue programs launched under the Act, but in a manner they saw fit, with the federal involvement primarily that of dispensing the money."

NEA admits that many school administrators like the idea of the block grants because it would reduce the voluminous paper work now necessary to qualify for and attain the federal money. About all some school officials have time to do at present is fill out forms for the government, and explain to federal inspectors how each dollar is being spent.

It might be assumed that Georgia's House delegation is all for the Quie plan. But that's not the case. They pay the usual allegiance to the principle of states rights and authority, but a report this week indicated they are "torn between" the two plans because they believe Georgia will get more money under the administration program.

Jack Nix, Georgia superintendent of education, told the delegation Monday that he hopes a compromise can be achieved, but that he would be "willing to stand a loss" of some funds in exchange for increased state control.

The administration, of course, proceeds on the theory that money will buy anything, and usually that theory stands up.

But this debate now going on in the House is the key to future state-federal relationships, and to how tax money is to be distributed for the benefit of all citizens.

The elimination of endless red tape, and the restoration of state control of all education funds are worthy goals.

If Georgia's congressmen believe in those goals they will support the Quie amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that "education transcends partisan politics." In the light of what has happened in the past month, it would be more accurate to say that "education should transcend partisan politics."

Unfortunately, education has not assumed its rightful place—free from the pressures and the counterpressures that men exert to gain partisan advantages. In recent weeks the present administration has descended to a low level to save face. The Great Society architects have resorted to any means to save their programs that have proven to be hastily drawn.

I am referring to the national campaign that the Johnson administration has launched to discredit my bill, H.R. 8983. It would amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to continue authorized programs after June 30, 1968, through block grants to the States. I have introduced this amendment with one purpose in mind, to improve the quality of education for many of our school pupils. The administration has deliberately misinterpreted my reasons for introducing H.R. 8983, because it believes the amendment is a challenge to the Great Society.

The administration gives itself away. It admits that many of the programs that it has foisted upon the American people were ill conceived. Many programs have cost taxpayers millions of dollars a year and have returned to them few real benefits. The administration knows that many of its programs can withstand neither the test of time nor close scrutiny. The administration has employed ruthless tactics to shift the focus away from the merits, or lack of merits, in what it offers. These tactics have roused fear in the hearts of millions of Americans. The administration has shown no mercy.

Millions of parents of private school children have been misled into believing the adoption of the block grant plan would mean the end of aid for their students. This is not true. The administration knows this is not true. But the stakes are high. The President's prestige and programs must be saved at all costs, even at the cost of playing upon the emotions of millions of men and women.

Millions have been told the adoption of the amendment would mean their children would be denied equal educational opportunities, that racial discrimination would find millions of Negro youngsters denied educational benefits that are rightfully theirs. This is not true. The administration knows this is not true.

But to an administration in whom the American people have shown an increasing lack of faith—to an administration that seeks "greatness" above all else—what does all of this matter?

The President has bitterly, and I must say, unfairly attacked my modified block-grant approach to Federal aid to school children. The basic question is: Should the U.S. Commissioner of Education gain more and more control over educational decisions? May I remind my colleagues there was a time when the President was vitally concerned with centralized control of education. For example, in August of 1958, in the debate over the National Defense Education Act, the President, then in the U.S. Senate, said:

> We do not want to encase our system in a totalitarian mold. Americans value deeply the traditional system under which the control of education will be in the hands of the local people who are affected. They rightly do not want to abandon that system. We are looking for a way through which help could be extended without the control of Federal bureaucracy.

Those were the words of the President in 1958.

My amendment to ESEA does just what the President spoke for in 1958. Under NDEA, as you know, each State adopts a statewide plan which is approved in Washington. That is what we propose in ESEA: a statewide plan. As the President said while he was in the Senate:

> We do not want to encase our system in a totalitarian mold.

Administration education amendments have been moving toward centralized control fashioned by the U.S. Office of Education, which seeks to make most of the decisions in Washington. Evidently, President Johnson could see the danger of Federal control in 1958, while he overlooks the danger in 1967.

The present law, with vast powers centralized in Washington, wastes untold dollars in bureaucratic redtape. Confusion and waste are bound to follow when some 25,000 school districts must try to find out what funds are available in each of the three separate categories in titles I, II, and III of ESEA. No matter how dedicated and brilliant are the Federal bureaucrats, they simply cannot understand the needs of 25,000 school units. My amendment will begin to simplify and improve Federal aid to the Nation's schoolchildren. It will permit more involvement in decisionmaking at the local and State levels, where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I observed that some 25,000, out of the active 27,000 school districts in the Nation, now deal directly in some programs with Washington. If every one of these districts, under titles I, II, and III of ESEA, applied for funds, the total number of decisions here would be 75,000.

Let us examine what happens under title III. That is to be funded for some $240 million next year, at the request of the administration. I know that there are at least 4,000 districts applying under this one title. The Office of Education has a grand total of 35 people to process the applications, of whom only a half dozen are executives who can make decisions.

No six men can give that many thousands of applications sound and careful scrutiny, for the average application involves no less than 200 man-hours of work to prepare. They are not simple requests. They are complex.

To survive this flood of paper, the six men "farm out" the requests to some 100 educational experts known as "readers." They do not work directly for the Office of Education. They do not coordinate their efforts. They work in all parts of the nation. As a result, there is no overall direction. The end result is a squandering of Federal aid funds.

Even the bureaucrats at last realized this could not continue. The Office of Education set up eight regional offices, supposedly to make decisions. I have been told by many educators most decisions still have to be bucked up to Washington, leaving the regional offices as another useless impediment to progress.

If the Office of Education believes decentralization is desirable, and they do because they set up the regional offices, why does the administration not simply join in supporting the Republican approach, the block-grant approach?

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration does not want the power and prestige to slip away from Washington. To be perfectly frank, those who have a vested interest in dispensing the billions of dollars in Federal aid do not want to relinquish the awesome power.

There is something about power that unsettles even the most modest and sensible man or woman. As Lord Acton remarked, absolute power corrupts absolutely. There is no denying that once power is tasted, it becomes sweet indeed.

It is difficult for any man to gracefully give up power.

That is at the heart, I believe, of much of the infighting that has gone on since my proposal was first announced late in April.

The designers of the Great Society sense their power may slip away. They are panicking, the John W. Gardners, the Harold Howes, and in the war on poverty, the Sargent Shrivers. There is a parallel here, between the great debate over Federal aid for schoolchildren and the coming debate over the war on poverty.

The architects of the Great Society sense that the outcome will set the tone for the coming debates over the Great Society concept of central control from Washington.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, so aptly pointed out last week, the administration's bill is the most unfair in history. Because of the inequities in title I of the present act, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Some of the very schools which can best afford to care for their disadvantaged children, get the most money from the Federal Government. Let us compare two school districts. One is New Rochelle, N.Y., which spends $896 a year on each pupil. This district can be fairly said to be comparatively wealthy, able to care for its own poor and disadvantaged. The other is Breathitt County, Ky., which spends only $285 a year per pupil. Under title I of the present act, however, New Rochelle receives $321,000 a year for 817 poor children. Breathitt County, Ky., receives only $340,00 a year for 2,125 poor children.

These inequities were uncovered in a penetrating series of editorials which appeared in the Boston Herald between January 2 and February 10, 1967, titled "The Rich Get Richer." It follows then that the poor get poorer.

Let us examine what happens as a result of this unfair distribution of aid under title I.

New Rochelle already had a full staff of remedial reading teachers, psychiatrists, and social workers before title I was enacted, yet the schools received $321,000 a year. The money issued, among other things, for Polaroid cameras and slide projectors, certainly not among the most desperately needed of educational tools.

Look now at Breathitt County in Kentucky. Most schools in the district are one-room schoolhouses without indoor plumbing. The $340,000 was used for free breakfasts for the large number of children who are suffering from malnutrition and to hire several high school teachers. But Breathitt County has no money left over for anything else, much less to purchase Polaroid cameras.

The writer of the series of editorials could only conclude: "This allocation procedure does not make sense," a sentiment with which I most certainly agree.

My amendment would correct such inequities. It allocates funds on the basis of the number of school-age children, with an equalizing factor based on the State personal income per school-age child, a much fairer formula. My amendment would permit each State to zero in on areas of educational need, where educationally deprived children are located.

Our forefathers, in constructing the Constitution, wisely separated the powers among the three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. As they understood the separation, the executive was to execute—to carry out the laws passed by the legislative branch, the Congress.

In the past 6 years, under both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, the separation of powers has been unbalanced. The executive has increasingly taken over the legislative work of the Congress. Now, the executive actually prepares nearly finished laws which the Congress is expected to rubberstamp.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out the ultimate result of the erosion of the power of the Congress. The present administration has come to believe it is allwise. It believes that it has only to propose and the Congress will rubberstamp.

Furthermore, because the present administration, as it proudly states, "wrote the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act," the President and his colleagues take an inordinate interest in its continuation. Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we are told, is the President's greatest achievement within the Great Society structure.

The result? Let the minority propose to aid education in another manner, as we have done in the Republican block-grant plan, and the reaction from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is extreme.

The President is piqued that anyone should be so bold as to propose another path to aid our schoolchildren. They are assailed by a host of false allegations. We are, at least by indirection, accused of being anti-Negro. We are accused of being against Federal aid to education. We are accused of deviously planning to take funds from poor States to give to rich States; of robbing Southern States for the benefit of Northern States; or craftily setting in motion a plan to strip funds from large cities for the benefit of small towns.

These charges, plainly false if the amendment is examined, in turn are repeated by national columnists. They have not taken the time to read and understand the Republican amendment.

Most deplorable, the delicate church-state issue has been deliberately injected into the debate. My colleagues are all too familiar with the extraordinary volume elicited by this false assertion.

The reason for this smokescreen of false assertions is this: We are proposing to take another road to Federal aid for the Nation's schoolchildren. We are trying to improve on his bill, his private creation. We dare to oppose his will. For that, we are assailed by a storm of false allegations.

Why? Is it because it would tarnish the record of the Great Society? In all frankness, which comes first: The welfare of our schoolchildren or the record of the Great Society?

We who support the block-grant plan are as sincerely interested in the welfare of schoolchildren as are those who support the administration method, the categorical grant method.

This is the outcome when the executive writes legislation and expects it to be rubberstamped by the Congress. These laws are no longer creations of the House and Senate. They are the handiwork of the executive. If this trend continues much longer, we will not remain three coequal branches of government. We will evolve into a 2½-branch Government, with the executive wagging an appendage once known as the Congress.

My colleagues, before we vote on this measure, I urge you to consider carefully our role as spelled out in the Constitution.

We are coequal with the other two branches of the Federal Government. We must never become a permanent rubberstamp. We must never allow ourselves to become another department in the executive branch, the department that subserviently rubberstamps decisions already made at the other end of that broad and beautiful avenue.

Mr. Speaker, before we vote on the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, let us ponder carefully the label "rubberstamp."

Let us pause. If the executive continues to send us prepacked bills for our supine approval, if we continue to truckle under to every demand of the executive, where will it end?

Will the Congress someday be just another department? A department on the same level as the Department of Labor or the Department of Agriculture?

Will these great bodies, the House and the Senate, someday be known as the "Department of Legislation"?

I ask you to earnestly think on this.

Shall we allow ourselves to be manipulated? Shall we stand passively by and allow our arms to be twisted whenever one of the Great Society programs is threatened?

I think not.

We will not be manipulated. We will stand up to the hidden pressures. We will not be subject to the well-known arm-twisting technique.

A well-known gentleman from Texas, late of this Congress, said:

> I am a free man first, a Texan second, next a citizen of the United States and finally, a Democrat.

We are all free men first. Let us act this week as free men should always act. Let us vote not as Democrats or Republicans and not as Representatives from New York or California or South Carolina or South Dakota.

Let us vote of deepest convictions.

Let us support the plan we sincerely believe will best aid the schoolchildren, especially the poor children, the disadvantaged children, the children who truly need Federal aid.

Remember the education of children when you cast your vote. It is their future we hold in our hands. The schoolchildren should not become the victims of political maneuvering.

DO NOT BLAME THE FARMER

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda campaign to blame the American farmer for rising food costs and higher food prices is being renewed. The facts, however, do not back this charge; they firmly refute it.

Even though retail food prices last year rose 35 percent above the 1947–49 average, prices paid to farmers actually were 2 percent below those paid in 1947–49.

A good example is wheat. In 1949, wheat sold for $2.75 per bushel and bread cost only two-thirds of what it costs today. Now, as of April 15, the price of wheat is $1.55 per bushel, but the price of bread has increased by one-third over the 1949 price. This would hardly seem to indicate that giving the farmer a fair return for his crop means that the consumer will be forced to pay higher food prices.

The facts show further that for every food dollar we spend, the farmer gets only 40 cents which is actually 10 cents less than he received two decades ago.

The farmer does not represent as many votes as his city cousin, but this fact should not be used as an excuse for blindly blaming the farmer for higher food costs.

The U.S. consumer pays less for food in comparison to total expenditures than in any other nation. But the prices received by farmers are only 72 percent of parity.

In short, the facts show the U.S. consumer is being highly subsidized by the farmer, something which should prompt more concern from all sectors toward the financial plight in rural America.

LOGAN ACT NEEDS CLARIFICATION

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that on February 18–20, 1965, at the Hilton Hotel in New York City, there was held a convocation on "Pacem in Terris," the encyclical of Pope John XXIII dealing with world peace. The convocation was counseled by Pope Paul XI that—

> Such solutions, of course, if based on the admirable doctrine of that Papal document, will exclude every ostensible remedy which ignores the existence and rights of the Creator.

It goes without saying that this advice was ignored and the convocation turned out to be a blatant political effort to push leftwing policies under the guise of a moral and religious mantle. The whole affair had been arranged by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, an offshoot of the Fund for the Republic, another left-leaning organization. Briefly, stated, the thrust of the convocation was to create disunity in religious circles, to unilaterally dismantle American military strength, and to withdraw the United States from its commitments to defend the free world from communism, beginning specifically with U.S. withdrawal from Southeast Asia. To those who were familiar with the background of the convocation, the undertaking was a monstrous joke in which the principle of peace with justice and freedom was distorted and degraded.

Evidently, the propaganda benefits of Pacem in Terris I were worth while, for next week, May 28–31, at Geneva, Switzerland, Pacem in Terris II will take place. The following article by the respected columnist, Alice Widener, documents thoroughly the backgrounds of those here in the United States who will participate. I agree with Miss Widener that it is high time that the Logan Act be explored for possible application in this case. If the law is unenforceable, then it should be revised to eliminate the incredible spectacle of American citizens possibly aiding an aggressor to dispatch more soldiers' coffins home from Vietnam.

I request that the article, "The Funded Four Hundred," which appeared in Barron's of May 22, 1967, and which was reprinted from the May issue of U.S.A. magazine, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

THE FUNDED FOUR HUNDRED—A NOTE ON NEXT WEEK'S "PEACE ON EARTH" MEETING IN GENEVA

(By Alice Widener)

Are the American people protected by a Logan Act? If so, does it protect us from the establishment in our country of a private foreign service in contradistinction to the U.S. Government Foreign Service?

These questions ought to be seriously studied and answers found, because the forthcoming Pacem in Terris II Convocation at Geneva, Switzerland, May 28–31, is an exercise in foreign policy sponsored by the tax-exempt Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., an organization in which the executive committee chairman, Mr. Harry S. Ashmore, speaks of himself and his associaties at the Center in terms of an elite intellectual group running what amounts to a privately financed foreign service "to do what governments ought to be doing and ultimately will have to do."

It is interesting to compare the substance of the Logan Act with the specific text and general context of Mr. Ashmore's remarks.

The Logan Act, adopted in 1799 and reinforced by Congress in 1948, never has been tested in our courts. It declares that any citizen of the United States who, without the authority of the U.S., directly or indirectly communicates or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government, or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the U.S., shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

Last January, Mr. Ashmore went with two companions to Hanoi, North Vietnam, to invite Ho Chi Minh to attend the Pacem in Terris II Convocation. (Pacem in Terris I took its title from Pope John XXIII's encyclical, was held in New York City in February 1965, and was conceived and sponsored by the Fund for the Republic's Center at Santa Barbara.) A few days after his return from Hanoi, Mr. Ashmore reported on his trip—described as a "mission" in the Center Diary—at a dinner in Los Angeles for Founding Members of the Center, each of whom contributes not less than $1,000 annually to it. Excerpts from his extemporaneous talks were edited for publication in the Center Diary of March-April 1967. Mr. Ashmore reports about seven days spent in North Vietnam:

"Toward the end of the week we had a private, hour-and-a half conversation with Ho Chi Minh, during which I presented the invitation to participate in the Center's Convocation in Geneva. The President (Ho) is a man of great charm, great sophistication, great intelligence."

Mr. Ashmore also found Ho "quite outgoing, quite frank," and said that, "He stated the Vietnamese (sic: not North Vietnamese) position without any particular rancor."

Though GIs are fighting and dying in defense of U.S. measures for protection of South Vietnam from the Hanoi regime's terrorism, Mr. Ashmore rates Ho Chi Minh, a man with whom he spent only 90 minutes, as tops on the worldwide list of statesmen. "I believe historically," says Mr. Ashmore, "he will rank with Gandhi, and it occurs to me there is nobody else around in the world today in any country who seems to provide a similar blend of spiritual and political power."

After this encomium, the Center's executive committee chairman got down to Funded business: "Our visit to Hanoi, and the possibility that the Vietnamese will participate in our Geneva Convocation vindicate the faith that we have had at the Center in this undertaking which, on its surface, seems a ridiculous attempt by a group of private people, without any government sanction or government backing, to do what governments ought to be doing and ultimately will have to do. We are in the rather absurd position of running what amounts to a privately financed, understaffed, and wholly unaccredited foreign service."

There appear to be several things wrong with Mr. Ashmore's strangely worded statement, which is a mixture of self-depreciation and supreme arrogance. The Fund for the Republic is financed through tax-exempt contributions which subtract from U.S. Government revenue money that otherwise would be a part of that revenue. Therefore, it is questionable whether tax-exempt financing can be regarded as "private" financing, for it is enjoyed at all Americans' expense.

The Fund for the Republic was created in 1953 by an outright grant of $15 million from the Ford Foundation. Subsequently, the latter publicly disavowed all connection with its controversial offspring, a notoriously left-of-center group. On the Fund's paid staff are such leftist political activists as W. H. Ferry, vice president of the Center, who in 1962 publicly attacked FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover at a Democratic Party meeting in such an ugly way that U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy publicly apologized to Mr. Hoover; Dr. Allan M. Butler, a former organizer of the Progressive Party in Massachusetts during the Henry Wallace campaign of 1948; Dr. Linus Pauling; Stanley K. Sheinbaum, who ran for office in California last year on the radical New Left ticket; and Harvey Wheeler, a sponsor of the New Left School in Los Angeles.

Last summer, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara was the birthplace of the radical National Conference for New Politics, a group described by the New York Times, May 7, 1967, as established to help the New Left "win political influence."

According to an official preview in the Center Diary, the Geneva Convocation will

discuss two political issues, "The Case of Vietnam" and "The Case of Germany." The essentially political nature of the Convocation is shown in the following statement: "Pacem in Terris II is taking place with the encouragement of officials at the United Nations and in response to the unanimous recommendations of a planning conference that met at the Palais des Nations in Geneva in May 1966. Its purpose is to assemble leading political and intellectual figures from countries throughout the world—East and West, Communist and non-Communist, aligned and unaligned—to examine in practical detail the requirements for nations to coexist in peace. Unlike Pacem in Terris I, which was attended by some 2,500 people, the present Convocation will be limited to 400 participants, who, in this wholly unofficial gathering, will not be limited by the necessity of speaking formally on behalf of their countries."

The new Funded Four Hundred will be addressed by two principal "unofficial" speakers, both bitterly critical of official U.S. policy in Vietnam: Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, and Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The Center Diary claims that "both Vietnams" will be represented at Geneva, but at this writing it is unlikely there will be such dual participation, and originally, it seems the plans were less objective.

The Republic of Vietnam Embassy in Washington, D.C. gave me the following statement on May 5: "The Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions first invited Ho Chi Minh and the National Liberation Movement (Viet Cong) leader to the forthcoming Pacem in Terris II Convocation in Geneva. No invitation was extended to our Government. We protested. After our strong protest was made, an invitation to our Government was extended but no decision has yet been reached in Saigon on the reply of the Republic of Vietnam."

Among the 400 private participants in the forthcoming Convocation at Geneva are U.S. Senators Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania and Albert Gore of Tennessee. Together with Sen. Fulbright, that makes three U.S. Senatorial opponents of U.S. policy in Vietnam and not a single Senatorial supporter of it. Other Americans taking part are J. Kenneth Galbraith, chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action; Jerome B. Wiesner, Dean of Science, M.I.T.; and Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago—all sentence-first, verdict-afterwards intellectuals on the subject of Vietnam.

Interestingly, almost all the Funded Four Hundred invited to attend the Pacem in Terris Convocation are members of what the Washington Post described, April 2, 1967, as "the Liberal Establishment." Instead of living it up on their private funds, as did the old Four Hundred in New York and international society, the modern Funded Four Hundred, many of whom are socialists or Communists, have discovered the art of living it up on tax-exempt funds furnished by dead or living capitalists.

Pacem in Terris I—says the Washington Post—was subsidized by several foundations, including the Johnson Foundation of Racine, Wis. Pacem in Terris II—continues The Post, while raising a question of propriety—will be subsidized by a gift of $400,000 from a foundation established by Mr. Bernard J. Cornfeld's Investors Overseas Service (IOS), an immense Panamanian-chartered financial outfit with headquarters in Geneva, which operates the Fund of Funds and is currently under investigation by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Thereby hangs a tale, says the Washington Post.

Under the headline "Peace Parley Financed by SEC Target," the Washington Post reported about Pacem in Terris II: "The Swiss-based Panamanian-chartered syndicate known as International Overseas Services, Ltd., S.A. . . . will pay most of the conference expenses, it will utilize the same staff and facilities that it maintains for its worldwide business operations to help organize the peace conference. . . . At a Los Angeles dinner held last February 7, Robert M. Hutchins, the Center's president, raised about $100,000 in cash to help . . . the costs of the conference. However, Hutchins and the conference chairman, Harry S. Ashmore, estimate that their venture will cost at least $500,000. The IOS Foundation, the Syndicate's charitable trust, will underwrite the remaining $400,000 . . ."

The dinner at which Mr. Hutchins raised $100,000 in cash was the same occasion on which Mr. Ashmore eulogized Ho Chi Minh.

The IOS Foundation derives its funds from 5% of net profits set aside from IOS, a global network of 80 companies, known in financial circles as "The Geneva Syndicate" and operating The Fund of Funds, which invests in mutual funds in the United States.

Bernard J. Cornfeld, founder and chief executive of IOS, is an American expatriate and former Philadelphia social welfare case worker who now resides in Geneva. The SEC has been investigating the Wall Street dealings of the Cornfeld-led investment empire for nearly two years. Last year the SEC accused IOS of violating U.S. securities laws by selling unregistered securities in the United States as well as to Americans living abroad. "The Fund of Funds would already be illegal," says the Washington Post, "if it operated directly in the United States, where a mutual fund is barred from putting more than 3% of its assets into another mutual fund." Reliable sources say it is probable the IOS, now involved in out-of-court discussions with the SEC, will soon come to an arrangement in conformity with SEC recommendations.

The Washington Post says that last January, Mr. Morris L. Levinson, a New York City businessman and director of the fund for the Republic who formerly was finance chairman of the Center, recommended to Mr. Robert M. Hutchins that Mr. Cornfeld might be willing to provide financial aid for Pacem in Terris II. A few days later, Mr. Levinson learned that former Congressman James Roosevelt had resigned from his post as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Economic and Social Council in order to become president of IOS Management Co., a Bahama-chartered, Swiss-based subsidiary that manages The Fund of Funds, Ltd., which is incorporated in Canada. Mr. Levinson told Mr. Hutchins the news about Mr. Roosevelt, and since the latter two were old acquaintances, Mr. Roosevelt went to Mr. Cornfeld with an appeal to finance Pacem in Terris II.

The IOS-Fund for the Republic interlock then became somewhat more complicated. The IOS not only contributed money to Pacem in Terris II but also contributed public relations services. Mr. James Roosevelt appears to be acting in an on-and-off-scenes capacity, for the Washington Post discovered that while his official executive position in IOS is not revealed in the Pacem in Terris II promotional literature, Mr. Roosevelt will serve as secretary-general of the Fund for the Republic's Convocation in Geneva.

In an exclusive story, The Post reported: "In a telephone interview from Geneva, Roosevelt said: 'Cornfeld has a keen interest in social matters. He was a social worker himself and he's got that kind of a conscience.' When Roosevelt was asked whether Cornfeld hoped the $400,000 would help to brighten an image that might have been tarnished by the SEC investigation, he replied, 'That never entered our minds. Of course, if it's a by-product, we won't be unhappy.'"

Not explained in this colloquy is how a financial enterprise involved in a dispute with a U.S. Government agency, the SEC, could improve its image by financing an international conference consisting of participants notoriously opposed to present U.S. Government foreign policy.

It is hard to see how a financier's image could be improved by supporting the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

There is a tight interlock between the Center Staff and the New Left's National Conference for New Politics. The Center's vice president, W. H. Ferry, and its secretary treasurer, Hallock Hoffman, are both on the national council of National Conference for New Politics. So is Irving F. Laucks, a consultant to the Center. The radical activities of NCNP are such that The Times carried the headline, "Trends of New Left Alarm Intellectuals of the Old." and quoted an Old Leftist as saying the New Left is displaying "a growing fascination with violence."

Just exactly how the New Leftists on the executive staff of the Fund for the Republic's Center reconcile their NCNP activities with "peace" in their role as members of a private foreign service is not explained.

The Fund for the Republic's Center at Santa Barbara (now the Fund's sole operational activity) denies emphatically that the IOS subsidy will in any way influence the policies or activities of the group sponsoring Pacem in Terris II. The Washington Post reports that the Center's "legal network" conducted a satisfactory confidential private investigation of IOS and of Mr. Cornfeld's problems with the SEC. This legal network ought to be very well informed, for it is composed of top talent. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas is board chairman of the Fund for the Republic, a consultant to the Center, and a fund raiser for it. There has been considerable discussion of the propriety in his triple role. Now that IOS has entered into the Funded picture there is even more discussion of Justice Douglas' intimate connection with the Fund for the Republic.

There is no doubt that the Center's private foreign service is closely in touch with foreign governments and agents and officials thereof. The Center Diary for March-April says that as of press time, the following persons had accepted invitations to be panel members at Pacem in Terris II: Chief S. O. Adebo, Permanent Representative of Nigeria at the United Nations; Vladimer Bakaric, Member, Federal Assembly, Yugoslavia; Hubert Beuve-Mery, manager, Le Monde (Paris newspaper); Lord Chalfont, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, United Kingdom; M. J. Desai, former director, Indian Foreign Service, East-West Institute, Hawaii; Sen. J. William Fulbright; Galo Plaza, former President of Ecuador; Josef Hromadka, Dean, Comenius Faculty, Prague, Czechoslovakia; David Horowitz, Governor, Bank of Israel; Masamichi Inoki, professor of political science, University of Kyoto, Japan; N. N. Inozemtsev, Director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences, USSR; Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand; Paul Lin, professor of history, McGill University; M. D. Millionshchikov, Vice President, USSR Academy of Sciences; Nugroho, Department of Foreign Affairs, Indonesia; Abdul Rahman Pazhwak, UN General Assembly President, Rep. of Afghanistan to UN; Chester A. Ronning, former Canadian High Commissioner in India; Princess Moun Souvanna Phouma, Laos; Willy Spuhler, Federal Councillor, Switzerland; Arsene Usher Assouan, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Ivory Coast; Secretary General U Thant of United Nations.

Concerning the foregoing list, it is significant that Inozemtsev of the Soviet Union is now an official consultant to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Among the persons listed by the Center Diary as having accepted invitation to Pacem in Terris II are such noted Communists as

physicist Leopold Infeld and Adam Schaff of Poland, and such noted Socialists as Pietro Nenni of Italy and Pastor Martin Niemoller of West Germany, who recently won a Lenin Peace Prize.

Judging by the Diary preview of Pacem in Terris II, it is not unreasonable to predict that all the force of the Funded Four Hundred's left-of-center propaganda will be hurled against the United States from a Geneva launching site. It is quite likely that Vice President Hubert Humphrey will again have tears in his eyes at the image of our country presented to the world by a vocal minority of Americans abroad. After all, we at home know what to expect from Sen. J. William Fulbright. But when he presides over sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the substance of his remarks can be challenged by witnesses from our State Department and the U.S. Foreign Service. In Geneva, however, it is most unlikely that there will be present an accredited U.S. Government official or even private citizen to challenge his deliberately soft-spoken but highly intemperate remarks.

Can any nation tolerate the existence of a private foreign service dealing with a Funded Four Hundred aiming at control over foreign policy and international diplomacy?

Are Americans actually protected by a Logan Act which wisely forbids citizens of the United States to carry on any correspondence or intercourse with any officer or agent of a foreign government in relation to disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat measures of our country?

If Americans are not protected by it, then it is high time for us to discover that we are not. If we are so protected, then it is more than high time for the Logan Act to be tested in our courts to determine whether the Funded Four Hundred are violating it.

CONGRESSMAN WHALEN INTRODUCES A RESOLUTION FOR THE CREATION OF A WORLD FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, the Kennedy round tariff negotiations were concluded successfully. After over 4 years, the representatives of 53 nations, which account for 80 percent of the world's trade, participated in this accord.

The results, according to Eric Wyndham White, director-general of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—are "of far greater magnitude than those obtained in any previous trade negotiations."

The goal of tariff reduction is to achieve a more effective utilization of international productive resources. This, in turn, improves living standards, both domestically and globally. Thus, the GATT agreement represents a significant move toward the attainment of a long-range, worldwide prosperity.

Despite the successful outcome of the Kennedy round, several trade policy issues remain unresolved:

First, coordination of national agricultural policies has not been achieved.

Second, only limited trading opportunities exist for underdeveloped countries.

Third, East-West trade restrictions still continue.

Fourth, there remain many barriers against mass-produced, low-cost goods manufactured by multinational firms operating highly sophisticated capital equipment.

It would be most unfortunate if the United States, the largest and most powerful economy in the world, were to fail to provide the machinery to make it possible to continue to negotiate with other countries for a more rational trading world.

Unless this machinery is provided, the momentum provided toward this end by the Kennedy round stands in danger of being lost.

It need not be lost, if the Congress and the President will take the necessary steps to achieve the long-range goal of the gradual attainment of complete free trade both with respect to tariff as well as nontariff barriers.

To this end, I am introducing today, a concurrent resolution which would authorize the President to undertake negotiations leading to a 25-year treaty or agreement. This treaty or agreement should call for the creation of a World Free Trade Association.

Initially, it would seem logical for the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom to provide the nucleus for such a move. There would be no attempt to restrict national sovereignty with respect to the tariffs which might be applied by member nations, individually, against nonmembers.

Instead, the treaty or agreement would provide only that over a 25-year period member countries would gradually reduce their barriers with respect to each others' goods until, finally, all tariffs, quotas, and customs formalities will have disappeared.

The association should be open ended so that other countries, or groups of countries—including EEC, EFTA, and other free trade blocs—might join at a later date.

In the life of a nation, 25 years is but an instant. If, by setting the target date for completely free trade a quarter of a century away we can insure that economic adjustments can be made with little difficulty, we would be foolish to attempt to eliminate all trade barriers over a short span of years. In this area, patience is a virtue, but patience must be accompanied by the momentum provided by commitment to a clearly defined objective.

THE QUIE AMENDMENT—THE ISSUE IS NOT SOLELY REVENUE SHARING

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the revenue-sharing concept has gained wide acceptance among those who seek to promote a system of creative federalism. The arguments on behalf of Federal tax sharing and/or block—untied—grants are persuasive.

First, State and local governments will have access to a tax source—personal and corporate incomes—largely preempted by the Federal Government.

Second, these governmental extensions as a consequence are strengthened relative to the Federal Government. They thereby can deal more effectively with problems which heretofore, through default, sought redress in Washington.

Third, State and local officials are in a better position to judge the needs of their respective areas than are Members of the National Legislature. A serious problem in New York City, for example, may not exist in Dayton, Ohio, or Salt Lake City, Utah. Thus, in a given locality, nonearmarked Federal grants—or shared tax—can be utilized to meet most pressing requirements.

Attendant to the Federal revenue- or tax-sharing principle, however, is a fundamental question. Should these revenues supplement or supplant existing national programs? The two noted economists who devised the tax-sharing theory—Dr. Walter Heller and Dr. Joseph Pechman—envision it as a supplementary undertaking. At least one Republican author of a tax-sharing bill now before the House of Representatives also subscribes to this view. In effect, therefore, revenue-sharing is forward looking.

Although in its metamorphosis it has become more restrictive, the proposed Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967 nevertheless is predicated upon the revenue-sharing thesis. Arguments advanced by proponents are similar to the three outlined above. There is one essential difference, however. The three foregoing reasons are only in themselves valid, without concern for other arguments, when applied to supplementary, rather than substitute, revenue-sharing programs.

The basic issue, therefore, which the Quie amendment poses does not relate solely to the merits of revenue-sharing. Were this the only question, I would support the Minnesota Representative's proposal. Instead, the question to be resolved by House Members as they vote upon this amendment is whether they want to substitute a new program for an existing one.

Whether or not a program should be replaced should be determined on the basis of two criteria. First, is the existing plan a failure? Second, is the substitute proposal demonstrably superior?

First, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been operative for less than 2 years. Thus, time has been insufficient for a fair appraisal. On the basis of early returns, however, school superintendents in my district enthusiastically endorse the present law.

Second, there has been no conclusive evidence to suggest that the Quie approach, if adopted, would be more effective than the plan enacted by Congress in 1965. Rather, the reverse is true. The

Quie proposal creates an atmosphere of great uncertainty.

First. The 1965 act was designed to attack problems peculiar to urban and low-income school districts. With 50 States disbursing EASA funds under the provisions of the Quie amendment, it is not certain whether this objective would be perpetuated in each and every jurisdiction.

Second. As an outgrowth of the 1965 act many local school districts established ongoing programs. Continued funding of these projects would be uncertain under a State distribution plan. Thus, communities might be forced to abandon certain existing activities if the Quie amendment were accepted.

Third. The 1965 legislation created a delicate church-state balance. This conceivably could be upset in those sovereignties whose constitutions prohibit the distribution of funds from the State treasury to religious-oriented schools. Ohio courts now are considering a challenge to the State's 1965 school bus law. It appears likely that similar suits would be filed if funds derived through the Quie amendment were disbursed through the general revenue fund to parochial schools by the Ohio General Assembly. Parenthetically, it is my belief that such cases would have more legal substance than presently pending school bus litigation.

In summary, neither of the two aforementioned substitution standards are met. The 1965 act has not been proved a failure. The Quie amendment is not demonstrably better. In fact, it creates, rather than eliminates, uncertainty.

In view of this, I plan to vote against the Quie amendment this week. From this, however, it should not be construed that I oppose the revenue-sharing premise. In fact, I hope that in the months and years ahead, new Federal efforts will be focused in this direction.

DUNMOREAN CITED FOR SAVING BABY'S LIFE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on November 17 of last year a young father here in the District of Columbia carried the lifeless body of his little daughter to the home of a neighbor. By a great stroke of fortune that neighbor happened to be a member of the Metropolitan Police Force. He took the child and over the next hour gave artificial respiration which brought the child back to life and kept her alive until the ambulance arrived. The young policeman who performed this wonderful act is James P. Rinaldi and I am proud to say he comes from the city of Dunmore in my own 10th Congressional District.

In a thousand ways everyday the policemen of America protect our lives. We do not often take time to thank all of them or even any one of them. James Rinaldi was named "Policeman of the Month" here in Washington and received the American Red Cross Certificate of Merit and lifesaving pin for his actions. But like every other policeman in America the real reward he sought was the reward of saving a life.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I append to these remarks the article from the Scranton Times on this splendid young American.

[From the Scranton Times, May 16, 1967]

DUNMOREAN CITED FOR SAVING BABY'S LIFE—HEROIC RINALDI GETS RC AWARD—LIFE-SAVING ACTION IN EMERGENCY NOTED

A Dunmore young man has been awarded the American National Red Cross Certificate of Merit and Life Saving Pin for the quick action he displayed in saving a baby's life while a member of the Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C., last November.

James P. Rinaldi, 2035 Rigg St., was presented the awards today by Scranton Red Cross Chapter officials in recognition of his heroic act. The award is reserved for persons whose prompt application of approved first aid skills in an emergency results in the saving of a life. It is signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, honorary chairman of the national organization.

Last Nov. 17 a neighbor, Herman G. Fleming, came to the door of the Rinaldi apartment in Washington bearing the lifeless form of his two-week-old daughter in his arms. He said the child had stopped breathing and he didn't know what to do.

Pvt. Rinaldi, preparing to report on the midnight tour of police duty, without hesitation, snatched the baby from the father, placed it on the sofa and immediately began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Sensing no response, he turned the infant upside down and smacked her several times on the back, causing her to vomit and to begin to breathe faintly.

Again he applied mouth-to-mouth revival techniques and by the time an ambulance and rescue squad arrived, Private Rinaldi had the baby breathing normally. The child was then removed to Cafritz Hospital, Washington.

For this act, the young policeman received the "Policeman of the Month" award from his superiors and fellow law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia Police Department.

He is now eligible for the department's "Man of the Year Award."

In his recounting of the incident, Capt. Owen W. Davis, Commanding Officer of the 11th Precinct, District Police, said: "Private Rinaldi is a young officer, 23 years of age with eight months in the Department. His actions in this emergency reflect great credit on the training he received, but more so on his application of this training and his cool level-headed approach to a situation which appeared hopeless."

A graduate of Dunmore High School, Mr. Rinaldi served six years in the Navy and was active in local amateur sports. He is married and the father of a two-and-a-half-month old son, James IV.

Currently, he is working for the Signal Finance Co.

FARM AUCTION SALES

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, recently I called attention to the large number of farm auction sales in the Red River Valley area of North Dakota and Minnesota as evidence of the tightening cost-price squeeze on American agriculture. This was not an isolated example. The auctioneer's cry is being heard throughout rural America.

The Syracuse, N.Y., Herald-American of May 14, 1967, carries three pages of sales announcements, many of them advertising auctions of dairy cattle herds. To cite a few: "Complete Dispersal—182 Registered and Hi-Grade Holsteins"; "Cattle and Milking Equipment Dispersal—78 Registered and Hi-Grade Holstein Cattle"; "Complete Dairy Dispersal—48 Holstein Cattle"; "Night Auction—Farm Equipment"; "Night Auction—50 Head Holsteins."And so it goes, sale after sale.

This is happening in one of the Nation's principal dairying areas. And it is also happening at a time when dairy imports from abroad are flooding domestic markets and forcing down prices farmers receive for milk.

When dairymen auction off their herds and their equipment, it is obvious that the industry is in deep trouble.

F-111

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Secretary McNamara announced that General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex., had been awarded a $1.8 billion contract for initial production of the controversial TFX fighter-bomber, now called the F-111. This is the aircraft that is supposed to meet the needs of both the Air Force and the Navy.

We first heard of the TFX in 1962. Five years have passed now, and there still is no plane. We are in the midst of a war, and much of the fighting is being done with nearly obsolete aircraft. Something is obviously wrong, and it is beginning to look as if it is Mr. McNamara again.

At ceremonies marking the rollout of the F-111 aircraft in 1964, Secretary McNamara said:

> . . . the Air Force, the Navy, and General Dynamics and its subcontractors have achieved the greatest single step forward in combat aircraft to occur in several decades.

But today, serious doubts persist as to the plane's effectiveness. Even the Secretary himself has now admitted that his insistence on commonality of parts affects the overall performance, although he calls the sacrifices "marginal." Nevertheless, the Navy has refused to accept the plane and is making extensive tests on its version, while the Air Force seems

to have crossed its fingers and is taking the plane on faith.

Secretary McNamara has tried to give the impression that this aircraft will fill this Nation's requirements for the foreseeable future. On February 14, 1966, before the House Appropriations Committee, he said:

> I believe it is clear . . . that the FB-111 is not an interim aircraft, but is, indeed, a truly effective strategic bomber.

And yet, a majority of the members of the House Armed Services Committee and most military leaders feel there is still a need for an advanced manned bomber to replace the aging B-52's.

Secretary McNamara justified the commonality concept by saying that it will save a billion dollars:

> By jointly conducting the design and development program for the F-111, our Navy and Air Force have each acquired a highly advanced aircraft for their individual missions. And they have achieved this at a cost one billion dollars less than the cost of developing two separate weapons systems.

The Secretary made that statement on October 15, 1964. Since that time, the Pentagon admits that costs have at least doubled the original prediction, and Senator McCLELLAN estimates that the eventual price tag will be something in the neighborhood of $12 billion, which is between two and three times the original estimate. It never ceases to amaze me how every time this administration saves the taxpayers money, we go deeper into debt.

And so, Secretary McNamara was wrong about the reliability of the F-111. He was wrong about the role of the F-111. And he was wrong about the cost of the F-111.

The same doubts that plague the plane have spilled over in the contract. There was no competitive bidding. The contract was awarded against the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The recipient is a company said to be suffering financial difficulties, but one that has managed to maintain obviously good political connections.

In an effort to cover up the fact that the F-111 just is not ready, the Secretary has let a contract for only the shell of the plane. Later on, other contracts must be awarded for such things as an engine, a weapons control system, and an electronic navigation system as soon as all of the bugs are ironed out. And it may be that Mr. McNamara prefers to let his contracts out piecemeal to cover up the true costs of the plane.

In any event, the apparent result is that the Armed Forces are saddled with an inadequate plane built at phenomenal cost. Our fighting men deserve more. The taxpayers deserve more.

While this country probably can afford the F-111, I wonder how much longer it can afford Mr. McNamara.

GOD'S MOMENT

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the solemn service in the Washington Cathedral on April 23, 1967, honoring the 50th anniversary of the General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel, Bishop Dwight E. Loder, Methodist bishop of Michigan, preached a very incisive sermon. His words are of such import to us in these critical times that I believe they deserve the attention of my colleagues in this House.

I respectfully request permission to include Bishop Loder's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

GOD'S MOMENT

(By Bishop Dwight E. Loder)

Jesus wept over Jerusalem. His heart was broken. He loved these people. But they were lost. They were morally and spiritually bankrupt. They had set the stage for disaster. Jesus knew it and he wept.

As we view our world we identify with him. We look at life about us with incredulity. But this is a case of mistaken identification. We are not on the mountain viewing the world, we are the world. It is Jesus who weeps and he is weeping over us. We are a part of the lost people, living in a time of deep confusion, a time of utter moral and spiritual decay. This is not something apart from us, it is a part of us, and we are a part of it. We cannot disclaim it or escape it. If we weep it can only be for ourselves as a part of the whole world. It can only be for the miserable situation which we have helped to create. We have set the stage for disaster.

Jesus spoke then and there one of the most poignant and persuasive insights of all time. "You did not recognize God's moment when it came." God's moment? But when was it? When will it be?

There are those who believe it is long gone. There are others who insist it is off in the dim distant future somewhere. But if I understand Jesus he is saying, this is it. It is now. It is here and you fail to realize it.

This is to say, every moment—is God's moment. Every situation is God's situation. God's moment is now, here, not sometime in the far flung future, or out of the palpitant past.

God did you say? But there are some who are telling us God is dead. We should listen to them. The real tragedy of our time is not that some are proclaiming the death of God. The real tragedy is that there is so little evidence among Christian people that God is alive. This question will not be settled by the person with the loudest voice, or the cleverest answer or the most persuasive argument. It is not that kind of question. It is answered when and where God and man meet.

But does God actually meet man? This is not so much a mystical union as it is determined by the way man meets man. Man against man, man rejecting man, is man against God, man rejecting God. Moreover it is indicated by the depth of our understanding of God and the purposes of God. Our attempts to understand God usually begin with the assumption of his Absoluteness. To picture the involvement of an absolute God with a limited human being is incongruous, to say the least.

Schubert Ogden has reminded us however, that we should begin to understand God where *we* are, in the *present* moment. We should begin with our present circumstances. We should begin with the understanding that God relates to us as persons in the circumstances of the moment. He relates to us in our contacts with others, in our suffering, our frustrations, our anxieties, our joys, our fears, our loves. He relates to us where we are. If we understand this, then from that understanding we may contemplate his absoluteness.

It is easy to dismiss a God who is only an idea. It is not easy to dismiss a God who is a part of my life. Every moment is God's moment. Every circumstance is his circumstance. We believe this if we know God is involved in Christ with us here and now.

If God was in Christ then God was in man. This speaks to the personal nature of God. If this is so, then it makes sense to talk about God in Christ and Christ in me. This I understand.

There are those who say God is dead, while others say if God could die, then he was never God, in fact he never was! Period! The infinite cannot become finite. The eternal cannot have a terminal point. If God is dead he simply never was.

There are two kinds of atheism, I hear Ogden saying. One is at the top of the head, the other is at the bottom of the heart. The intellectual atheist is only deluded about who he is and what he is. He does not disbelieve, he simply does not understand. Christians so understand God that everyone in some sense must believe in him, and no one in every sense can deny him.

Atheism at the bottom of the heart is different. It allows a person to profess his belief in God. He may attend church regularly. He may be orthodox, but under it all he does not believe it. He does not live it. It makes no real difference to him. This atheism which is often found within the church is far more devasting than the other. But even this does not affirm the death of God. When someone blatantly denies the existence of God, from the top of the head or the bottom of the heart, he is in an encounter or struggle with God. This too is God's moment.

If God is dead, say still another, then love is dead. But who would believe that love is no more? Love dead? Yet love is of God, and where love is there is God. If we begin at this place in our understanding then every moment of outgoing, creative, demanding love is understood to be God involved in life. Every such moment is God's moment.

The death of God is rather the death of a pattern of thought about God. That is to say, it is the death of old and superstitious notions about God, which make God look ridiculous in our time, and cause the believer to appear to be utterly absurd. This is a move toward religionlessness.

Bonhoeffer speaks about religionless Christianity. We must understand that he was moving away from a tightly structured systematic theology. To Bonhoeffer religion had a rather rigid and well defined meaning early in his ministry and he was moving away from it during his concentration camp years.

Religion had meant obsession with personal salvation. Yet this is perhaps the supreme expression of personal egotism and unmitigated arrogance, and constitutes a breach with the Gospel. It puts myself ahead of all else.

Religion also had meant that the Kingdom of God was characterized as our world made perfect. Yet this is a primitive kind of kingdom even on the very surface of it. The Kingdom is already a reality and a gift to be received. It is first an inward condition rather than an outward experience. It is not something God expects us to build for him it is His Kingdom. If we accept it then we become new and responsible persons.

Religion also had meant that man was compartmentalized, and that he could be intellectual and not spiritual, or spiritual and not intellectual or not either but just physical. The whole man was not a part of Bonhoeffer's early religious understanding.

Moreover religion had meant that God was

a gap filler. Where gaps in knowledge had left unanswered questions, they were filled by belief in God. As knowledge increased then God diminished. Little wonder Bonhoeffer, as he broke with these concepts of religion, talked about religionless Christianity.

This is a pattern of thought which must go. We no longer think of God as provincial, as though he were here or there, or a vapor floating in and out of the room. In this respect a religionless God is more nearly Christian than is a Godless religion.

But did not Dietrich Bonhoeffer say that the world has come of age? Otto Dudzus, a former student and biographer says, this was a phrase used as a working tool to lead to a different question, the elemental Christian question, "Who is Jesus Christ for us today?" This fits into the pattern of Bonhoeffer's developing theology.

Certainly Bonhoeffer did not mean that man had arrived and no longer needed God. He was in a Nazi concentration camp when he wrote this with the insanity of World War II raging about him. A level look at our world would put the lie to those who quote Bonhoeffer out of context. The world come of age? Think about it! Vietnam. Jordan. Israel. India. South Africa. Latin America. The American Negro. Crime in America at forty billion a year with untold terror and death. Highway deaths at fifty thousand a year. The world come of age? Think about it! T.V.! Morals! Purpose! Meaning!

The first story in the Bible is not an account of creation. It says simply and yet profoundly, that when man eats enough of the tree of knowledge to imagine he is equal to God, he is about to be dispossessed. He has set the stage for tragedy!

We are called by the church to be awakened to this moment, and to realize and accept the sovereignty of God in his moment. We are called upon this moment to be the church!

The church, did you say? There are those who tell us the church is irrelevant, immaterial, divided, imperfect and sick! And we must listen to them. They are right. But they talk like this is something new. something they have just discovered. They talk without benefit of history.

The church is sick. But when has the church been healthy? Certainly not when Paul wrote to Corinth and told them their services seemed to be doing more damage than good. They were divided. They were immoral. They were selfish and insensitive to God's leading. Dr. Edward Bauman has called the letter to Corinth the most typical church letter of all time. It began with a fight over the preacher and ended with a collection.

When has the church been healthy? Certainly not at Nicea in 325 where Constantine called the leaders of the church to settle their differences. But they were unable to do it. Certainly not at Chalcedon in 451 where divisions actually deepened. Certainly not in the Gnostic movement. This was a splinter movement made up of those who among other things were certain they had a direct line through to God. Certainly not in the Docetic movement that insisted that Christ was never a man. Certainly not in the time of the Montanists, who awaited momentarily for the world to end and listened to Montanas who claimed to be the voice of the Holy Spirit. Tertullian defected and joined the Montanists because he felt the church was insensitive to new revelations. Defection is not something new in the life of the church.

When was the church ever healthy? Certainly not during the eleventh century split between east and west. Not at Constance in 1414 when the first Pope John XXIII was deposed and John Huss burned. Certainly not at the time of the reformation, or since that time with its Protestant splinter groups. The Roman Catholic Church has drawn back the curtains to reveal its inner strife in a new and exciting wave of reformation. Only now do we dare to begin to talk about a return to sanity and unity in the Christian community.

But the critic, who is so necessary to the health of the church, must also mark certain obvious insights which follow, even a random sample of history.

1. Man will worship. If not God, then something less; himself, his intellect, knowledge, money, power, the state. Man will worship, and what he worships will shape his values and determine his life patterns. If he worships something less than God, then all of life is profane. Nothing is sacred including man.

2. Man will belong. He will not exist in isolation or as an amorphous society. He will structure, his business, his society, his government, his school, his church into institutional form. We make the mistake of confusing the structure and the church.

When a minister writes, "It is the business of the church to quicken the conscience of its people and to send them out of the church into society," he simply does not understand the meaning of the church. The church is not separate from the people. The church is the people! It is impossible to send the church out of the church to be the church. It is not an institution.

That there will be form or organization among Christians is inevitable. That form may replace force is a calculated risk. This was Wesley's concern for Methodists. But to imagine that force does not take or need have form is a total misunderstanding. Force without order is Chaos. That God works better in disorder is an illusion.

If the institution is in disrepair, or if it is obsessed with its own life as an institution then let the people bring about change, or rather let God through the people bring reform. But the church is the people, gathered as a community and scattered as ambassadors.

Dr. Paul Minear wrote about the New Testament image of the church. He says these images were forms of self recognition spoken from within the fellowship and adopted by a community whose sense of uniqueness stemmed from the fact that its thought always centered beyond itself in the majestic activity of God. "Today," he says, "questions about the church often arise from a stance outside the church." This is to say that even ministers often speak of the church as though they were separate from it, as though it is a thing set apart or an organism separate from the world.

And yet the church is the people who are drawn to Christ, the minister, the layman, you, me. Where you are, there is the church. You do not go to church or leave the church, you are the church. When you speak the church speaks. When you act or fail to act, you are the church. The gathered community is the church. The scattered community is the church.

The outreach of the church expresses itself in many forms. It reaches out as world missions, which is the church as mission. It reaches with specialized ministries into the inner city, into industry, labor, into urban and rural work. But this is always the church, not just segments of the church out of the main stream. Just so the Chaplaincy is the church in outreach.

The Chaplaincy in the Armed Forces is not the Government becoming Church or the Church becoming Government. It is the Fellowship reaching persons wherever they are. It is the Fellowship being the Church everywhere.

The Chaplaincy is not the Church blessing war as the best answer for solving the human problem. It is the community of Faith reaching persons drawn into the armed forces wherever they are and into the hell of war when it is necessary.

The Chaplaincy is not an instrument of the Military to make a better fighting machine, it is the fellowship in ministry to persons. It reaches the men in uniform, their families, with near three-quarter million religious worship services in one year, with a congregation of nearly thirty-seven million in attendance. It reaches the wounded and persons in war torn areas. It ministers by bringing sacraments, religious education, counselling. It is the fellowship with an inclusive ministry.

The Chaplaincy is the ecumenical Church in a unique and magnificent relationship. It reaches more than armed forces. It includes mental institutions, prisons, hospitals, homes and church institutions.

The Chaplain is a minister. Wherever he is, first of all he is a minister, and he remains a Chaplain only as long as his particular church family endorses him. Above all else he is an Ambassador of Christ.

As the General Commission observes this anniversary, it does so as the church in action as the outreach of the Fellowship.

3. God uses imperfection. Perhaps that is fortunate for what else does he have to use on this earth? The church is made up of imperfect persons. That includes all of us, you and me as well as the critics and the reformers. It is possible God understands this better than we.

But the church is the only fellowship that has within it the power that will renew or remake or reshape it as it has done through its history again and again.

No government, no business, no secular institution has survived two thousand years of such imperfection. The church has survived because God is in it and has and will make it new.

We are called to be the church. The time has come to stop institutional self flagellation, and self analysis and be the church. This is God's moment. We must act in it as God's Ambassadors.

To the disheartened, he says through his church, through you and me "Lo I am with you always!"

To the displaced, the transient, the lost, he says, "You have not chosen me, I have chosen you."

To the warlords of our day he says, "Live by force, die by force, live by the bomb, die by the bomb, live by power of love and live."

To your son in Vietnam he says, "Though you make your bed in hell, I am there. You cannot go where I am not."

To the war widow, to the orphan, to the ravaged of all countries he says, "Love your enemy, bless him who curses you, pray for him who dispitefully uses you."

To the greed of the world he says, "Save yourself and you are lost, lose yourself for my sake and you shall live."

To the weary, the frustrated, the broken, he says "My burden is a cross but it is light. Come to me I will give you life. You will find meaning, purpose, direction here."

To the ruthless rugged rich he says, "You fool, tonight your soul will be required of you, then whose will all of this be?"

This is God's moment. It need not be a moment of disaster. It may be a glorious moment. That is, of course, if we recognize it, accept it, live in it, and act upon it under God.

POLITICAL FAVORITISM AND THE APOLLO TRAGEDY

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the May 15 issue of the Washington Evening Star carried an eye-opening article on possible corruption in America's massive space program, written by the noted political columnist, Richard Wilson.

Perhaps the facts brought out by Mr. Wilson are not too surprising in light of the shameful TFX scandal which rocked Washington not so long ago. But I for one think it is a disgrace that an idealistic project such as our space exploration program, may have been used by unscrupulous public officials for selfish and dishonest gain—especially when it may have been a contributing factor in the deaths of three brave astronauts.

Certainly, no one can deny that the facts in Mr. Wilson's column point up the necessity for a complete and objective public investigation of the contract award for construction of the Apollo capsule to North American Aviation, after a group of 200 space experts had made it plain they felt the contract would best be fulfilled by the Martin Co.

In view of the importance of this matter, and the need for the public to be informed of it, I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

APOLLO, TFX AND THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

(By Richard Wilson)

The death of three astronauts has revealed much more than the defects of the Apollo space capsule. This tragic event has led to the exposure once more of that tenuous link between the private and the public interest which so often casts a cloud of suspicion over large undertakings in the defense and aerospace programs. In this case Bobby Baker once again drifts about in the shadows.

An identical parallel is now disclosed between the award of the multi-billion dollar TFX fighter-bomber contract and the award of the very large contract for the Apollo capsule. In both instances the recommendation of the experts was rejected and a handful of public officials chose the contractor they favored. In both instances attempts were made to hide this fact. And in both instances many other facts and expert opinions were suppressed.

Contrary to the findings of expert boards and committees and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the TFX contract was awarded to a company with good political connections which was temporarily in financial trouble. Contrary to the findings of a group of 200 space experts, the Apollo contract was awarded to North American Aviation, strongly represented in Washington's political life, instead of to the Martin Company.

This decision would now be more defensible were it not for the fact that in the first instance Congress was misinformed by James E. Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On April 17, Webb informed the Senate Space Committee that the North American company was the first choice of NASA's source evaluation board for the Apollo contract. But three weeks later when asked by Sen. Margaret Chase Smith if it were not the fact that the Martin Company was really the first choice of the technical experts, Webb conceded that this was so. He then belatedly disclosed that he and a few of his associates had decided instead to give the contract to North American.

It is too much to conclude that had Martin got the contract instead of North American the revealed carelessness and negligence in construction of the capsule would have been avoided and the astronauts would have lived. But a chain of other circumstances cannot be brushed off.

Webb was, some time before becoming NASA administrator, a former administrative assistant to the late Sen. Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma. He was also a former assistant to the president of Kerr-McGee Industries. At the time of the North American award Kerr was chairman of the Senate Aeronautics and Space Committee. He was also chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee where he was pushing a project for the development of the Arkansas River.

North American, it has been reported, had agreed to an extensive building and expansion program in Oklahoma along the Arkansas River project. It has also been reported that in the same month as the Apollo award was made to North American the company agreed to give Bobby Baker, who was a close associate of Senator Kerr in the Senate, a $2.5 million-a-year food vending business at North American plants. This food vending business was the anchor of Baker's financial operations.

Immediately after the award, North American did in fact undertake a large new plant expansion in Oklahoma. After Kerr's death on Jan. 1, 1963, it was discovered that Kerr, his family and Dena A. McGee, one of his business partners, had purchased more than 1,100 acres of land at a key point on the Arkansas River project. This land is now the proposed site of the terminus of the navigation project.

Webb continued to be and is now a leading stockholder in Fidelity National Bank and Trust Co. of Oklahoma City where the Kerr family and McGee have been major figures.

Now all these circumstances may be explicable. Webb asserts that there was no favoritism or politics involved in the Apollo award. The decision was made, he says, because he and his qualified associates thought North American would do the best job.

"There are a lot of people who have tried to give the impression that I was not independent, that I was in Senator Kerr's pocket because I had worked for the Kerr-McGee enterprises," Webb said.

He added that this was not true, that in fact his connection with Kerr-McGee was only part time before President Kennedy appointed him to head NASA. He had listened to Senator Kerr on behalf of North American, but so had he listened to many other senators and congressmen who had rcommendations on the Apollo project.

It is in Webb's interest, if this is the case, to cooperate in a full investigation of all the circumstances surrounding the North American award. It is not enough to say, "Let's stop this wrangling and get ahead with the race to the moon."

Congress and the public need to know how these huge undertakings have been handled because there will be many more of them in the future.

COLORADO UNIVERSITY WINS COLLEGE BOWL

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of Colorado, which is both my alma mater and the largest educational institution in my district, has a long and glorious history in athletic competition. But none of its many victories and championships made me prouder than an event which took place Sunday before a nationwide audience.

The battleground was an academic one—the GE College Bowl, a National Broadcasting Co. production.

The four members of the University of Colorado team demonstrated once again what we proud alumni have always known—that this school combines the attributes of both Sparta and Athens. It turns out both outstanding athletes and outstanding scholars.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article which appears in today's issue of the Denver Post which describes both the feat and the well-deserved homecoming which the team members and their coach received last night.

The article follows:

CU WELCOMES COLLEGE BOWL VICTORS

The University of Colorado's victorious College Bowl team was met at Stapleton International Airport Sunday night by a joyful crowd of about 100 students, parents and university officials.

The four-student team members and their coach were greeted by cheers, fight songs, pennants, placards and even a few hugs from the more enthusiastic girls in the crowd.

The team returned from New York where it won its fifth straight—and final—victory Sunday afternoon in the nationally-televised GE College Bowl program.

In winning the five contests, the team copped $19,500 in prize money for the C.U. Scholarship Fund and brought home a silver trophy.

But, according to the rules, the C.U. squad must retire as an undefeated team—an honor achieved by 21 other colleges since the program began in 1959.

Sunday's contest was against the University of Kentucky and, until the last minute, it looked as if Kentucky would win. With 90 seconds to go, Kentucky was ahead by 50 points but C.U. forged ahead in the stretch and won by a score of 235 to 220.

On the team were Jeffrey B. Levine, 5900 E. Mansfield Ave., team captain; James A. Cavender, 2665 Stuart Ct.; William L. Hines, Sterling, Colo.; and Maynard T. Robison, Colorado Springs. The coach was David L. Bowen, assistant professor of marketing.

Representing the University in the welcoming party Sunday night were Vice President Thurston E. Manning and Glenn E. Barnett.

For each of the five weekly victories, $3000 was contributed to the Scholarship Fund by General Electric and Seventeen Magazine.

The two firms and Gimbel's Department Store threw in a bonus of $4,500 after C.U.'s fifth victory Sunday.

MARITIME DAY

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, at no other time in our history has this Nation's maritime fleet been so neglected. Unless the United States can regain its position of maritime strength, I fear that we will be reduced to a second rate commercial power.

Today a grateful Nation pauses to pay homage to our merchant seamen and the

merchant marine. It is indeed proper that this day was set aside by Congress over 30 years ago to honor the entire maritime industry. Ironically, May 22 was the day selected as Maritime Day because on that day in 1819 the SS *Savannah*, the first steamship to cross the Atlantic, departed from Savannah, Ga. And, tragically, history records that shortsighted men in this country were not willing to accept the idea of steam propulsion and the *Savannah* died an ignominious death. Obviously, some men are not students of history because, almost 150 years later, the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah* is being placed in mothballs. But the *Savannah* is not the only victim of our Government's shortsighted maritime policy. In this critical area of national concern, the entire merchant marine fleet is being threatened with mediocrity. While the Soviet merchant marine is competing favorably on the high seas, the administration is turning a deaf ear to our critical maritime needs. Unless the trend is reversed I foresee the day when the Soviet Union will become such a powerful maritime nation that we will have to depend on Russian vessels to carry American goods. When this day happens, we will have lost a critical prerequisite to national survival—free and open trade routes.

The administration's decision to temporarily retire the *Savannah* is sheer folly. Its unimaginative goals for our merchant marine policy is an invitation to disaster. Unless this administration wakes up and presents a positive maritime policy to the American people, this Nation is going to face serious problems, both economic and military.

MANDATORY OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall, this morning began very important hearings on the mandatory oil import program. These hearings will continue until May 24 of this year.

I was privileged to appear as one of the congressional witnesses on this program and present to the Secretary and the panel my thought with respect to its operation in certain selected areas.

Having been one of those primarily responsible for the implementation of the executive order in 1959 which set up the mandatory oil import program, I have watched its administration with considerable interest. I have, very frankly, been critical of the administration of the program, particularly the aspect of the program as it deals with residual fuel oil and the manner in which the Secretary of the Interior has continued to permit ever-increasing quantities of this wasteful and highly pollutable product to enter this country. The loose operation of the program has been detrimental to the economics of the coal mining community of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, however, this morning I took another approach to the program and pointed out another area of its operation which is severely injurious to the State of West Virginia. The position I took in this respect was entirely consistent with my past opposition to the administration of the program. From its inception, had the national security of our Nation been the base for the implementation of the same, the points I raised in my statement this morning are of equal national security magnitude. The manner in which the oil import program is being administered and its effect upon the petrochemical industry of West Virginia and the United States is severely handicapping the growth of the petrochemical industry. Anything that retards the growth of the petrochemical industry retards the growth of the State of West Virginia. If we, as a State, are on the one hand to receive repeated blows at the coal mining community by the ever-increasing flow of low cost residual fuel oil and then, on the other hand, be deprived of the necessary quantities of naphtha in order that our petrochemical industry might grow in advance, this then, is indeed a sad commentary on the administration of the oil import program.

There are those who watch with genuine concern the economic difficulties and problems of my State and speak in glowing terms of friendly gestures made by the Federal Government to aid us in our economic plight. Their words are empty indeed when one equates the severe attack this administration made on the economics of our State in the handling of the oil import program. That severe attack visits itself upon the coal mining community and the petrochemical community in my State. That severe attack cannot be answered by suggested new Federal programs which have as their purpose the economic plight of our State. If West Virginians are going to be made to suffer the loss of markets for coal, it is beyond me that at the same time its petrochemical industry is forced by reason of foreign competition to relocate itself beyond the United States. In both instances, certainly the national security of our Nation is effected.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the statement I made this morning on this matter at the oil import hearings:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ARCH A. MOORE, JR., OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE OIL IMPORT HEARINGS, MAY 22, 1967

Mr. Secretary, members of the panel. It is a pleasure for me to appear before you as you undertake this important and extensive review of the Oil Import Program. As you know, West Virginians have long had a keen interest in the Oil Import Program, and I well recall the intensive efforts which I and many others made in 1958 and 1959 to secure an effective program which would meet the needs of the Nation.

In the eight years since the Mandatory Oil Import Program was first proclaimed, a lot of oil and a lot of coal has come out of the ground. To industries which are as dynamic as those affected by the Oil Import Program, eight years is a long period, time enough for enormous changes in needs, in competitive conditions, and in circumstances generally.

West Virginians generally have had problems by the administration of the program; first with respect to the residual oil and with the petrochemical aspects of the same.

One of the most dynamic of the industries affected by this program is the petrochemical industry, and I appear before you today to discuss some of the problems which that industry faces as a consequence of the Oil Import Program. It is especially proper that I do so because the petrochemical industry was created in Clendenin, West Virginia, early in 1920 and the State today is dotted with plants of the industry. One of the most important factors in the location of petrochemical plants is the availability of raw materials. It was the natural gas of West Virginia that formed the basis for the 1920 developments in Clendenin, and availability of such materials is vital to petrochemical operations today.

Unfortunately, and unnecessarily in my view, the Oil Import Program is forcing the domestic petrochemical industry into a straight jacket.

The U.S. petrochemical industry has historically used liquified petroleum gas, LPG, as its raw material. The supply of LPG has generally exceeded the demand and it has therefore been widely available at an economically attractive cost. This has made it a highly desirable feedstock for petrochemical production, a feedstock whose cost is roughly equivalent to the cost of the naphtha which has been freely available to overseas producers. Under these conditions, the Oil Import Program did not weigh heavily on the petrochemical industry.

Today, however, the phenomenal growth of the industry is causing the demand for LPG to outstrip the available supply. And to meet its rising needs for feedstocks at competitive prices, the domestic petrochemical industry must look elsewhere. Unfortunately, the Oil Import Program restricts its search to domestic petroleum materials—whose prices are artificially higher than in the rest of the world because of the Oil Import Program—nearly half again higher than world market prices.

Such higher prices can have a crucial effect on chemical prices because for key products like ethylene, feedstock prices account for more than half of the total cost of the product.

The ingenuity and efficiency of the West Virginia petrochemical industry will make little difference if it is to be restricted to raw materials costing some 50 percent more than the feedstocks used by their overseas competitors. And that is precisely the prospect that faces the industry. It will have great difficulty in expanding in West Virginia, unless it can have adequate access to raw materials whose prices are fully competitive with those paid by overseas producers. It will have just as much difficulty expanding anywhere else in the United States, or in retaining its export markets (which now produce a balance of payments surplus of nearly $1 billion a year). It will have just as much difficulty in retaining, over the long run, its domestic markets against foreign producers, especially in light of the agreement in the Kennedy Round at Geneva.

If the domestic petrochemical industry is to retain its vigorous growth, increase its employment opportunities in my State and elsewhere in the Nation; if it is to continue to contribute massively to our balance of trade surplus; and if it is to continue to meet its enormous responsibilities for our national security, then it must not be chained down by raw material prices unreasonably and unnecessarily increased by oil import quotas. The alternative, clearly, is overseas production.

Thus, we would create a situation in which a program that was designed to maintain a

healthy domestic petroleum industry in case of a national emergency would have a reverse effect on an expanding and equally important industry by driving its producing facilities overseas.

To avoid this, I believe the Oil Import Program should be modified to recognize the important distinctions between the petrochemical industry and the petroleum industry.

The petrochemical industry should be given access to foreign feedstocks in sufficient quantities to assure that they are fully competitive, in raw material prices, with overseas producers. I am convinced that these changes in the Oil Import Program can be adopted and put into effect in such a way, with such restrictions, and over such a period of time as to safeguard the domestic oil and coal industries from any significant dislocation.

MARITIME DAY, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to salute our maritime industry on this day set aside by the President of the United States as "Maritime Day."

Today, as never before, this country's merchant marine is making an exceptional contribution to the Nation's needs in its unsung and often-overlooked role in the Vietnam conflict. Operating under enormous handicaps, with an undersized and obsolete fleet, this industry has performed admirably. Its men, its ships, its shipbuilders and their companies, all are to be congratulated.

On this occasion, it is well for us to reflect upon the lamentable condition of our merchant marine today. The past 20 years have seen this country's interest in and attention to the maritime industry fade away year by year until the crisis of Vietnam spotlighted its desperate plight. From a once-great seapower, which the United States was from its early history to the end of the Second World War when its fleet numbered about 5,000 ships, this country has allowed its merchant shipbuilding industry to deteriorate until it now ranks an ignominious 14th among world powers. In size of its active merchant fleet, which now numbers 1,090 ships, it ranks only fifth, with 70 percent of these ships over 20 years old. Compare these figures with parallel statistics of the Soviet Union: from a merchant fleet of 432 ships in 1950, their fleet has grown to 1,422 vessels, as of January 1, 1967. And their ships are, by and large, recently built. Russian shipyards are so busy, building more and more ships for their own commerce—and Russian ships carry 75 percent of the Soviet Union's foreign commerce—that some of their shipbuilding contracts have had to be placed with free world shipyards. Only 7.7 percent of this Nation's foreign commerce is carried in American flag ships. While the Soviet fleet grew by 137 ships in 1966, only 13 new ships were added to the American fleet last year.

Faced with these facts and their ominous forewarnings, administration policy falteringly proposes to add 13 to 15 ships a year to our merchant fleet. It further proposes to scrap the only bright light on our maritime horizon, the U.S.S. *Savannah*, the first nuclear merchant ship in any fleet. With scarcely enough sea experience to be considered shaken down, the drafters of our national sea policy now intend to put this ship in mothballs. This is not the way to build up a merchant fleet nor a forward-looking merchant marine policy.

Let us put the maritime industry back in business. They have shown us these past few years how well they can operate. Now let us give them a chance to produce as well.

MARITIME DAY, 1967

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, Monday, May 22, has been proclaimed by President Johnson to be National Maritime Day, 1967. It is a day set aside annually to remind us of the important role of the American merchant marine in our national life and to commemorate the anniversary of the first transatlantic voyage by the SS *Savannah* on May 22, 1819.

Unfortunately, Maritime Day 1967 does not hold forth the prospect of being a very happy occasion for the American maritime industry. To the contrary, it is a day which will perhaps be most remembered as the third successive annual observance which has passed without the fulfillment of the President's promise of January 1965 to "recommend a new policy for our merchant marine."

In his proclamation setting aside Monday, May 22, as National Maritime Day, the President stated that:

> Merchant ships carry the essentials of life to millions in need. They transport military supplies and equipment to our forces abroad. Of all our supplies being sent to Viet Nam today, 98 percent are carried by ship.

This point by the President is well taken, but I hope he recognizes that this vital sealift to Southeast Asia is being accomplished in large measure by the more than 150 vessels which have been reactivated from our national defense reserve fleet. These are vessels of World War II vintage, the newest of which are more than 20 years of age.

The necessity for our Nation to reactivate these World War II reserve fleet ships, disparagingly referred to as "rust buckets," serves to underscore the dire need for a meaningful maritime promotional program. But, let us also give the Devil his due. Let us remember, too, on this Maritime Day 1967 that the reactivation of these aging ships represents a significant feat. For perhaps the first time in maritime history, ocean-going merchant vessels have been preserved in a state of semireadiness so as to be able to respond to our Nation's needs on three noteworthy occasions—the Korean conflict, the Suez Canal crisis of 1956, and today the conflict in Southeast Asia. In this sense, the more than 600 personnel of the Maritime Administration employed in the preservation of these reserve ships at the fleet sites located on our three coasts, and the American shipyard personnel who reactivated these same ships, are deserving of high praise and commendation for a job well done.

As the condition of our reserve fleet ships which have been reactivated for the Vietnam sealift is symbolic of the dire need for a meaningful maritime program, so, too, is the nuclear ship *Savannah* which is presently plying the sea lanes of the world. Like its predecessor of the same name, the steamship *Savannah*, the NS *Savannah* represents a similar breakthrough in maritime technology. The greater misfortune, however, is that the similarity of these two vessels does not stop at this point. After having pioneered marine steam propulsion with the SS *Savannah*, we decided to cast our lot with sailing ships, and thereby surrendered a technological advantage to our foreign competitors from which we have yet to recover. So, too, is the NS *Savannah* seemingly ill-fated, since the administration has decided to lay up this vessel in August of this year, and thereby retire from service our only, and indeed the world's only, nuclear propelled merchant vessel currently in operation.

The NS *Savannah*, however, is symbolic of an even more basic issue, which was pointed up only last week by Dr. George Kavanagh, Assistant General Manager for Reactors of the Atomic Energy Commission, when appearing before our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At that time, in response to an inquiry concerning the continued operation of the NS *Savannah*, Dr. Kavanagh remarked:

> I think the point is we ought to be figuring out *what it is we want to do for the U.S. Merchant Marine.*

Well, this is exactly what I and many Members of the Congress thought the administration was trying to accomplish by its intensive studies of the American maritime industry made over the past 6 years. Yet it seems that today on Maritime Day 1967 we are no closer to answering these most basic questions—what do we want for the American merchant marine, and where are we going?—than we were when we first embarked on these several and most fruitless studies. The time is now, if not long overdue, for us to take remedial action on our mounting maritime problems, and to this end I earnestly urge that we act so that next Maritime Day—1968—will not come upon us bogged down in the same quagmire of indecision and vacillation which characterizes the 1967 Maritime Day.

KENNEDY ROUND RESULTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after years of intensely difficult negotiation, the Kennedy round can be considered an important success for economic as well as political reasons. In large measure, the success of the negotiations, to the substantial extent that they achieve American objectives, can be attributed to the organization and procedures established by Congress to conduct the trade negotiations, that is, the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, as directed by Gov. Christian A. Herter and by his successor, Ambassador William M. Roth, as well as by Deputy Special Representative Michael Blumenthal, and their able and dedicated staff.

In economic terms, the Kennedy round has included a greater volume of trade than any other negotiation, the average weighted cut on industrial products has been more extensive than any negotiation, and there have been important concessions on agriculture products. In addition, there has been significant progress in the area of nontariff barriers, particularly the problem of dumping.

In overall trade terms including both industry and agriculture, the tariff cuts made by the United States now appear to be in balance with those of the other industrialized countries. The United States is obtaining tariff concessions on about $7 to $8 billion of industrial and agricultural exports, and is giving tariff cuts on about $7 to $8 billion of industrial and agricultural imports.

For industrial products, the participants seem to have agreed on cuts averaging between 33 and 35 percent. In agriculture, the average cut is less but the United States seems to have obtained important concessions covering a substantial volume of trade.

But it is at best difficult at this time to specify in dollar terms the precise meaning of these negotiations for world trade flows. There is little doubt, however, that these major tariff and trade barrier reductions are reciprocal in trade terms and will have an extensive trade expansion effect, and that they therefore will have an important effect in expanding the world economy, to the benefit of the United States and other trading nations, and to the benefit also of the developing countries.

In political terms the Kennedy round can be said not to have succeeded fully in the important initial objective of binding together the Atlantic community nations, but it has had effects that signify a political success in other ways. The success of the negotiations in the final analysis demonstrates that the hard-bargaining European Common Market in fact feels an ultimate sense of responsibility toward expansive, outward-looking economic and political objectives; that, in other words, it is not committed to an inward-looking trade policy.

The substantive agreement reached on Monday, May 15, by the heads of delegations in Geneva, resolved many fundamental issues in dispute—issues that have been evolving as the major concerns of the negotiations during the last several years—most importantly grains and chemicals.

In grains, the concept of guaranteed access to the Common Market was abandoned on the theory that greatly increased demand for feed grains would allow us to maintain our market share in spite of the trade restrictive effects of the EEC's farm price systems, and in view of the extreme reluctance of the EEC to give substantial access. In return, the EEC dropped its demand that world trade in feed grains be organized to reflect its own pricing practices.

For wheat, the United States agreed to a price range, with a minimum price of $1.73 a bushel for Hard Red Winter ordinary protein free on board gulf ports, a price below the present world price for that grade wheat. The upper limit of the price range is $2.13. This price agreement will take the place of the International Wheat Agreement, which expires at the beginning of July, this year. The new wheat agreement must be ratified by the Senate.

In conjunction with an agreement on the price of wheat, the major participants on Monday agreed that they would contribute a food aid package of 4.5 million tons of grains each year for 3 years. The United States share will be about 42 percent, the EEC will provide 23 percent, Canada 9 percent, and Australia, the United Kingdom and Japan each 5 percent.

In the agriculture negotiations on items other than grains, dairy, and meat, there are indications that there will be very significant trade concessions from the other participants, including the Common Market.

In chemicals, the United States succeeded in having its position accepted that there had to be a separation of the American selling price system from the larger chemicals sector. The result is a "two-package" agreement, one package part of the Kennedy round and the second package, containing ASP, separate from it. In the first package the United States agreed to make cuts on all chemicals of about 42 percent. In return the EEC, United Kingdom, and Japan will make cuts which combined average 25 to 30 percent. This package is said to be "self-balancing," or reciprocal.

In the second package, the United States agrees to seek legislation eliminating ASP and establishing new duties for chemicals at 20 percent, except for certain drugs at 25 percent, and dyes at 30 percent. In return, the EEC, United Kingdom and Japan will make further cuts of 20 to 25 percent. Also, the EEC will modify "road" taxes that discriminate against exports of American autos, and the United Kingdom will make a 20-percent reduction in the Commonwealth preference on American tobacco. Thus the EEC has accepted the American position that a change in a U.S. nontariff trade barrier should be reciprocated by change in a foreign nation's nontariff trade barriers.

Now these basic agreements, and the many others, must be worked out in detail. This task, as well as the extremely complex task of extensively rewriting the 6,000-item Tariff Schedules of the United States to reflect the Kennedy round bargains, will consume the remaining days until midnight, June 30, when the authorities to negotiate given to the President by the Congress in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 will expire.

During the period until the June 30 deadline, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and his staff will prepare comprehensive summaries which will present, in dollar terms, the extent of foreign nations' trade concessions to the United States, and the extent of U.S. trade concessions to foreign countries. It appears that for the first time in a trade negotiation of a nature similar to the Kennedy round these evaluations of the dollar meanings of concessions are being formulated with a determined effort at objectivity and accuracy through statistically correct procedures and with the assistance of computers. The reporting procedures required by section 226 of the Trade Expansion Act will be completed when the final comprehensive reports are delivered to the Congress. These reports will be made public.

The future of U.S. trade policy must now absorb our attention. First, it is imperative to continue the study of the issues that have been brought to light, many for the first time, in the Kennedy round. No means of beginning to do so is superior to public congressional hearings conducted by the appropriate committees of Congress, primarily the House Ways and Means Committee and the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee.

A specific congressional role in the immediate future is to study and consider the benefits or detriments to the United States of the separate bargaining "package" for American selling price, which would give the United States important additional tariff concessions from the Common Market, Britain, and Japan in chemicals, in return for converting the American selling price customs valuation system to the normal American valuation system used for all other products, and for adjusting the rates on chemicals now covered by the American selling price system.

In the meantime, Congress should consider in open debate improvements in the permanent organization of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to reflect increased foreign economic policymaking responsibilities in the immediate post-Kennedy round period, during which time the Special Representative will also conduct a thorough study of future trade objectives.

But perhaps most pressing is the need to shape new policies to create a better climate in which the developing countries can trade with the developed world. The members of the 21-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—are now rapidly moving toward important decisions in this area, decisions for which the United States must be well prepared.

This concern for the trade problems of the developing countries—a concern for implementing a policy of "trade not aid"—and a concern for focusing attention on the "other than tariff" barriers to world trade that have become so important to present world commercial relations, can be furthered by means of bilateral or other negotiations in the pe-

riod until a major new legislative effort is launched. In this coming period there will be ample opportunity to carry on other aspects of the work initiated during the Kennedy round, such as in agriculture trade, and to begin working on new fronts, including the problem of unfair and hidden export subsidization, the contribution of international futures markets in stabilizing prices of important agriculture products of developing countries, and the laying of groundwork for establishing uniform rules of international fair competitive practice in all fields.

THE U.S.S. "NEW JERSEY"

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there have been continuing reports in the press speculating that the Department of Defense is preparing to call back into service one of our World War II vintage battleships to serve in the Vietnam war. I have personally checked with officials in the Department of the Navy and I understand that, although no firm decision has been made, there is serious consideration being given to this matter.

Of special interest and pride to the citizens of New Jersey is the fact that the battleship U.S.S. *New Jersey* is the leading contender for being recommissioned for service in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S. *New Jersey* has served this country with distinction in the Pacific theater during World War II and during the Korean conflict. She has been a source of admiration, pride, and honor for the State of New Jersey.

The prospect of recommissioning the U.S.S. *New Jersey* also gives renewed hope for a proposal which would embody the pride of the people of the State of New Jersey in "our ship." I have for several years been interested in converting the U.S.S. *New Jersey* into a national monument to be situated off the shore of Jersey City.

As many Members are aware, the Ellis Island National Monument is scheduled for completion in the near future. In addition, the State of New Jersey is presently constructing Liberty Park on the shores of Jersey City. These attractions would provide a natural and inspiring setting in which to place the U.S. *New Jersey* once it is decommissioned and declared of no further military use to the U.S. Navy.

One of the factors which has prevented serious consideration of bringing the U.S.S. *New Jersey* from its present mothball berth to Jersey City has been the tremendous cost involved in moving the huge ship and rehabilitating it for use as a national monument. Now, assuming that the *New Jersey* is recommissioned for service, the cost will be minimal to decommission the *New Jersey* in the vicinity of Jersey City's Liberty Park and convert the ship into a national monument.

The tremendous popularity of the U.S.S. *North Carolina* as a national and State attraction in North Carolina points to the popularity that the U.S.S. *New Jersey* would enjoy. It would be a fitting end to a distinguished ship.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S. *New Jersey* has a record in war and peace scarcely touched by any other ship of the fleet. What follows is a brief sketch of her record which should indicate the prime reason why she deserves better than going back into the mothball fleet or conversion to scrap after her final service.

The U.S.S. *New Jersey* has an overall length of 887 feet 7 inches with an extreme beam of 108 feet 1 inch. She displaces 45,000 tons and is designed with a top speed of 33 knots. Her armament consists of nine 16-inch guns, twenty 5-inch guns, 16 quad 40-mm. antiaircraft cannon and 60 single 20-mm. antiaircraft cannon. The *New Jersey's* armor is 17 inches thick.

Actually, the present U.S.S. *New Jersey* had a predecessor named for the great State of New Jersey. The original U.S.S. *New Jersey* was one of the great white battleships of the pre-World War I vintage. The first *New Jersey* first served off the coast of Cuba during September and October of 1906 ready to protect American citizens and property during the Cuban insurrection of that year. During 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt sent the *New Jersey* on a cruise around the world to show our increasing naval might. She traveled around South America making stops at most of the major ports. From there the *New Jersey* proceeded to Australia where Prime Minister Deakin made a speech of welcome in the Sydney Townhall in which he said:

> No other flag but that of Great Britain would receive such a welcome as we are extending to the United States fleet. May our cordiality convince our King that even the giant strength of majestic battleships counts for less than the strength of the invisible ties drawing us together, united in affection in our heritage of freedom and humane ideals.

The *New Jersey* then proceeded to Japan and from thence on to the Suez Canal, Egypt, France, and on February 22, 1909, she arrived on the east coast of the United States.

During 1911 through 1914, the original battleship *New Jersey* stood duty in the Caribbean with particular emphasis on Mexico. In April of 1914 the men from the *New Jersey* assisted in the occupation of Vera Cruz, Mexico.

The battleship *New Jersey* served as a gunnery training ship during World War I and after the signing of the armistice she made four trips to France to assist in returning nearly 5,000 American veterans. The original battleship *New Jersey* was deactivated at the Boston Naval Shipyard on August 6, 1920.

New Jersey gave a last measure of service to the Nation on September 5, 1922, when she was sunk off Cape Hatteras by Gen. Billy Mitchell's Army bombers—proving once and for all the effectiveness of airpower.

The present battleship U.S.S. *New Jersey*—BB-62—was built by the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. Her keel was laid on September 16, 1940, and she was launched on December 7, 1942, by Mrs. Charles Edison, wife of the Governor of New Jersey. Governor Edison, incidentally, was a former Secretary of the Navy.

The *New Jersey* first engaged in action during the American capture and occupation of the Marshall Islands during January of 1944. She next led a task force of battleships, cruisers, and aircraft carriers to destroy the Japanese advance fleet base at Truk Atoll, Caroline Islands. The *New Jersey* continued to operate in support of landings throughout the smaller Pacific islands. She took part in the invasion of New Guinea in April of 1944.

During June 1944 the *New Jersey* lent her tremendous firepower to the invasion forces occupying the Mariana Islands. During that same month she provided antiaircraft cover during the critical Battle of the Philippine Sea. Japanese Admiral Ozawa's log shows that of 430 aircraft used during the Battle of the Philippine Sea, only 35 survived.

The *New Jersey* became the flagship of the 3d Fleet on August 24, 1944, when she hoisted the flag of Adm. William F. Halsey, Jr. For the next 3 months the *New Jersey* led the 3d Fleet in operations against the Japanese at Okinawa, Manila, Leyte, and Formosa. Toward the end of 1944, the *New Jersey* shelled Japanese positions along the Indochina coast and on the Chinese mainland. The *New Jersey* protected the support fleet during the invasion of Okinawa.

After the war, the *New Jersey* returned to the United States, arriving at San Francisco on February 10, 1946. After an overhaul at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the *New Jersey* traveled through the Panama Canal and celebrated her fourth birthday at Bayonne, N.J. Gov. Alfred Driscoll and former Gov. Walter E. Edge were the honored guests at Bayonne.

For the next 2 years the *New Jersey* served in the North Atlantic, training Naval Academy midshipmen. During her stops throughout Europe, the *New Jersey* was host to numerous government officials and royalty.

On June 29, 1948, the *New Jersey* cleared Brooklyn Bridge with only 2 feet to spare on her way to decommissioning ceremonies at the Bayonne Naval Annex.

The *New Jersey* was recommissioned at ceremonies in Bayonne attended by Governor Driscoll and Admiral Halsey. After shakedown cruises throughout the Caribbean, she set sail for Korea and service with United Nations Forces as the flagship of the 7th Fleet.

The *New Jersey* pounded the North Korean shores in support of United Nations troops. Her 16-inch guns rained death and destruction on the North Korean and Chinese troops and installations. Her helicopters assisted in rescuing numerous airmen shot down over North and South Korea.

On November 11, 1951, the *New Jersey* participated in her last action of this

first tour of Korean service. She had fired over 3,000 rounds of 16-inch shells and nearly 4,000 rounds of 5-inch ammunition. She had completed over 49,000 miles of cruising in the Korean theater.

The war-weary battleship returned to the Norfolk shipyard for a well-deserved overhaul. On July 19, 1952, she left Norfolk on training exercises with 1,500 Naval Reserve midshipmen aboard. The *New Jersey* stopped at ports in France and Portugal.

After passing again through the Panama Canal and stopping briefly at Pearl Harbor, the *New Jersey* reached Yokosuka, Japan, and relieved battleship *Missouri* the following day as flagship of Vice Adm. Joseph J. Clark, commander of the 7th Fleet.

The *New Jersey* arrived off the Korean coast on April 13, 1953. Her first mission was to play host to the President of Korea and Madame Syngman Rhee, American Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs, and other American and Korean officials.

The mighty battleship continued to lend her guns as protection to United Nations operations. As flagship of Admiral Halsey's 7th Fleet, the *New Jersey* hosted numerous conferences and strategy sessions attended by President Rhee and Gen. Maxwell Taylor. On September 16, 1953, President Syngman Rhee came on board the *New Jersey* to present the Korean Presidential Unit Citation to the 7th Fleet. On July 27, 1953, the Korean conflict had ended.

The *New Jersey* returned to Norfolk for extensive overhaul, and until late 1956 she served throughout the Atlantic and Caribbean, making calls at most major ports. Many times she had on board an extensive complement of midshipmen in training.

On August 21, 1957, the USS *New Jersey* was decommissioned at Bayonne, N.J. She had earned 13 battle stars for operations during World War II and Korea. She holds a number of other awards including both the Korean and Philippine Citation badges. There is no doubt from her record that the mighty dreadnaught, *New Jersey*, has served her country with distinction and valor in the past, and she retains the potential to be a powerful force again.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that if any battleship is recommissioned that it will be the *New Jersey*. I hope she will again lend her might to bring peace and freedom to the world.

U.S. EXHIBIT AT EXPO 67

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Canada where it was my privilege to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference. At the conclusion of the conference, our gracious hosts invited us to visit Expo 67, the outstandingly beautiful and successful world exhibition being held in Montreal this year.

I congratulate the people of Canada on the success of Expo 67 by which Canada is sharing with the world the happy occasion of the 100th anniversary of Canadian Confederation.

It was also with great pride that I visited the 20-story "Sky Break Bubble," which is the U.S. pavilion at Expo 67. This giant geodesic dome, designed by R. Buckminster Fuller, led the New York Times to aptly state in an editorial of April 27, 1967, "Canada and the United States both have hits in Expo 67." The editorial went on to state:

> The fair bids to be one of the great international shows of the century, and the United States Pavilion is a standout—a joyous distillation of the best American art, science and culture, no less profound for its easy wit and beauty.

We must keep in mind that although Expo 67 will be visited by a large number of Americans, the U.S. pavilion is there for our friends in Canada and other countries who will visit Expo 67. It was planned to enter into the true spirit of Expo 67 in providing a joyous experience for all who attend.

I know some Americans will disagree with our exhibit inside the dome, especially so if they compare the hardware and consumers goods of the Soviet pavilion with ours. The space exhibition alone with the actual space vehicles is enough to tell that story of American might. But by now people in the world know of our industrial capacity. Perhaps what they no longer associate the United States with is our fundamental values and beliefs. We are basically a peace-loving people who still hold dearer than material values our ideals, our faith in the future, our hopes for our children. I think our exhibit does an excellent job in putting this in proper perspective. It is a side of America that needs retelling, for it is not told very often these days. The American exhibition in Expo 67 tells it very well. And it tells it with a quiet confidence that is in itself impressive.

I wish to congratulate the former Congressman from Maine, the Honorable Stanley R. Tupper, Commissioner General of the U.S. exhibit at Expo 67, for a job well done.

That the pavilion has succeeded in capturing the spirit of creative America could be no better illustrated than by an article in the Montreal Star of Saturday, May 13, 1967, under the headline "251 Hats Off to Those Subtle Americans." The article praises the geodesic dome, pointing out that it "glitters in sunlight and sparkles with a breathtaking interior light at night," and goes on to state "it is spectacularly beautiful."

The reporter writing the article, Dusty Vineberg, captures the spirit of the exposition in these words:

> The fact is that the American Pavilion, which girdles a pond, a tree and a mini-rail as minor details of interior decor, is possibly the most brilliant manifestation of man and his world at Expo 67. However, it is a sophisticated and subtle exhibition, to be understood as much by what its designers have dared to omit as by what has been included, as much by what it is not as what it is.

Our own U.S. publication, U.S. News & World Report, states in the May 23, 1967, issue:

> The American Pavilion has an "Alice in Wonderland" air. People say you catch your breath and exclaim "Gee Whiz." It's an entertainment.

The Virginia Pilot, of Norfolk, Va., summarized it with these words:

> The Montreal Universal and International Exposition—EXPO 67, for short, as befits a gay birthday party—celebrates the 100 years of our neighbor, Canada, by depicting man as creator, explorer; producer, provider, and member of the community.
>
> And celebrates is the right word. The overall impression of EXPO 67 is one of delight with the world around us an optimism for its future. The exhibition itself, which makes a Venice of what had been acres of pollution, is an exposition of how modern planning can transform man's environment.
>
> No exhibit is more expressive of the mood of creativeness than the 20-story dome, gay as a Christmas baubel, conveying an impression of life in the United States. The airy presentation of pop art and space capsules, cheek by jowl, is daring and controversial; but that, too, represents this nation's willingness to experiment. If the U.S. exhibit invokes debate, that is evidence that it is way out, which is where this country ought to be, whether exploring the universe in space or at a world's fair.

I would like to include for your attention some reactions from Montreal papers:

[From the Montreal Star, May 13, 1967]

U.S. POP-ART AT EXPO—VIETNAM "CAMOUFLAGE"

Moscow, May 13.—The Soviet government newspaper Izvestia last night said the U.S. hoped to use "five-story" pop-art paintings at the Montreal world's fair—Expo 67—to draw attention away from U.S. aggression in Viet Nam.

Izvestia correspondent S. Kondrashov praised architect Buckminster Fuller's geodesic dome, which houses the American pavilion, and said the space exhibit was interesting, but had few kind words for the "creative America" section of the exhibition.

He singled out mammoth paintings by Barnett Newman and Robert Indiana for special criticism. Indiana's painting "cardinal numbers," a 53-foot high canvas in which numbers are written in both figures and words, "freezes the soul of art," he wrote.

Kondrashov accused the U.S. information agency of cold-bloodedly drawing attention away from the war in Viet Nam—"a war that is present only in the form of polished medals on the chests of the burly Marine sergeants guarding the pavilion."

The Soviet Union, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the October revolution, has the biggest pavilion at Expo 67.

[From the Montreal, Saturday Gazette, May 13, 1967]

THE AMERICAN PAVILION AT EXPO '67

A POET'S VIEW

(By Louis Dudek)

The popular U.S. Pavilion at Expo is a good subject of conversation these days. Everyone has his pros and cons, and reactions vary from praise to paltry prejudice. But there's a reason for all these discussions.

The dome is like some miscroscopic structure vastly enlarged, one of the protozoa, or perhaps a molecular arrangement from beyond the scope of human vision. The inside, one would expect, should be stuffed with bio-

physical displays, models of atoms, studies in physics and metaphysics to fit the external appearance. Actually it contains nothing of the sort.

R. Buckminster Fuller, the architect who designed the geodesic dome, indeed is interested in the mystery of the creation. He believes that we do not merely live in a universe where all energy is running down (entropy), but that we are also accumulating energy as creative living beings and releasing energy of our own.

Jack Macy at the American Pavilion, who *had the job of* "filling the bubble," explains that the aim was simply to give "a visual statement about a cross-section of America" . . . and to make it all "big, American, and beautiful." It certainly is, and most visitors are hugely pleased and stimulated by the lively "happenings" inside. Like much of Expo, it is designed for popular consumption—since, let's face it, Expo is one of the mass media—but it also has its serious intellectual side.

Actually, the new technology is against old art; it demands a new kind of art that comes straight out of the new technology. The old principles of individual creativity and expression are replaced by new impersonal and functional products. The result is a state of crisis in all the arts, a kind of hysteria that seems ready to abandon all known distinctions between art and non-art, all aesthetic principles, and yields to the process of mechanical transformation. Camp is one of the results, a state of mind which says "Nihilism is fun . . . Since there are no gods, let's collect the clay fragments of what other foolish people have admired."

The geodesic dome at Expo is filled with blow-ups of film stars, exhibits of famous guitars, antique folk-art, 197 hats (count 'em), Raggedy-Ann dolls from New Jersey, and retrieved components of space vehicles. It all adds up to modern America, like Dos Passos' U.S.A.; but the modern hysteria is also there, and the crisis in values is recorded in the various exhibits as well as the Andy Warhol picture overlooking the lot. This is all very contemporary, and it reflects the dilemma of modern art and life, better than any poetry.

Our problem, since T. S. Eliot's The Waste Land and Mr. Bloom in Ulysses, is one of triviality and how to transcend it. The trivial, in everyday life, is really absurd, stupid, unreal—and we know it. We try to escape it. Art was always the answer to the unreality of commonplace existence: art, or religion.

When the trivial is recent enough, and we can remember it with affection, we bring it back as the art of nostalgia. The old film stars, at the U.S. Pavilion, are suffused with nostalgia. Children's games, on the other hand, shown in the Art Kane film in the auditorium, are the ideal itself reduced to the sentimental, a very attractive cliché. Neither is really strong enough to save us from futility.

The realism of the Apollo space capsules, and the stark replica of the moon's surface, are something else again. These might take us up, out of the realm of trivia; but then we know that the space game is really a misguided missile. It doesn't really answer the problem of technological and scientific meaninglessness.

The permanent, the durable in art, is the only index in experience of what is not absurd, stupid, or unreal, and that is why we will always return to it. No matter how distracted or confused, we will return to the idea of art after the hysteria of technological discovery and innovation peters down. In the meantime, the excitement of new adventure leads us on.

AN ARCHITECT'S VIEW

(By Satish Dhar)

This is not the first time the Geodesic Dome has been used in a Fair. For the last nine years the United States has been laying it, like a golden egg, at many International Trade Fairs, particularly in underdeveloped countries. Different versions of it have appeared at Istanbul, Kabul, Tunis, New Delhi, Accra, Tokyo and even Moscow, where incidentally the Russians liked it so much that they bought it.

But in these cases there were reasons for the United States to act the protective hen to Buckminster Fuller's Dome. It was easy to ship, easy to put up and take down and then reassemble on another site with unskilled labor. It did not mean that the Americans were taking the Dome seriously as a piece of architecture. But its inclusion in a fair in North America, where there are no problems of transportation or construction indicates that it has now been canonised by the architectural profession and has triumphantly come of age.

It is easy to wax poetic about Buckminster Fuller's glistening bubble with its interlacing steel filigree-work, the everchanging sheen on its glassy skin or the endless play of the sun on its surface. It is easy also to get carried away by the sheer purity of its beauty or the lightness, the airy soaring vitality of its interior. But it is not easy to understand why it took a non-architect. Fuller, to give one of the most satisfying answers to a purely architectural problem.

An exhibit pavilion is in the realm of pure visual design where structural and utilitarian problems are secondary.

It is for this reason that an exhibit pavilion has been called the architect's delight. And yet, where most architects have got lost in their own aesthetic virtuosity or their orgiastic imagination, the American giant bubble has a directness and simplicity with few parallels in this Fair or others that have gone before it. It is almost as if modern architecture, whose most important contribution on the aesthetic level has been simplicity, has lost its pristine innocence and has had to look outside its own realm to win it back.

It is small wonder that Buckminster Fuller got his inspiration for his new building system outside the field of architecture. Long ago he discovered that the building industry was geared to obsolete materials based on their strength in compression. These materials were not as strong as the tensile materials developed by the aircraft industry. He realised that a structure built on tensile structural principles would be lighter, faster to build and cheaper.

Fuller had been probing into the nature of forces in the Universe and he realised the ascendant law of the Universe was not the state of rest as Newton had described it in his First Law but that of motion as discovered by Einstein. Fuller then carried his researches to the building industry, where the structural system was based on the principle of materials in compression. But a structure in compression is a structure at complete rest. This to Fuller was going against the grain of the Universe.

So he invented a new building system—the geodesic principle. This system is a combination of structural members in tension and compression which balance and thus distribute the stresses evenly throughout the structure. Such a balancing of contrary forces, such as interaction of stresses is directly opposed to the "structure at rest" bases of the compression system. Such a self-annulling of forces has resulted in a prodigiously strong structure in comparison to the weight.

It is therefore not surprising that the American pavilion at Expo is one of the lightest structures of this size devised by man.

It is this springy, almost effervescent lightness that is the most striking aspect of the American Exhibit, and the designers of this pavilion have sought to enhance this quality of lightness by every means at their disposal. Such an attitude on the part of the designers makes this particular Geodesic Dome more successful as architecture when compared with the 5000 or so that have gone before it. Though based on the same principle the earlier domes looked squat and rigid like an inanimate weight on the ground. This was because they were designed as pure hemispheres and placed on flat ground.

The American pavilion on the other hand is a ¾ sphere and is placed on a raised platform on one side and a pool on the other. The fact that it is not a rigid hemisphere gives it a soaring dynamic quality: like a transparent balloon caught in its ascent to the sky.

It is understandable that in the presence of such a spatial fantasy that the interior organization should seem like a hindrance, an intrusion. For what takes place inside the structure is architecture, and architecture, as it is today, is like an anachronism when it has the Geodesic Dome for its backdrop. But within the limitations of architecture the Cambridge Seven who have designed the interior, have done a valiant job, putting up the exhibits so as to set off the dome to the best advantage.

This pavilion will be remembered by architects if only because it has underlined for them the limitations of their profession. This may in turn encourage them to look beyond their discipline for inspiration. If it does that, architecture may yet get another lease of life.

[From the Montreal Star, May 13, 1967]

251 HATS OFF TO THOSE SUBTLE AMERICANS

Ever since opening night many Americans have come away puzzled and angry from their nation's pavilion at Expo 67. They concede that Buckminster Fuller's dome, which glitters in sunlight and sparkles with a breath-taking burst of interior light at night, is spectacularly beautiful But they feel let down by its contents. They say it is a hollow bubble.

Always in the minds of visitors, it seems, is that other pavilion across Cosmos walk, the huge, didactic exhibit of the U.S.S.R., jam-packed with every last nut and bolt manufactured in the Soviet Union.

The fact is that the American pavilion, which girdles a pond, a tree and a minirail as minor details of interior decor, is possibly the most brilliant manifestation of man and his world at Expo 67. However, it is a sophisticated and subtle exhibition, to be understood as much by what its designers have dared to omit as by what has been included, as much by what it is not as by what it is.

It is not boastful or aggressive, it is not militaristic. There is nothing of the hawk in the theme of "Creative America" or in its execution. And strangely the Americans, normally masters of the hard sell, have not even publicized it very much, fearing perhaps, congressional watchdogs and the Un-American Activities Committee.

The fact that somehow it got away from that kind of officialdom, although it was organized by the United States Information Agency, is a miracle.

Art is rarely created by committee, that is to say, by democratic processes, but governments tend to see it as their duty to dilute the unique and individual, to be all-inclusive, to represent in their exhibitions every aspect of their countries and their peoples. Unfortunately, as Sir Herbert Read has pointed out, art is the opposite process of choosing, selecting and emphasizing.

The designers of the American pavilion, working with Jack Masey of the USIA, understood this. Headed by Ivan Chermayeff of the young design group called Cambridge Seven, they have shown the world certain aspects of their country, confident no one would misunderstand such selective emphasis.

Can anyone really imagine that the Amer-

icans are unable to lay out as much hardware as the Russians if they wished? The designers of this exhibit, civilized and world-oriented as they are—Buckminster Fuller refers to them as "world men" like himself—simply take for granted their country's ability to achieve technologically whatever is necessary for survival, health and social welfare.

That, in fact, was their starting point. It left them free to explore the theme of "Creative America." And they started with the physical situation, the geodesic dome, which in itself is a statement. As Marshall McLuhan might put it, the pavilion is the message.

With its computer-controlled sunshades, its forecasting of temperature-controlled cities under plastic, its spectacular view of the city, fair, river and mountain, it makes, by itself, an overwhelming statement about American architectural and engineering genius. It also provides a thrilling sense of space and one of the longest escalator rides in the world.

In short, it is fun and it really does feel, as Buckminster Fuller described it, like going aboard an ocean liner. And like the rest of the American pavilion, it requires no captions. This cinematic virtue is also a virtue of pavilions at a fair the size of Expo 67 where the ability of foot and brain to absorb punishment is a factor to be respected.

As for the four main exhibits—two for space research and exploration and one each for Hollywood memorabilia and contemporary art—visitors will find some more rewarding than others according to their inclinations. Only the space exhibits, dramatic demonstrations of technological creativity, are unanimously accepted. The movie display has been deplored as superficial, the art show described as "a clubroom for an American clique," and the four-area division felt to be vaguely unsatisfying and unexpected.

It seems to me on the contrary that the division is bold but valid, an intriguing and original conception that highlights important aspects of creative America.

And it is counterpointed by the sub-exhibits of folk arts and "The American Spirit." No history professor has been at work here. There has been no effort to teach anyone anything except indirectly, through the startling beauty and variety of the objects and the dash and elan with which they are exhibited.

From Indian beadwork to patchwork quilts, they have been lovingly assembled by people who recognize quality whether in a museum or at a country fair. They create a mood and they convey also a sense of the past and of tradition that contrasts brilliantly with the space world of today and tomorrow. Like the rest of the exhibits, they have been mounted with wit and elegance.

Yet, since the pavilion opened, these displays and especially a collection of 250 men's hats, have displeased visitors who appear to feel that anything that is fun cannot be serious. The hats—from cowboy to hard hat—are intended to represent in a lighthearted way the diversity of American life. There are some among us, it seems, who would have preferred hard facts to hard hats.

Even they must concede, however, that the American pavilion achieves the nearly impossible in this day of over-shocked, supersaturated people: it is surprising. As one visitor reported joyously the other day, it is for artists and children. It is not what one expects of the United States. It does not take itself too seriously. It is elegant, witty and fun.

What the world expects these days is more in the military line—rockets, napalm, the blindfold blunder into a quagmire from which it is impossible to extract the nation and where hate, fear and fanaticism are bred, dark companions of the qualities of love, hope, optimism, genius, grace and joy which have built the American pavilion.

The pavilion stands as a reminder of American diversity which resists generalizations about the country. As Germany was a nation which nurtured Goethe and Hitler, so the United States is a country of warring forces. Our future may depend on which ones prevail.

Standing under that soaring dome which offers—unfortunately it can't be tagged, labelled and exhibited in a showcase—"an aesthetic sense of space," it is possible to feel happier with the answer to the question: "How goes the battle?"

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LXVII

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after World War II, a naval hero of that war wrote:

> War will exist until that distant day when the conscientious objector enjoys the same reputation and prestige that the warrior does today.

That former naval man was John F. Kennedy.

Today, instead of respecting the rights of the conscientious objector, the Committee on Armed Services would have us agree to two changes in the present law that would place further restrictions on these individuals.

Currently conscientious objectors are divided into two groups—those who object to war in any form but who are not opposed to noncombatant service in the military, and those who object not only to war but to military service of any kind.

Under present law, members of the second group are not inducted, but are simply ordered by their local draft boards to undertake 2 years of work of a humanitarian or social nature. If they do not fulfill this obligation, they can be prosecuted under civil law, but are technically not under military discipline. The Armed Services Committee, however, recommends the elimination of some of this distinction by inducting all conscientious objectors into the Armed Forces. Those who object to military service as well as to war would be immediately granted leave to perform 2 years of work, but they would be under military discipline.

The other change urged by the committee would eliminate from the present law a clause attempting to define what the Congress means by "religious training and belief" as a basis for conscientious objection. The act attempted to define this in terms of the individual's "relation to a supreme being."

The Supreme Court broadened the definition of this particular clause in the 1965 Seeger decision, by interpreting it to mean a belief in a universal moral imperative, which would parallel the ordinary religious belief in a supreme being. The committee, however, would have us undermine the U.S. Supreme Court by narrowing the grounds for conscientious objection through the removal of this section from the law.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 50 years ago, on April 27, 1917, to be exact, a speech was made in the U.S. Senate which discussed the rights of a conscientious objector. The speaker was the great Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette. He clearly understood and respected not only the religious objections to military service and war but also, the dictates of human conscience. In offering an amendment to the 1917 draft bill that would extend the basis for conscientious objection, the Wisconsin Senator said:

> As we all know, there are many thousands of spiritual-minded citizens in the United States who believe that all war is wrong, and that it is against civilization and the Christian religion, and who will be killed rather than to kill. These people are by no means confined to members of religious organizations—as that language used in this bill. These people are among our best citizens—sober, industrious, law-abiding, God-fearing people, and yet this bill makes no provision which will allow them to obey the dictates of their conscience if in the operation of the draft they are selected for military service, and neither does it contain any provision to protect these people or any others from being singled out and made the special objects of military persecution under this law. These and other considerations in justice and fairness require the adoption of this amendment.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, we here in Congress and American citizens all over the country have been talking about air pollution for many years. Considerable legislation has been enacted, some progress has been made, but the problem remains serious and in some parts of the country is getting even worse.

The other day, a former Member of the Congress, a Representative from Wisconsin, Andrew J. Biemiller, now the director of the AFL–CIO Department of Legislation, recommended certain amendments to strengthen the Federal Clean Air Act, which are worthy of the consideration of all of us. I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of Mr. Biemiller be inserted in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION OF THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON S. 780, THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967, MAY 3, 1967

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am Director of the Department of Legislation of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. I am also chairman of the AFL–

CIO Staff Committee on Atomic Energy and Natural Resources.

On behalf of the AFL–CIO, I wish to express our support for the broad program set forth in S. 780, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. We have some comments and suggestions for improvements, but we are in basic agreement with the aims and approach of this legislation.

The AFL–CIO has a long standing interest in clean air and air pollution control. The last AFL–CIO convention in 1965 declared: "The federal air pollution program should be strengthened by increasing grants-in-aid to state air pollution control agencies, to establish strict federal performance criteria, and to improve state programs, to provide strong enforcement machinery, and to expand efforts to provide economically feasible techniques of reducing air pollution from motor vehicles, industrial and municipal contaminants."

More recently, the AFL–CIO Executive Council on February 23, 1967 again spelled out needed changes in the Federal Clean Air Act as follows:

"CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION"

"The Federal Clean Air Act requires strengthening amendments in order to:

1. Empower the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to set air quality criteria over all sources of industrial pollutants released into the atmosphere, not merely those by automobiles and provided under the present act.

2. Establish federal airshed commissions to control air pollution in those areas, in cooperation with state and local governments.

3. Provide meaningful enforcement procedures.

4 Expand research into causes, effects and control methods with regard to air pollution and reorganize the scattered federal research program in this area.

"The President's recent message on air pollution and his proposed program demonstrate his deep concern over the problem. We are in general agreement with his stated goals and will give his legislative proposals the serious consideration they require.

"We urge AFL–CIO state and local bodies to cooperate with other groups in their communities to help achieve strong local and state air pollution control programs."

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the complete text of the AFL–CIO Executive Council statement on "Air and Water Pollution" be included in the record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, all of the oratory, the proliferation of literature, both technical and popular, the activities of all levels of government, the National Conferences on Air Pollution over the past decade cannot set aside one stark fact: The problem of air pollution is not being solved. It is growing worse.

In his message to the Congress on Air Pollution the President said: "We are not even controlling today's level of pollution. Ten years from now when industrial production and waste disposal have increased and the number of automobiles on our streets and highways exceeds 110 million, we shall have lost the battle for clean air unless we strengthen our regulatory and research efforts now."

The health, economic, esthetic and long-range environmental threats of polluted air are well known. Equally well known are both the principal pollutants and the principal polluters.

Air pollution is self-generating, self-sustaining. It grows from the principal elements of our evolving society.

By 1980 more people will be driving more cars, consuming more electric power, buying more manufactured products, creating more wastes to be disposed of.

There is a constant outpouring of new products and new processes created by a constantly changing technology. The introduction of new and often toxic materials into the atmosphere, already proceeding at a fantastic rate, will, as time goes by, create even greater and more complex problems of airborne contamination.

I would like to present our comments on a number of important proposals contained in S. 780.

1. *Establishment of industry-wide emission levels for the principal polluters.*

As it stands now, some industries which pollute the air are not regulated at all in a state or locality. There are other situations where an industrial plant in one locality can operate without any regulation while a few miles away a competing plant might be forced by local ordinance to submit to a high degree of control over emission of pollutants.

If uniform emission controls were set over the principal emittants and emitters, it would remove inequities now existing and provide the basis for firm compliance and enforcement procedures at all levels of government.

Equally important, it would eliminate unhealthy competition for industry between localities and states, competition based on more lenient regulation permissive legislation, or no legislation at all.

We urge that the establishment of emission standards be established as rapidly as possible. This part of the air pollution control program should be buttressed by expanded research and development.

Therefore, we support those provisions of S. 780 which call for designation of interstate industries as significant contributors to air pollution and which set industry-wide pollution emission standards.

Under S. 780, states could set emission standards equal to or more stringent than the federal standards. However, if the states fail to set or enforce standards in a timely manner, the federal government could proceed to enforce the minimum federal standards.

We support this approach because we believe it meets any possible "states' rights" argument that might be raised in opposition to minimum federal pollution emission standards.

We believe this proposal in S. 780 for setting industry-wide pollution emission standards is in full accord with the position of the AFL–CIO Executive Council, which called for action to "empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set air quality criteria over all sources of industrial pollutants released into the atmosphere." Therefore, we support this proposal.

2. *Regional Air Quality Commissions*

The concept of regional air quality commissions is one of great value in enlarging the control efforts to correct air pollution problems which transcend state lines. Air pollution levels in one place often are set by air pollution originating from pollution emissions a long distance away. Indeed, polluted air can be and often is carried across the continent from California to the Eastern seaboard.

Under the Clean Air Act of 1963, the only way to control air pollution problems that cross state boundaries is through an interstate compact. Such compacts have limited value, however, because they must first be ratified by the legislatures of the states involved and then by the Congress. Only one such compact in the field of air pollution—between Illinois and Indiana—has gotten as far as the Congress. The proposed New York-New Jersey compact has been ratified by the New York Legislature but still awaits action by the New Jersey Legislature.

The regional commission proposal contained in S. 780 is an improvement on the interstate compact for two reasons. (1) Such a commission's area of operation would be based on a region which possesses a characteristic of configuration of air movements. And (2) the initiative for creation of such a commission would not depend on states and localities which now too often fail to meet their existing responsibilities for setting emission standards.

Under S. 780, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could set up a regional air quality commission at the request of the particular states involved. The Secretary is likewise authorized to set up such a commission "whenever on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies he has reason to believe that such action is necessary to protect the health or welfare of persons" in some particular area.

We believe this proposal for regional air quality commissions is in full accord with the position of the AFL–CIO Executive Council, which called for action to "establish federal airshed commissions to control air pollution in these areas, in cooperation with state and local governments." Therefore, we support this proposal.

3. *Research and Manpower*

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has called for action to "expand research into causes, effects and control methods with regard to air pollution and reorganize the scattered federal research program in this area."

We are happy to note, therefore, that S. 780 would raise the authorized appropriations for fiscal 1968 from $66 million to $84 million. This is a step in the right direction.

I should add, however, that we maintain that title to any patents developed under federally financed air pollution control research and demonstration projects should be acquired and retained by the federal government and should be made freely available to the general public.

Also, I wish to call your attention to the shortage of skilled manpower in air pollution control. The Public Health Service says there were some 1,200 higher skilled air pollution personnel in federal, state, and local government control programs in 1965—with an estimated need of 7,000 such personnel now and 9,000 in 1980.

In light of this current shortage, I suggest that this Subcommittee may wish to examine more thoroughly air pollution manpower requirements, current and projected, in federal, state, and local government, and also in private industry. Perhaps such a report could be prepared by the National Center for Air Pollution Control of the Public Health Service.

Once this information is available, this Subcommittee may wish to to devise programs of support for short and long term training to develop the skilled personnel required for successful prosecution of all aspects of air pollution control.

4. *Tax Incentives*

Although tax matters fall under the jurisdiction of another committee of the House of Representatives, I wish to comment briefly on proposals for liberalized depreciation incentives for industries investing in air pollution control equipment.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has clearly stated our opposition to such tax incentives:

"We continue to oppose any special federal tax benefits to industry for the costs of controlling water and air pollution from its own operation; such costs are already covered by federal tax treatment of business investment and depreciation."

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express again the broad general support of the AFL–CIO for the program set forth in S. 780 to help raise the quality of the air which the American people breathe. I appreciate this opportunity to present our views.

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION, FEBRUARY 23, 1967

The increasing pollution of America's air and water constitutes a growing threat to the health and well-being of the American

people. A growing investment in physical facilities will be required over the next decade to meet this challenge. It is estimated by government and private experts that the cost of an effective anti-pollution effort during the 1966-75 decade would include the following outlays from the federal government, states, localities and private industries:

About $10 billion for the building of needed sanitary sewer collection facilities.

Capital costs of constructing needed storm sewers may amount to about $25 billion. Large additional outlays may be necessary for separating present combined storm and waste sewer systems and providing new separated systems, if inexpensive alternatives are not devised.

Capital costs of constructing new and modernizing waste water treatment plants may run as high as $20 billion.

Costs of a relatively effective program to reduce air pollution, including the costs of control equipment by industry, have been roughly estimated at about $3 billion a year in the next 10 years.

There is growing public awareness of both the challenge and the cost. Modern facilities have been constructed and are being planned, particularly in the effort against water pollution. But this progress to date has been offset by the increasing volume of waste that is spewed into the water and air. The anti-pollution effort must be speeded up.

CONTROL OF WATER POLLUTION

1. It is most urgent that the Congress appropriate the full $450 million authorized by the 1966 Amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control act for grants-in-aid to assist localities to finance needed water waste treatment plants. Such appropriation is needed by the large cities and essential to stimulate state legislatures to provide their own matching grant programs.

2. The Federal Water Pollution Control act should be strengthened by amendments to streamline federal enforcement powers, more adequately deal with oil pollution, expand manpower training and research and create federal river basin commissions responsible for dealing with water pollution among other water resources responsibilities.

We continue to oppose any special federal tax benefits to industry for the costs of controlling water and air pollution from its own operation; such costs are already covered by federal tax treatment of business investment and depreciation.

We do not regard the levying of effluent charges on industrial wastes as the essential answer to the problem; the solution requires control and abatement of pollution.

We call on AFL–CIO state and local bodies to urge their state water control boards to establish and enforce adequate water quality standards that will assure a clean water supply.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The Federal Clean Air act requires strengthening amendments in order to:

1. Empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set air quality criteria over all sources of industrial pollutants released into the atmosphere, not merely those by automobiles and provided under the present act.

2. Establish federal airshed commissions to control air pollution in those areas, in cooperation with state and local governments.

3. Provide meaningful enforcement procedures.

4. Expand research into causes, effects and control methods with regard to air pollution and reorganize the scattered federal research program in this area.

Expanded use of electric-powered vehicles would sharply reduce the largest and most rapidly-growing source of air pollution. Any federal program to develop an economically feasible electric-powered vehicle should public domain ownership of all federal patents and a searching assessment by a national commission, with labor representation, of the social and economic impact of a large-scale changeover to the electric automobile.

The growing trend toward nuclear power will also help reduce the large output of air pollution. This program should continue to retain all necessary safeguards, established by the Atomic Energy Commission, to protect against the possibility of nuclear accidents and of pollution from nuclear wastes.

The President's recent message on air pollution and his proposed program demonstrate his deep concern over the problem. We are in general agreement with his stated goals and will give his legislative proposals the serious considerations they require.

We urge AFL–CIO state and local bodies to cooperate with other groups in their communities to help achieve strong local and state air pollution control programs.

HELP FOR THE HARRIED CANADIAN COMMUTER

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many exciting events are taking place in our neighbor to the north these days. Although Canada's Expo '67 is getting all the headlines, other innovations in public programs are just as important. Not the least of these is the efforts being made in the field of mass transit in the province of Ontario. Toronto has already built a gleaming new subway system, to efficiently transport those who work and live in the city. Now the Government of Ontario is seeking to create a truly balanced transportation system by channeling additional moneys into a metropolitan commuter service to serve a wider area and avoiding the extraordinarily high costs of highway construction.

In addition to making this substantial commitment to a mass transit system, it is most significant that the Ontario Government has recognized that a substantial $2 million operating subsidy will be necessary in addition to the $15 million capital expenditures. I have long felt that operating subsidies are a proper instrument of public policy for use in conjunction with new outlays for capital projects such as cars, stations, and rehabilitation of existing facilities. I think that the Government of Ontario has shown commendable foresight in drawing up its mass transit plans.

While the fares for the new system sound high by comparison with New York subway fares, it is of interest to note that the new cars will be air-conditioned.

I now insert an article from yesterday's New York Times which more fully describes the program being undertaken to help the harried commuter:

COMMUTERS GET HELP IN TORONTO—A SUBSIDIZED RAIL SERVICE WILL EASE HIGHWAY LOAD

(By John M. Lee)

TORONTO, May 20.—Ontario is trying to lure the commuter off the expressways with a $15-million rail commuter service that begins on Tuesday.

The government of Ontario (GO) transit system is the first attempt by a Canadian province to create and underwrite a metropolitan commuter service.

The provincial Government hopes to attract 15,000 highway users a day and avoid some highway construction, which costs between $3.5-million and $4-million for one mile of six-lane expressway.

The GO system is expected to cost $2-million a year in operating subsidy in addition to the $15-million capital outlay for equipment, stations and modifications to existing rail lines of the federally owned Canadian National Railways.

Ontario's Premier John P. Robarts, said: "What we are looking for is a better use of our transportation dollar through a balanced use of all modes of transportation."

EXTENT OF THE SYSTEM

The commuter system extends along the shore of Lake Ontario, about 40 miles west of Toronto, to the steelmaking city of Hamilton and about 20 miles east to Pickering, site of a large nuclear power project. The service feeds into Toronto's downtown Union Station, which connects with the subway system.

The multiple-ride fare has been set at 3.5 cents a mile, a rate that transit officials say will save automobile commuters from 60 cents to $1.40 a day. Pickering residents, for example, will pay 71 cents one way for a 21-mile ride in 37 minutes to downtown Toronto. Bus service has cost $1.20 and taken longer.

The fares have been well received. Another attraction is the all-new equipment, with black and beige bucket-type seats, air-conditioning and background music.

Service is being introduced in four stages, and it will be Sept. 5 before the 45 daily trains are in operation. The Government plans 20-minute frequencies in rush hours and hourly service in off-peak periods. There are 15 stations.

It was two years ago this month that the Ontario government announced its commuter service to replace limited service offered by the Canadian National Railways.

PROPOSED TAX CHANGE DOES NOT BENEFIT BULK OF PERSONS OVER 65

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the President submitted a new and imaginative proposal which would more fairly apportion the tax burden imposed on our citizens over 65. Since that time, the proposal has been subjected to much criticism from long-time friends of the elderly as well as from those who have not in the past been overly concerned about their welfare. As I stated when I inserted in the RECORD my own analysis of these tax proposals, I think that much of the criticism has been based on misinformation.

The same point of view is lucidly set forth in an informative article by Hobart Rowen in yesterday's Washington Post. Mr. Rowen reaches the conclusion, with which I heartily agree, that "the huge bulk of persons over 65, dependent heavily on social security, would be totally unaffected by the proposed tax

change. And of those whose tax bills would be affected, two-thirds would get reductions totaling $220 million." Mr. Rowen's article follows:

FEW ELDERLY AFFECTED BY TAX CHANGE PLANS

(By Hobart Rowen)

Elderly people do not have much of a lobby—but they can and do write letters to the President and to their Congressmen.

And lately, many Washington officials have been deluged with complaints that a proposed change in the system of tax benefits for those over 65 threatens their well-being—even their ability to carry on with their limited means.

But the facts of the matter are that the huge bulk of persons over 65, dependent heavily on Social Security, would be totally unaffected by the proposed tax change.

And of those whose tax bills would be affected, two-thirds would get reductions totaling $220 million!

The one-third who would pay higher taxes are a high-income group, who now get special tax relief—never intended for them—just because they happen to be 65 or over.

THE GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSAL

The way the Government's proposal—now before the House Ways and Means Committee—would work is this:

The present $600 added exemption for a person over 65 would be eliminated.

Social Security benefits, now not taxable, would be taxed.

A special retirement income credit, designed to equalize conditions for persons not on social security who get other retirement money, would be eliminated.

But in place of the above varying privileges, the Government would provide a simple blanket exemption of $2300 for a single person and $4000 for a married couple where both are 65 or over.

The new blanket exemptions would be reduced, dollar for dollar, over certain income levels. When the single person's income reaches $5600, he begins to lose his exemption. Same for a married person at the $11,200 level. But there is a minimum exemption amounting to one-third of social security benefits being received—this provision being to compensate for payment of Social Security taxes prior to retirement.

LOWER BRACKET DEDUCTIONS

Complicated? Perhaps so. But the net result is to concentrate an estimated $2.3 billion in tax reduction for the elderly in the lower brackets.

Take the case of an elderly married gentleman with a $45,000 income. He's been getting a special tax reduction of $1800 just because he's 65. Under the new system, he would get only $400 in credits, meaning an effective tax increase of $1400.

But on the other end of the scale, a married taxpayer over 65 earning $4,000 in addition to his social security, who had been getting $784 in special relief would get $905.60 under the rejiggered system.

Yet, in making these proposals, the Government is bucking a strongly-entrenched feeling that it is wrong, somehow, to tax Social Security benefits.

Certainly, the assumption until now has been that social security benefits would be tax-free. In part, although it endorses the objectives of the revision, this is the reason for opposition by the AFL–CIO.

UNION OPPOSITION

The union men also think that the new formula is too tricky for the elderly people involved to understand.

But it shouldn't be difficult to explain to a taxpayer whether or not he's getting a tax reduction. Why cling to a principle which is giving tax relief to people who don't need or deserve it?

Assistant Treasury Secretary Stanley S. Surrey insists that his suggested reform will enable tax relief for the elderly to be directed where it's most needed.

If you want to figure out where you stand under the proposed new system, there is a fairly simple rule of thumb that will generally apply (with a few exceptions, principally those who are getting maximum railroad retirement pensions, and in these cases, the Treasury is trying to work out a special provision):

If your income is $11,600 or below—and you are a married couple over 65—you will get a tax reduction.

If your income is $5,800 or below—and you are a single person over 65—you will also get a tax reduction.

If your income is over these amounts, you will pay higher taxes.

Of the 20,000,000 persons now over 65, about 15,800,000 do not pay any income tax now—nor will they be liable to taxes under the new system.

Curiously enough, the National Association of Manufacturers joined the AFL–CIO in opposition to the proposal.

It is easy enough to understand the NAM's objection, since the new exemption would hit upper bracket taxpayers the hardest.

The union—which complains that Surrey unveiled "a drastic change" in the system without consulting labor or groups representing the elderly—would prefer to keep the principle that Social Security benefits would be tax-free, and then expand those benefits.

But there is a long way to go before expanded benefits would be hit by Surrey's formula. For a married couple living on average Social Security benefits ($1,600), those benefits could triple under the new system before they'd owe a tax.

As the AFL–CIO well knows—since it supported the President's proposal calling for an increase in benefits to only $2,700—there is nothing in view that would give the elderly taxpayer a better break under the current system than under Surrey's program.

THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF CRATER LAKE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on this date, in the year 1902, the Congress created Crater Lake National Park. I know that many of my colleagues have visited this premier attraction of the Pacific Northwest and join with me in praising the foresight of President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot in preserving this scenic and recreational attraction.

Crater Lake National Park is the jewel of the national park system. It is unsurpassed in its spectacular scenic splendor and geological interest. The lake itself is situated at an elevation of 6,177 feet in the caldera of the extinct volcano, Mount Mazama, on the summit of the Cascade Range. The national park embraces about 250 square miles of land and water, including Hillman Peak, the highest point at the rim, named in honor of the lake's discoverer, John W. Hillman, in 1853.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of its unique place in our national park system and great popularity with the traveling public, Crater Lake has, unfortunately, been at a disadvantage because of cramped, outmoded, and deteriorating public facilities. Whether through neglect or oversight, this beautiful park has lagged behind other parts of our national park system. Throughout my years in Congress I have strongly supported a program which would realize the tourism and recreational potential of one of America's greatest natural wonders. I have encouraged efforts to modernize and develop the facilities at Crater Lake National Park to provide a fitting compliment for the breathless scenery which nature generously supplies.

In honor of the 65th anniversary, I am pleased to announce a major investment program expanding the visitor's facilities available at Crater Lake National Park. As Representative for Oregon's Second Congressional District, which includes the park, I have been privileged to follow the planning for this new development and would like to commend the National Park Service for recognizing the importance of these new facilities.

Crater Lake National Park played host to 550,000 visitors in 1966. In its present budget, the Park Service has provided money for relocation of 2 miles of road which will develop a new entrance into the park at the junction of roads from Klamath Falls and Medford, Oreg.

Once the road is underway, a $1.4 million construction program by Ralph O. Peyton, concessioner Tom Flynn, and Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., will begin. Included are plans for a grocery store, restaurant, service station, laundromat, showers, 100 trailer sites, and an extensive campsite complex. Crater Lake Lodge, Inc., estimates that work on this development will be completed by the end of the 1969 season.

A motel and dining room, at a cost of $350,000, are planned by the completion of the 1971 season, and an employee dormitory will be added by the end of the 1973 season. Ultimate plans call for a complete remodeling of Crater Lake Lodge itself by the end of the 1975 season. It is expected that the new lodge will offer 60 guest rooms, spacious dining and recreation facilities, at an estimated cost of $500,000.

The National Park Service will share in the proceeds of this extensive development by collecting a franchise fee of 1½ percent on gross sales.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and my colleagues for your attention today in celebrating the anniversary of one of our country's most beautiful attractions and know that you share my enthusiasm for the future development of Crater Lake National Park.

ULLMAN BILL TO CURB INDUSTRIAL FINANCING ABUSE

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I introduced last Thursday, for appropriate reference, a bill to stop an abuse of the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds and to assist the orderly expansion of industrial development throughout our Nation.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has conducted extensive research on the problem of abuse of the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds. It is my privilege to serve as one of the three Members of the House of Representatives, along with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] on the Advisory Commission. As an organization which includes officials from State and local governments, the Commission is particularly well qualified to develop solutions to this problem of industrial bond financing. I am indebted to the Commission for the assistance their studies have provided in preparing this bill today.

As many of my colleagues are aware, certain corporations in recent years have entered into agreements with local governmental units to finance the construction of plants and equipment by utilizing the tax exempt privileges accorded municipal, but not corporate, bonds. The arrangement works as follows: a municipality authorizes a bond issue—which provides tax-free interest for the investor—to build an industrial facility; once built, a facility is leased by a corporation at a rate equal to the local government's annual cost in retiring the indebtedness.

The community has successfully attracted a new industry—with its attendant payroll and other economic benefits; the corporation has avoided the higher costs involved in raising capital for a new plant by use of taxable corporate bonds and debentures.

I am not suggesting today that we prohibit this arrangement, which has provided considerable help to towns and cities throughout the country in diversifying their economies and encouraging their growth. However, I do object to an abuse which has accompanied much of this industrial financing. In some cases, the beneficiary corporation has itself guaranteed the purchase of the local government's bonds on the open market and received tax-free interest on its investment. Then, once the plant was built, the beneficiary corporation deducted its annual rentals from its corporate income tax as a necessary business expense.

The tax-free status which the Congress has bestowed upon State and local financing was intended to assist these governments in meeting the critical demands of State and local transportation, education, health, welfare, and other responsibilities. This privilege was never designed to create a tax haven for corporations and should not be used as such.

Many financially strong companies are using the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds to their advantage. More and more local governmental units are using their credit to finance plants for lease to industrial and commercial firms. It is estimated that communities in over 30 States now engage in this practice, and from a start of $1.5 million in 1956, it is projected that close to $1 billion worth of bonds will be issued in 1967 to finance industrial development in this manner.

Two States, Maine and Hawaii, have enacted legislation to control these practices. Congress, too, needs to take action to keep the tax privilege of State and local governmental financing within reasonable bounds.

My bill prohibits corporations which lease facilities from deducting rentals from their corporate income tax in those cases where the facilities are financed with industrial development bonds issued by local governmental units. This legislation goes beyond the recommendation of the Advisory Commission in that it does not require actual purchase of some of the tax exempt securities before removing the deduction.

Mr. Speaker, local efforts to attract industry are necessary and commendable. However, this practice must not be permitted to flaunt certain privileges granted local governments by our Internal Revenue Code. A corporation which benefits from an industrial bond financing arrangement—including a possible tax-free income from their own facility—should not in addition be allowed a deduction for the rentals paid in retiring the indebtedness.

I thank the Speaker and the Members of this House for their careful attention to this national problem and am hopeful of early consideration for my legislation.

MEMORIAL FROM THE OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to introduce, last Thursday, a memorial from the Oregon Legislature for the consideration of the House. The legislature memorializes the Congress to refrain from any actions, legislative or otherwise, which would restrict funds available for farm credit.

The memorial was recommended by the interim committee on agriculture to the Oregon Legislature following an in-depth study of farm credit needs. I share the deep concern of my distinguished colleagues in the State of Oregon that a recurrence of last summer's tight-money crisis might result in restrictions on the funds available for farm credit. Over-reliance on monetary controls and high interest rate policies have disastrous effects on an agricultural economy—where most financing is for long-term development.

With sagging farm prices and many other problems, Oregon farmers cannot afford an impairment of farm credit.

I urge the Congress to give its careful attention to this memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

ARKANSAS HOUSE RESOLUTION OPPOSES RESTRICTIVE GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, another resolution adopted by a State legislature has come to my attention regarding restrictive gun legislation.

This resolution clearly indicates why S. 1 and H.R. 5384 are not in the public interest.

The resolution approved by the State of Arkansas, February 28, 1967, follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 45

A concurrent resolution expressing opposition to the Dodd bill and other restrictive gun legislation

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States guarantees the people of this country the right to bear arms, and

Whereas, Arkansas is a sports-minded State, and thousands of citizens of this State possess firearms used for hunting and other recreational purposes, and

Whereas, the right to possess and bear firearms is essential to the protection of persons and property, and the possession thereof by large numbers of our citizens is a deterrent to crime, and

Whereas, since the tragic and unfortunate death of President Kennedy there has been a concerted effort in the Congress of the United States to pass restrictive gun legislation, yet testimony of experts has indicated that this legislation would not accomplish any purpose other than to deprive the citizens of their right to possess and bear arms as guaranteed by the Constitution: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty Sixth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to refrain from the passage of the proposed Dodd bill or similar legislation that would limit the rights of citizens of this country to possess and bear arms, it being the consensus of the General Assembly that adequate legislation now exists on the statute books to protect the public against gun abuses; be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof, a copy of this Resolution shall be furnished the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate of the United States Congress, and to each member of the Arkansas Congressional delegation.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH R. BRENNAN

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in surveying the history of public works in our country, I feel safe in saying that many

of the individual public servants who have contributed in great measure have not been fully recognized.

It was especially pleasant, therefore, on Thursday, May 18, 1967, when Joseph R. Brennan, the engineer consultant of the House Committee on Public Works, was given a testimonial luncheon by the American Public Works Association. One of the larger banquet rooms of the Washington Hilton Hotel was crowded with men and women associated in some way with public works, eager to hear splendid recapitulations of what Mr. Brennan accomplished as a member of the Corps of Engineers and later with our committee.

Among the messages of esteem were those of President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Both are long familiar with the sterling counsel Joe Brennan has afforded Members of the Congress and his skill in translating engineering principles into sound legislation. Their praise was full endorsement of our own evaluation of Joe, which had adequate expression from majority and minority committee members at this memorable function.

In addition to his extensive knowledge of engineering and legislation, Joe Brennan is largely responsible for the fine liaison and cooperation that exists between the Corps of Engineers and our Public Works Committee that has been maintained over the years. This was the main point of the exceedingly nice remarks by Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

Joe Brennan literally grew with the expansion of our modern national public works programs. He came to the Corps of Engineers fresh from MIT where he received his bachelor's degree on a full scholarship, and later his master's degree. After 20 years with the corps, when such monumental projects as the Interstate Highway System, water pollution, flood control and watershed developments, area redevelopment, and modern architecture and building construction were truly experimental and in their formative stages, he came to our committee. Confronting Members of the Congress were technological systems and new methods and inventions which would have been quagmires and nightmares if it were not for the guidance and counsel of Joe Brennan. His vast knowledge has been a real contribution.

As chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, and on behalf of the many people in and out of public service, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the American Public Works Association for their recognition of Joe Brennan. I concur with the highly complimentary remarks made at the luncheon.

I am indeed proud to be affiliated with such a dedicated and conscientious public servant as Joseph R. Brennan.

DR. J. HERBERT HOLLOMON HEADS UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, today it has been announced that Dr. John Herbert Hollomon, Acting Under Secretary of Commerce, has resigned from his Government post to become president-designate of the University of Oklahoma at Norman.

I am happy to welcome Dr. Hollomon to Oklahoma, as I know the regents, faculty, and students are, too. The search for a suitable successor to Dr. George L. Cross has been long and diligent. The right combination of scholarly attainments, practical experience, youthful vigor, and innovative drive is hard to find in these days when the number of colleges and universities is rapidly increasing. The competition is very keen. The University of Oklahoma is fortunate to have found the right combination in Dr. Hollomon.

In research and development, graduate work, extension courses, and other fields the university is constantly increasing its contacts with the Federal Government.

As one who will be working on these matters I think it will be particularly valuable to the institution to have at its head a man experienced both in the operation of the Federal Government and in academic affairs.

A biography of Dr. Hollomon follows:

J. Herbert Hollomon became Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology in May 1962, having been nominated by President Kennedy and confirmed by the Senate. In this position he supervises the Patent Office; the National Bureau of Standards; the Environmental Science Services Administration; and the Office of State Technical Services. He also is a member of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, consultant to the President's Sciences Advisory Committee, and chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences. On February 1, 1967, President Johnson assigned to him the additional duties of Acting Under Secretary.

Dr. Hollomon was with the General Electric Company for 18 years and was General Manager of the General Engineering Laboratory when he entered Government.

He received the B.S., 1940, and the D.Sc., 1946, from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He also has received honorary doctorates from Michigan Technological University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Dr. Holloman has received many honors including the Raymond W. Rossiter Award of the American Institute of Mechanical Engineers; the Alfred Noble Award of the Combined Engineering Societies; the Army Legion of Merit; and the Rosenhain Medal of Great Britain's Institute of Metals (the first American recipient). He is a founding member and a member of the Council of the National Academy of Engineering.

He has been an instructor at Harvard University School of Engineering and Applied Science and adjunct professor at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. He also has been an advisor to Harvard, M.I.T., Cornell, and George Washington University and has directed several studies of engineering education.

Dr. Hollomon was born and reared in Norfolk, Virginia. Mrs. Hollomon is the former Margaret Knox Wheeler, of Portland, Oregon. They have four children.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—JOSÉ MARTÍ, DEFENDER OF HUMAN DIGNITY

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, May 20 marked the 65th anniversary of Cuban independence. On that day, especially, the citizens of Cuba and the United States honor the noble heroes whose dedicated efforts created the sovereign Cuban republic.

One such hero is José Martí, statesman, teacher, thinker, and poet, whose patriotic ardor aroused in the hearts of his countrymen the will to be free. The people of the United States are deeply proud to call Martí their friend. His dream of a sovereign Cuban republic was born here, in New York City. Martí came to this country as a refugee after the devastating 10-years war. He had been exiled from his beloved country because of his adamant revolutionary feelings and his avowed determination to fight for the cause of Cuban independence. In New York, he immediately set about his task of uniting the Cuban exiles, renewing the revolutionary spirit of his compatriots in Cuba, and drawing up a democratic constitution for his nation.

Martí's powerful personality and deep love of people drew friends to him by the hundreds. He labored for 15 years here, writing, teaching, and helping people. He gained an excellent reputation as a journalist, translator, and literary critic. But Americans loved him most for his spirit, his deep respect for human dignity, and his belief in the right of all men to be free.

While in the United States, Martí suffered for his people far away in Cuba. He constantly talked of the injustice of alien government and the importance to life of man's right to self-determination. The people of the United States understood his words. His words brought forth in them remembrance of the early years of our own American Revolution. When he spoke, they could see our own beloved patriots, men like George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. These men had taught the American colonists the precious value of the principles which inspired Martí; they had worked to create a government based on human rights and individual freedom which Americans from that time on have enjoyed. Americans in Martí's time felt a strong kinship with him, and while he lived and worked among them, their hearts went out to him in warm friendship and in deepest sympathy to his cause.

A majestic monument to Jose Martí's greatness stands in the central park in Havana. In New York City's Central Park, another monument was unveiled in May of 1965. It stands facing the Avenue of the Americas between two other great statesmen and liberators of Latin America, Simon Bolivar of Venezuela, and

José de San Martín, hero of Argentina. The statue was the gracious gift of a U.S. citizen, Anna Huntington, who created the dramatic memorial in tribute to the everlasting bond of friendship which unites the people of Cuba and the United States. The monument is a stirring depiction of Martí upon his horse, clutching his chest and falling of a mortal wound. He was killed at the battle of Dos Rios on May 19, 1895.

Martí's death in the battle for Cuban independence embodies his selfless devotion to his people and to the cause of liberty. He had yearned to fight; throughout all of his years of work to free his people, he had expressed often the desire to put his words into action, to ride valiantly into battle to prove that life in bondage is not so precious as liberty, even if it must be paid for by supreme sacrifice. On the day of his death, Martí's cause was won. A Cuban historian wrote that Martí had died, but a people had been born. The loss of their beloved leader revitalized the fighting spirit of the Cuban people and inspired them to undertake a more determined struggle to secure their sovereignty and rights as free citizens.

Today, José Martí is a living spirit in the hearts of his people and a source of hope to the tormented citizens who live now under Communist domination. His teachings are so vitally necessary while his beloved Cuba is once more chained by an alien force. Fidel Castro won the support of the Cuban people because he had promised them a better way of life. Castro pledged to support an effective government structure which would safeguard the guarantees contained in the constitution of the Cuban republic. He promised them that Cuba would move forward economically, politically, and socially, and that the rights of each citizen would be respected and augmented. Often, Castro quotes José Martí and attempts to draw a parallel between himself and the great patriot. But the people of Cuba know that he has betrayed them. His treacherous violations of their privileges as free citizens belie his hollow words. The inhumane crimes which the Castro military machine have committed in the name of a "people's revolution" have shown the Cuban people, and indeed the peoples of all nations in the world community, that this man stands for nothing but his own power and glory. José Martí loved mankind, Fidel Castro holds nothing but malicious contempt for it. José Martí strived all his life to help his people, Fidel Castro only uses his countrymen as a means to feed his ego, and to increase his own power and heighten his glory.

The base of Martí's monument in New York bears the inscription:

Apostle of Cuban Independence. Leader of the peoples of America and defender of human dignity.

Let this 65th anniversary of the Cuban Republic bring forth in the hearts of those who suffer in Castro's Cuba, and in the hearts of their compassionate friends everywhere, a renewal of dedication to the principles for which Martí died. The two statues in Martí's honor offer patriotic inspiration to the enslaved Cuban people to rededicate themselves to the struggle for true independence.

It is the steadfast hope of the citizens of these United States that the Cuban people will rally once more to the cause of liberty, throw off the chains of Communist tyranny, and reinstate their once proud republic in the name of human dignity, liberty, and justice.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, under the leadership of my State's senior Senator, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, the Senate passed and sent to the House the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. Senator MAGNUSON is the father of educational television in the country, and it is, therefore, not surprising that he has taken a lead in the passage of legislation that can substantially help television better fulfill its great potential.

Under the provisions of this bill, educational and informational programing can be increased in volume, improved in quality, and given a chance to exercise greater innovation. It deserves thoughtful and, hopefully, prompt consideration by the House.

To that end, I would like to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my interested colleagues an editorial from the New York Times for May 13, 1967:

[From the New York Times, May 13, 1967]

GO-AHEAD FOR PUBLIC TV

President Johnson's excellent proposal for a quasi-public corporation to spark the development of noncommercial television has cleared its first hurdle with its approval by the Senate Commerce Committee. If progress through the full Senate and the House is swift, as it should be, the new body can begin addressing itself this year to the basic issues on which depend the future of public television.

Neither the President's bill nor the trailblazing reports of the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television grapple in any specific terms with the ways by which educational TV can achieve its maximum capacities as a medium of information, entertainment and cultural enrichment.

Spokesmen for all the commercial networks have made clear their conviction that a strong public TV system will not only be valuable in itself but also as a goad to higher standards in the established branches of television. Guidelines for the attainment of full public dividends in that direction will be required.

A major need, of course, is to insure that educational TV will provide broader dimensions in the coverage of news—local, national and global—and in the significance of the news. The Ford Foundation plans to conduct an experimental laboratory to this end next winter on more than 100 interconnected noncommercial stations.

But this experiment will still leave many unanswered questions, especially in such areas as the relative stress to be put on development of community-oriented stations and on building up creativity in a centralized network command. Most important of all will be the drafting of recommendations for the President and Congress as to sources for the substantial public contribution that will be needed to insure the vitality of the entire enterprise.

Creation of the new Corporation for Public Television will not solve any of these problems, but it will provide the instrumentality out of which considered solutions can come.

CLEARING THE AIR

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, for the benefit of my colleagues, two editorials which appeared in the New York Post—one on Friday, May 19, entitled "Clearing the Air," and the other on Saturday, May 20, entitled "Just One More for the Road."

I believe these articles speak for themselves:

CLEARING THE AIR

The heart of the heartfelt "Plea for Realism" to Hanoi, made by 16 Senators who are among the sternest critics of American policy in Vietnam, is their declaration against "any unilateral withdrawal of American troops" without a negotiated settlement of the war.

Their statement is unfailingly accurate in its analysis of American national sentiment and is unshrinking in its warning to Hanoi of a "prolonged and intensified war" as the only alternative to peace talks.

It is also an unmistakable challenge to the Johnson Administration, which has officially welcomed it.

For many weeks, Washington has been insistently claiming that dissent from its Vietnam policy has had the effect of comforting and aiding the enemy.

It has been artfully—and sometimes crudely—alleged that Hanoi interprets such protest as a sign that this country will not remain steadfast. Conversely, it has been claimed that unity of purpose will hasten the end of the war.

In fact, no responsible critics of the current policy have proposed that we cravenly fly the field. These critics, these Senators and, if we may say so, this newspaper have always acknowledged that we have promises to keep in Vietnam, although we may have miles to go. The responsible debate has centered on how to shorten the mileage.

That perspective has been restored by the declaration of the Senators. The Administration's endlessly optimistic predictions now face a critical test. If the President and Secretary Rusk have been correct in their most sanguine moments, this statement by the Senators should have the effect of clearing up dangerous misapprehensions in Hanoi and bringing the North Vietnamese to the bargaining table forthwith.

In any case, the air has been cleared. There is firm agreement that the U.S. must remain steadfast in Vietnam and that a negotiated settlement must be found. Why should the Administration delay further in exploring the key avenue to negotiations: a bombing suspension in North Vietnam?

The newly welcomed Senate critics have proposed this individually. The Secretary General of the UN and the leaders of the Soviet Union say flatly it would lead to peace

talks within weeks. Next week's brief truce on the birthday of Buddha should be the signal for a great new peace initiative.

JUST ONE MORE FOR THE ROAD

Step by step, with almost macabre precision, the U.S. military course in Vietnam conforms to the gloomy script predicted by critics of the escalation. Will their warnings of an ultimate confrontation with Peking be tragically confirmed as all their earlier prophecies have been?

From the time President Johnson apparently reached the final fateful decision to reject an "enclave strategy," and to broaden the scope and intensity of the bombings, each successive aspect of the American involvement has been forecast in advance. There would be bigger bombings; we would hit closer and closer to Hanoi and Haiphong; then—as occurred yesterday—we would begin to invade the demilitarized zone.

Each new escalation would be defined as another phase of "limited" action; when each one failed to produce an enemy collapse, the pressure of the military for "just one more move" would prevail. And when the mounting intensity of the U.S. offensive was matched by escalation of military movement on the other side (as inevitably it would be), this would be offered as new excuse for further expansion of our operations. That is what has happened now; U.S. entry into the neutral area is described as a "defensive" measure against mounting infiltration by the North Vietnamese.

But where does the cycle end—short of a calamitous collision that could, as U Thant has repeatedly warned, ignite World War III? Despite all the current disclaimers of any intent to stage a full-scale actual invasion of the North, our options are running out. We are exhausting aerial targets; there is no indication that pounding away at battered installations will break the deadlock. Nor is there any sign that transfer of the "pacification" program to military control will bring sudden success in the countryside.

If anything, it is basically an admission of the bankruptcy of Saigon's own efforts in this realm.

Have we already crossed the crucial line with our entrance into the demilitarized area? Have the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their deputies finally driven Mr. Johnson beyond the point of no return? We prefer to believe that he has taken this step—like previous ones—with deep misgivings. But we urge him to ponder anew the failure and folly of the counsel to which he has repeatedly yielded.

MEANING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, at a time in history when the American flag has been subjected to infamous abuse, it is heartening to note that the symbol of our national heritage is still revered. I should like to submit for the attention of my colleagues the following inspiring letter which recounts the meaning of the American flag.

DALLAS, TEXAS.

Congressman JOE POOL,
Washington, D.C.

Please know your efforts pertaining to the amendment of the 1950 Internal Security Act have not gone unheeded. Parents of servicemen in Viet Nam, such as ourselves, are grateful for the support given the armed forces fighting for the principles of this nation and all free men.

The following excerpt from a letter written to our Marine son upon his departure for a second tour in Viet Nam eloquently expresses this spirit.

"DEAR PAUL: I guess this will be a letter to say good-bye.

"I have enclosed a small American flag that to me has always meant a great deal. It has been flying over my dresser here at school (A & M) ever since I first came. It's significance to me is simply that I bought it the first time I understood what it meant to be an American, and promised myself that I would always display it, or carry it with me when I was in the service.

"What I would like you to do for me Paul, is to carry it with you when you go to Vietnam this time, and bring it back again to me when you return home. Unfortunately it's the only part of me that can go along at the moment, but to me it's an important part. I hope this doesn't seem ridiculous to you, but if it does, just leave it at home and disregard the thought with no hard feelings. If you do decide to carry it with you, I don't mind how dirty, or worn or faded it gets as long as its in good enough shape for me to carry when I get my chance to serve my country.

"JIM BENSON."

Needless to say our son cherished the flag given him by a "buddy" and has taken it with him, for it is more than a flag.

"Washed in the blood of the brave and the blooming,
Snatched from the altars of insolent foes,
Burning with star-fires, but never consuming,
Flash its broad ribbons of lily and rose.
Thousands have died for it, millions defend it,
Emblem of justice and mercy to all.
—"Oliver Wendell Holmes."

Mrs. PAUL E. BURNS.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. John Bookhout, chairman of the resolutions committee of the Public Affairs Luncheon Club of Dallas, Tex., has requested that I call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following resolution adopted by their membership on May 15, 1967:

RESOLUTION—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM, H.R. 7819 AND S. 1125

Whereas, in the long persistent drive for passage of a bill for Federal aid to education, the fears of the people were allayed by repeated assurances of proponents of the legislation that Federal aid would not carry with it, Federal control of the schools, and

Whereas, the legislation was no sooner approved by Congress and the ink barely dry on the President's signature than the Commissioner of Education brought forth the autocratic "guidelines" under which school districts might receive the Federal grants in aid, and

Whereas, now, even to the most trusting and naive, comes the stark realization that with any acceptance of Federal aid, local control of the schools is lost, the educational system becomes nationalized and an integral part of the unprecedented expansion of Federal power, and

Whereas, the question arises in our minds, could there be a more effective reversal of the principles of a free people and a democratic form of government to a socialized autocracy than through Federal control of education of the youth of this land, and

Whereas, the history of conquests by dictators, through which peoples of other nations have surrendered their freedoms—perhaps, never to be regained—reveals a pattern for step by step exploitation and regimentation of the youth, which is sufficiently convincing proof that this nation should not leave its educational system vulnerable now or in the future to the power mad ambitions of any man or small group of men, and therefore be it

Resolved: That members of The Public Affairs Luncheon Club, assembled this 15th day of May, 1967 urge the adoption of the amendment proposed by Representative Albert H. Quie which would abolish Federal government control and would provide broad grants to individual states to spend as they see fit, thus removing federal aid to education from being a political football, and, be it

Further resolved: That copy of this resolution be spread upon the Club minutes and copies be sent Dallas District Congressmen Joe Pool, Earle Cabell, Graham Purcell and Olin Teague and to other members of the Texas Delegation in the House of Representatives.

A QUANTUM JUMP IN CRAFTSMANSHIP

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the very interesting and thought-provoking article which appeared in the New York Times, Monday, May 8, written by Edward Swayduck, president, Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, entitled "A 'Quantum Jump' in Craftsmanship."

A "QUANTUM JUMP" IN CRAFTSMANSHIP

(The "quantum theory," developed by physicists working with atoms and molecules early in this century, exploded the concept that certain basic changes in nature were gradual and continuous and showed they occurred abruptly—like leaps.)

(Our tax dollars, spent for space exploration, have produced unprecedented technological windfalls reaching to every corner of our society and industry. The failure of certain leaders of management and labor to utilize these quantum-like advances for mutual benefit accounts for much of the current difficulty in management-labor relations.)

(By Edward Swayduck)

Never in the history of our country have so many of our best brains been mobilized for a single purpose as today. Backed by billions of dollars, our finest physicists and engineers have been put to a common task: "Send men into space; set them walking on the moon."

Before you reach a corner like that you pass a good many doorways. On their way to their great goals our scientists have had to

invent new materials, new optical devices, new forms of radar and radio instrumentation, new techniques. These are now seeping down into our everyday world. The products of this research, today permeating all industry, have caused a "quantum jump" in new techniques and craftsmanship. A good deal of American industry is flying, along with the astronauts, like a tail to a kite.

Traditionally industry has spent a certain amount of its profits for research to improve its products, at a pace sufficient to meet the competition of its peers. But in the last few years, with our tax dollars buying research, which no single corporation could possibly afford, the pace of research available to industry has skyrocketed. But not all industries have availed themselves of it.

In some fields, either labor or management has held back from technological process, eyeing it suspiciously; in others, labor and management have lacked a rapport which would have let them adapt to change by joint effort; often there has been a simple lack of understanding or interest in what is taking place. When the "quantum jump" in techniques and craftsmanship started a few years ago, there was in some quarters a total lack of preparedness for it and we can see the effects on all sides.

THE RHYTHM OF DEVELOPMENT

The cause of many of the strikes and other labor-management heartaches of the last decade has been a failure to be in rhythm with developments in this fast-moving world—and a failure to realize that the rhythm was speeding up. The price for being out of step is enormous.

Because—please notice—we all pay taxes to support the government's massive research programs. Every worker and every employer who pays taxes helps to pay the bill. Every time you smoke a highly-taxed cigarette, you chip in your share of a test-tube for our space program. But if an employer and a union are in rhythm with these new developments, they get their money back, in the fruits of the new research, and the devices and materials this creates for them to use in their own lines.

That is what has happened in our trade, lithography. It is startling to note how many new and enlarged skills our men have had to acquire, simply to keep up with new electronic devices, photographic materials, scanning equipment and chemicals flowing to our industry, basically from government-financed research.

An industry which holds back against technical progress, whether because of an improper attitude on the part of management or labor or both, pays out dollars in taxes for research but gets no return. We are in an era of government-financed research in a private enterprise system. It is unique in history that a public program of research should give private enterprise its greatest forward surge, but that is what is happening. We appear to be well on our way to confound the political science dogmatists.

SOME INDUSTRIES WERE READY

How does it happen that some industries were ready for the "quantum jump" when it came, and others were not? Surely the answer to that question would be an important piece of economic and social information. We've been thinking about it because this year our union, Local One, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, celebrates its 85th anniversary. Exercising an anniversary privilege of immodesty we can say that we have not merely accepted new technologies but have in fact welcome them and engaged affirmatively in the build-up of the new skills required of our craftsmen members.

A fortunate organizational development no doubt contributed much to this. In 1915, we "amalgamated"—i.e., we brought all the lithographic crafts, theretofore separately organized, together into one union, to work as a team, under one contract. That put our organization in a favorable form for meeting change. From that time on—52 years ago—whenever a technical concept came along that reduced the demand for lithographic workers in one craft or category, the men affected were allowed and urged to retrain and shift to another. In this we were not beset with jurisdictional problems as the shifts were made within one union. We were therefore not conditioned to view new technology as a threat to jobs, a view which in many cases, mostly unwarranted, has produced panic, strained labor-management relations, strikes and last ditch stands of resistance to change. Many of the destructive labor-management tangles today only reflect minds on both sides that have not been ready for the new period.

SEVENTY TIMES AS FAST

We appear, fortunately, to have been prepared for conditions today by our form of organization and experience with the technical changes which took place in the past at a slower pace. When the new conditions came along, it was like drinking a glass of water for us—there was no particular taste surprise. It is in that spirit that we have moved from the time when a lithographic press gave us only a little more than two million square inches of printing an hour, to today, when a new press can turn out a hundred and fifty million inches an hour—in multicolor—an increase of seventy times in a short span. It is in this spirit that our men have learned new skills to go with new films, new developing processes, new metals for plates, new cybernetic controls on presses and much more.

Far from finding that the new machines make their skills unnecessary, our members have discovered that they have to be better craftsmen than ever. They must learn new vocabularies, a host of new ultra-discriminating measurement processes, a complete new chemistry, a whole new science of technical optics. A workman of the old times, who walked into one of our shops today, might well be bewildered by what has happened to the old processes, and he would have real difficulty understanding the shop language. Our members are not button pushers. They are the most skilled craftsmen the graphic arts have ever had. Their need to master the machine and use its full potential has made them so.

THERE WILL BE FURTHER LEAPS

There are going to be more "quantum jumps," and in many more fields. Technologically, the whole world is about to take a "quantum leap." All unions must get their minds and the minds of their members in tune with what is coming. There will certainly be such leaps in communications—the television satellites are only samples of what will come. There will definitely be "quantum jumps" in transportation, within cities and between cities. The world's flow of knowledge and information is being reorganized while we watch. The children of some of our union and industrial leaders know more from their school science books about what the future has in store than do their parents.

Industry and labor can no longer afford the luxury of living in the past. Labor does that when it resists technical advances. Management does that when it tries to jam new developments down labor's throat without regard for the futures of men who have invested lifetimes in an industry. A "tripod" approach, making sure that new methods produce better living for labor, more growth for management, and lower prices for the consumer is the only approach which can equal, in economic and social skill, the scientific skill that is changing our world.

Those in industry who try to turn science into selfish, one-sided gain, and labor leaders who boast in their official organs that they have no philosophies but prefer to go from crisis to crisis, are no longer in the ball park. Truth is, they are not even on this planet.

To represent men who live by the work of their hands and minds and not to be fully aware of the total transformation that is taking place in our lives by virtue of the one-a-minute pace of new discoveries is to invite economic and social disaster.

To rephrase an oft-heard remark: *"They don't make things like they used to . . . thank God!"*

KRUPP'S LAST TRADE?

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of discussion of expanded East-West trade, and in this connection I have suggested that, before the United States embarks on a course of energetic bridgebuilding in this area, all the facts of trade expansion should be carefully examined, especially the aspect involving the granting of long-term credits. The experiences of those who have actually done extensive trading with the East should be studied with particular care.

Columnist Eliot Janeway, writing in the Chicago Tribune, has described the credit jolts which the German Krupp enterprises experienced in dealing with Russia. In trading with this nation, Krupp agreed to Communist conditions that credit be extended over a long period of time—10 to 15 years—and that payment would not start until the factory or mill being constructed under the terms of the trade agreement was in full production. As Mr. Janeway has pointed out, Krupp overextended itself by agreeing to this long-term repayment and other Communist conditions. Little or no relief is in sight for Communist creditors.

Mr. Janeway has astutely pointed out that Krupp's crisis is America's object lesson. Germany has found out the hard way that not even Krupp can afford to do business with the Soviets on their terms. Thus, the need for studying long-term credits is one of the problems of expanded East-West trade.

House Concurrent Resolution 293 which I have introduced expresses the sense of Congress that the OECD countries should establish a committee on East-West trade. This committee would investigate and study all aspects of such trade, including that which I have above described, with the goal of protecting members' interest, and apprising them of the facts, advantages, consequences, and pitfalls of expanded East-West trade. I ask that Mr. Janeway's article be printed below.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 27, 1967]

"SERIOUS CHANGES" FACE KRUPP EMPIRE

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 26.—Any time Krupp makes news, something funny is happening

in world business and serious changes are in the making in world politics. Bankruptcy would be too harsh a word to describe the take-over to which the largest paternalistic family proprietorship left in the world has just been forced to submit. Besides, a bankruptcy hurts creditors as well as owners. But Krupp's creditors have just protected themselves by jumping the owner.

It seems that Krupp has been doing too well for its own good—a fact which in itself testifies to the enormous progress Germany has made since she converted swords into plowshares. The trouble which has developed is not commercial but financial. Krupp's export salesmen had taken the business up as high as it could go without finding a couple or three cash customers.

DEBT IS UNKNOWN

How much Krupp has wound up owing no one really knows. The behavior of the fallen empire's creditors is suggesting that, the closer they get to the books, the less appetite they have for finding out themselves. It is certainly true that the easy going philosophy of the easy money years—exemplified in the quip "The more you owe, the more you own"—has suddenly stopped making sense or money for the strongest competitor in the most competitive country in the world.

Krupp's export volume is easier to guesstimate than its indebtedness.

It is prodigious, running at a rate in excess of a billion marks a year, or 250 million dollars—which is tremendous on the European scale of operations and increasingly formidable alongside America's falling trend of industrial exports.

Unfortunately, however, the more business Krupp put on abroad, the deeper the hole it dug itself into at home. Krupp's error lay in overdoing its traditional recipes for German success.

". . . TO THE EAST"

The first is that Germany must export to live. The second is summed up in the phrase "drang nach oesten"—which means "drive to the east," whether with soldiers or salesmen. Both rules are realistic—provided the customers to the east send money westward in payment.

But Krupp never had a chance. For its big export successes were racked up across the iron curtain. And the soviet states—however they may disagree with one another—agree on one fundamental operating principle. All of them will jump at the chance to buy anything offered to them—just so long as they don't have to start paying for it inside of five years, and so long as they get terms stretching over another 10 to 15 years.

It's little wonder that the Communists' governments boast of their perfect records of paying their bills promptly. They insist on having their imported equipment installed and operating before they obligate themselves to start paying for it; so that the plant and equipment the various soviet governments import earn their keep before the bills start falling due. The way the communist governments hornswoggle the capitalists, startup investment costs need not be paid for until the time comes to declare dividends on a free ride.

"FREE RIDE" AT TERMINAL

For Krupp's soviet customers, the free ride has been a joy ride for years on end—until Krupp's salesmen finally ran out of gas. The creditors, in declaring the party over, have set hard conditions. Krupp's manager, who is the super-salesman and the self-styled unofficial German ambassador in the soviet sector, is to be superseded by a banker. The bankers, moreover, have told the government that, if Krupp was carrying its soviet customers as an accommodation for foreign policy, the government and not the banks should hold the bag; and the government is—to the tune of a new 75-million-dollar export credit guarantee for Krupp.

In return, the banks have extended debt that was due in the middle of 1966, until the end of 1968, and they have advanced another 100 million dollars as a starter.

Krupp's crisis is America's object lesson. Germany has found out the hard way that not even Krupp can afford to do business with the soviets on their terms. Soviet financial diplomacy always needs a new sucker, and America is being invited to pick up the tab for the next round of "sales" across the curtain.

Are we about to rush in where the Germans fear to tread?

ADDRESS BY GOV. RICHARD J. HUGHES BEFORE THE ANNUAL NATIONAL DINNER OF THE UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to commend to the attention of the House an illuminating address delivered by Gov. Richard J. Hughes last evening before the annual dinner of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America at New York City.

Governor Hughes' remarks are particularly appropriate now that we have before us legislation to extend and expand the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act. You will learn from the Governor's remarks that our State of New Jersey is unalterably opposed to any move to weaken the act. Specifically, he urges defeat of the proposed amendment that would substitute a system of block grants for the categorical assistance which the act now provides. The Governor's remarks are as follows:

I am deeply honored that you have asked me to be with you here tonight, to address so distinguished and learned an audience, for several reasons. I believe we have many things in common, a perception of the value and dignity of the individual man created in the image of God, an appreciation of the worth of a society ordered by law and social justice, a devotion to the cause of education of the young, so needful of expansion and increasing excellence, as almost to make one think of the zestful admonition of the popular song "to reach the unreachable stars * * *." And you, who by the guardianship of religion, have responsibility for the good order and well-being of the spiritual community, can realize full well the abiding tie between the ancient glory of eternal truths and their present manifestation in today's application to what I shall refer to as the common good.

It seems almost coincidental that this very week the Congress of the United States will be dealing, for good or ill, with the subject of education. Education is the first work of our times. This fundamental truth, now shared by virtually the entire American community, is in fact a bedrock foundation of the Jewish tradition. So it is a happy opportunity for me to be here this evening to perform the Mitzvah, if you please, of speaking on behalf of the Administration's program, which might also be called the American program, of federal aid to education.

When the history books are written about the achievements of the American people in the mid-sixties, I am confident that what our states and federal government are achieving in the field of education will be our greatest single mark of distinction. Federal assistance for improving the schools and colleges of our country has tripled in the last five years. State and local efforts have also been increasing. Even in this time of great international involvement and equivalent sacrifice, our efforts to improve educational opportunity for all of our people are substantially ahead of last year and so they must continue.

But all of this did not come easily. For almost a century the Congress of the United States wrestled with knotty issues impeding the passage of federal aid bills. Roadblocks and obstacles had to be scaled and overcome. Representatives of the poorer states feuded with the wealthier states. City school interests mistrusted the motives of rural legislators. Those who would aid only integrated education clashed with the advocates of segregated schools. Proponents of general aid could not command a majority because too many would vote for only categorical supports. Finally, some would offer federal tax dollars solely to public schools while others opposed any bill which did not make equitable provisions for the children attending the private schools of America.

Time and again a breakthrough for federal assistance seemed close at hand. But time and again defeat and frustration were all that came to pass. Until 1965 . . . then our President and the great 89th Congress, working closely with representatives of *all* of American education, devised the delicately balanced compromises of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For the first time in our history, federal revenues were made available in large sums to both north and south, to both city and countryside, to both poor and wealthier states, to children of all races, and to young people in both public and private schools.

You are familiar with those deliberately balanced compromises because the leaders of your faith helped to shape them. You helped to insure that federal dollars flowing only to public schools would be used to improve educational opportunities for all the young people of our country and would be particularly mindful of the children of the poor.

Now the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is working well. In city and hamlet around the nation it is bringing about educational innovation and experimentation as never before. Over eight million children are receiving long overdue attention through improved educational programs. Virtually every schoolchild in the country will be benefitted through the availability of new school library materials and audiovisual aids. Educational research and state departments of education have also been greatly strengthened with the help of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In its first year of operation, this wonderful law put more than a billion dollars into school districts with crowded classrooms and inadequate staffs. A bill of Congressman John Brademas proposes extending this sensible and compassionate law for another two years. The 1965 legislation requires neither replacement nor substantial amendment; what is urgently called for is more aggressive enforcement, for it has reached only half of the 16 million children it was intended to benefit. And many of those who are not reached will remain largely illiterate and economically useless, to the tragic damage of the common good.

In my own State of New Jersey over 150,000 public and private school children whose educational achievement is below the norm—because of physical, mental, social, cultural or emotional handicaps—are receiving the benefits of the supplementary

and remedial instruction, pupil and family counseling, cultural enrichment, and health and welfare service needed to overcome their learning handicaps. All of this has been made possible by this wonderful federal legislation.

Two of our most urbanized cities have developed programs for the training and utilization of teacher aides. These aides, selected from economically deprived areas, are working effectively to assist children and are in turn being assisted economically. And the program has been found to carry with it an invaluable by-product. Not only does it improve in-school instruction, but the use of these aides, coming from among the disadvantaged themselves, has resulted in considerable change in student attitude and parental receptiveness to educational envolvement. No longer are children afraid to be seen carrying home books, going to the library or doing homework. When children can be given more individual attention—when they have the aid of individuals from their own environment with whom they can relate—wonderful and exciting things begin happening.

In one of our more suburban communities nearly 650 children who were doing badly in the regular school program, are meeting with success as the result of intensive efforts and individual attention. Instructional teams of teachers, administrators, psychologists, social workers, and specialists from all disciplines are carrying out educational programs for each child. This has meant individual counseling and guidance for the children and their parents; and individualized reading, language and other programs geared to specific needs. It has also meant—and perhaps we should be a little ashamed in these times of affluence—providing food for hungry children and furnishing medical and dental assistance.

Many of our cities contain children who do not speak English although bright and literate in their native tongue. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has made possible programs which enable these children to join their English speaking peers on an equal footing. Just imagine the frustration of a bright child—literate in Spanish perhaps—but unable to fully participate in the educational process because he or she is weak in English. Individual instructors, highly trained bi-lingual teachers, new techniques and materials, effective use of parents as teachers and interpretors are rapidly helping them to bridge the gap in language and cultural differences.

But now all of this accomplishment and promise is threatened by a substitute bill sponsored by Congressman Quie which will be voted on in the House of Representatives next week. Many who for generations have opposed any form of federal aid to education now claim to have found "a better way" to dispense federal aid. In place of the delicately balanced compromises of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act they would substitute a meat-axe kind of approach which would imperil all that we have jointly achieved. Private school students, now beginning to participate in publicly sponsored educational programs, would find their participation hobbled, in many cases prevented, by the constitutions of almost three dozen states. In place of the friendly consultations between public school and private school educators now going on at the local level all around America, in a spirit of friendship and cooperation, private school educators would have to go, hat in hand, to necessarily hostile state departments of education.

This substitute bill is a bad bill, christened by the current issue of The New Republic as "Republican mischief," although I would personally hope that education-minded Republicans would see in the Quie proposals a tragic setting back of education discordant with the dreams and hopes of America.

As the President recently said, this is "a time of testing for American education." The old roadblocks against federal aid to education are being raised once again. Members of the Congress are being urged to tear apart all that has been laboriously constructed in the last two years.

I do not think that this will happen because I have faith in the American people and in their elected representatives. But I do urge each and everyone of you to tell his representatives in Congress that the substitute bill should be defeated and that the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act should be *extended and supported in its full vigor and intendment*. For that is the way to build success upon success. That is the way to insure that all American children receive a better education. That is the way to build a better America of which we can all be proud.

And I ask your help in the next crucial 48 hours in calling your Congressmen because this issue seems to me to be relevant to the very substance of America—the common good. I address this appeal to all of you, whether conservative or liberal, so-called, in the political sense.

In this context I would hope that Congress, on this important subject, would try to avoid the modern polarization of political thought and rest its decision purely in the common good.

It is increasingly obvious to all of us who are concerned to any degree with current affairs that a strange phenomenon is taking place in this nation—more and more, our society is dividing itself between two philosophical extremes. As we face the moral, social, economic and political questions of the day, Americans seem to be aligning themselves with extreme philosophical viewpoints, either to the "left" or to the "right" of center, which results in sharp and bitter antagonism between those in both camps. This phenomenon is reflected in the degree of emotionalism with which men approach those who disagree, however slightly, with them on social issues. It is reflected in the name-calling which dominates our news media and public discussion forums—we read and hear about the "hawks" and "doves," the conservatives and the liberals, the fascists and the anarchists, the reactionaries and the revolutionaries, the rights of the individual and the rights of the state, and so on. And this polarization of our society is manifested even more strikingly in the manner in which extremists on each side have become the symbols and spokesmen for all whose opinions fall to the same side of precise center as theirs.

The right to dissent, to differ in opinion from one's fellow citizens, is basic to the American way of life. At the same time it is fundamental to this nation's greatness that there be the spirit of cooperation, of compromise, of collaboration which has characterized the way in which sincere and honest men in our pluralistic society have reached out to each other to find solutions to the questions they have faced throughout our history. Now, I believe, this coming together, this meeting of the minds, upon which our success as a society depends is in serious danger. No longer does it seem possible for upright men to meet with one another in order to resolve differences of opinion on questions of either public or personal good, for contemporary opinion has been sharply divided into two sides each distrustful of the other, each too ready to denounce the other, each able to view the other only in terms of an extreme point of view.

Last summer, I had the privilege of hearing an address by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, Bishop of Pittsburgh, at the National Governors' Conference in Los Angeles. Bishop Wright spoke with wisdom and with eloquence on this timely area of concern. He said that the contemporary American tends to align himself around one or the other of the answers to these questions: "Does the state, the organized society, exist for me; or do I, the individual citizen, exist for the state?"—in other words, the good of the individual versus the good of the collectivity. He suggested that we need now find "a formula under which we can rally to the service of America all the spiritual energies and intellectual resources which are now dissipated by polarized division disastrous alike to personal interest and to collective well-being." And he offered as that formula a phrase rooted in Christian philosophy, in Hebrew prophecy, in Greek wisdom, in Roman law, and in the philosophy of the founding fathers of this nation—"the common good."

This common good, the Bishop said, "Is all the heritage from the past and all the hope for the future which good men share under God. Common to many, it is therefore public; perfective of the individual, it remains somehow personal. It calls the individual out of himself to share things with the general community, but it puts the resources of the general community at the service of things closest to the personality of the individual. That is what Cicero meant when he defined the common good, the *res publica*, in terms of a nation's altars and hearths, of the spiritual and domestic values which center about these and which serve personality."

And I hope that when Congress acts this week on the education bill, the voices of its members will bespeak this common good, unmindful of narrow partisanship, as have the voices of great individual Americans in our treasured past.

"For example, Abraham Lincoln was a Republican; he lived in a specific period of American history; he presented strongly individualistic traits; he was a partisan of the northern cause in the war between the states; it is difficult sometimes to appreciate that millions of sincere Americans profoundly disliked some of his ideas, deplored many of his policies, distrusted him personally. But when he spoke at Gettysburg, he spoke . . . for us all—for all Americans (of every time and) . . . every part of the country.

"Woodrow Wilson (my distinguished predecessor as Governor of New Jersey and a great President) was a Democrat. He, too, lived in a particular period of our national history and a specific phase of our emergence into the international community. He had marked individual traits, many of which his friends found amiable, others of which his critics found distasteful. Whole areas of his political philosophy were unacceptable to millions of his fellow citizens, and some of his policies provoked the resentment of many. Yet, in his public pronouncements he frequently transcended the inevitable limitations of himself, his times and his political context . . . (for example,) the exalted address to the Military Academy at West Point in which Wilson summarized so many of the elements of our common good . . . (He said,) 'America came into existence for a particular reason . . . It was as if in the providence of God a continent had been kept unused and waiting for peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth'."

When I first heard Bishop Wright's eloquent words and pondered his idea, I was profoundly impressed with the thought that in this concept of the common good may be found our greatest hope for the future, not only of this nation but of all mankind. Under this guiding principle of the common good, a man, while retaining his personal values, may reach beyond them to find common counsel with his neighbors for the enrichment of community life; a state, while preserving its local character, may reach beyond it to find common counsel with other

states for the strengthening of national life; and a nation, while conserving its ideals and characteristics, may reach beyond them to find common counsel with other nations for the building of a better international order.

As we part tonight to return to our altars and hearths, let us hope and pray that the dreams of America will always involve the common good, the relationship in which the Creator intended us all to live.

CONSIDER THE ECONOMICS AND THE ECOLOGY OF OIL SHALE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a fortnight ago I made some remarks to my esteemed colleagues on the subject of oil shale development on public lands in our Western States.

At that time I urged Members of this House to give this matter a most thorough and thoughtful study lest this tremendous natural resource be permitted, through inadvertence or error, to fall into the hands of private interests who would reap a private fortune at public expense.

The New York Times today carries an editorial entitled "A Policy for Oil Shale" which contains a similar admonition. This editorial stresses that there is no need for making hasty decisions in this matter. It reads as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1967]

A POLICY FOR OIL SHALE

Secretary of the Interior Udall has attempted to please everyone in devising Federal regulations for the private development of the huge, publicly owned oil shale deposits. He is likely to discover instead that he has embarked on the vain policy of trying to appease appetities that are unappeasable.

Mr. Udall's compromise is to make a small section of public land available for lease and establish graduated royalty fees to prevent any company from gaining huge profits if the extraction process proves to be cheaper and the oil more abundant than now anticipated. These proposed regulations assume that it is settled national policy to have the shale developed under private auspices; they represent an effort to assure a reasonable return to the Government from a resource whose value is actually incalculable.

There is no immediate need for developing these shale deposits, which lie in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah. The oil companies are primarily interested in these deposits as reserves for the future. If they were eager to begin development, they could start on the one-fifth of the deposits which are already in private ownership. The companies own or have leasing rights to private parcels of land quite large enough to permit exploitation now.

The pressure for prompt development comes from the smaller owners of the privately held lands who could realize immense capital gains if oil shale development were encouraged now by the Federal Government. The pressure also comes from Western politicians and businessmen who view the shale deposits as the basis of an economic boom for their region.

Behind the present maneuvering lies the long-term danger that the Federal Government might be pressured into opening up all the publicly owned deposits for private development, with generous tax incentives and no restrictions except perhaps the payment of a small royalty. From the standpoint of the ordinary taxpayers of the entire nation, who own this valuable resource, such a policy would be a giveaway of unprecedented magnitude.

Three proposals have been advanced to protect the public interest. One is for public development by an agency modeled on the Tennessee Valley Authority. Another is for a mixed public-private corporation patterned on Comsat. The third, more modest, suggestion is that the Government give a research-and-development contract to private industry to develop a commercially feasible process for extracting the oil and to operate a pilot plant. Once all the problems had been worked out, the Government would have a much clearer understanding of the exact value of this resource and therefore could determine future national policy on the basis of facts, not guesses.

Another important aspect of this question concerns the conservation of the land, water and scenery in the region. Full-scale development would require huge amounts of water in an arid area and might lead to unsightly slag heaps and erosion far surpassing the ugliness perpetrated by strip mining for coal.

Since petroleum from conventional wells is more than adequate to meet fuel needs for many years to come, the Federal Government need not rush into any decision until it has looked fully into both the economics and the ecology of oil shale development.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLEPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 24 and 25, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. KUYKENDALL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 25 through June 2, 1967, on account of official business as member of House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURLESON, for the week of May 22, 1967, on account of death in his immediate family.

Mr. NEDZI (at the request of Mr. DINGELL), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, 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. GROSS, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, May 23; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. KUYKENDALL), for 25 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. KUYKENDALL), for 15 minutes, on May 23; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. KUYKENDALL), for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

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

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DENNEY.

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

Mr. ULLMAN in three instances.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. WHITENER.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 61. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Carlos Suarez-Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 62. An act for the relief of Dr. Pablo E. Tabio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Dr. Noel O. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Dario Lorenzo Platas-Prohias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 123. An act for the relief of Kathleen Styles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 174. An act for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 189. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 221. An act for the relief of Dr. Armando Perez Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 281. An act to increase the amount of real property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 344. An act for the relief of Louis Beaud (Brother Amable); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 503. An act for the relief of Dr. Angel Reaud, also known as Angel Reaud Ramos Izquierdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 576. An act for the relief of Magaly Jane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 610. An act for the relief of Lilliana Grasseschi Baroni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 613. An act for the relief of Manuel Rodriguez-Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 653. An act for the relief of Capt. Robert C. Crisp, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 809. An act for the relief of Dr. Youssef (Joseph) Selim Hasbani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 821. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Domingo Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 906. An act for the relief of Luis Tapia Davila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 976. An act for the relief of Zofia Walasek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 985. An act for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1021. An act for the relief of Antonio Luis Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1160. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1354. An act for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to recognize the 175th anniversary of the admission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Federal Role in Urban Affairs"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to designate the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution designating February of each year as "American History Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth week in April in every year as National Coin Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of July 23 through July 29, 1967, as "Professional Photography Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the month of May 1967, as National Home Improvement Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a comprehensive plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. 1587. An act for the relief of Richard L. Bass;

H.R. 1646. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. E. Housley; and

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

763. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

764. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 2357, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

765. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report on the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; to the Committee on House Administration.

766. A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of the Reserve Officers Association of March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 81–595; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to nonprofit institutions during calendar year 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

768. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation (1) to amend the authorizing legislation of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; and (2) to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

769. A letter from the Executive Director, Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, transmitting resolutions relating to the breeder reactor program, and to the international traffic of radioactive materials, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87–563; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn. (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8140. A bill to provide for the settlement of the claims against the District of Columbia by officers and employees of the District of Columbia for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 10196. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee of conference. S. 666. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 270). 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. BARING:

H.R. 10154. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10155. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 10156. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10157. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 10158. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 10159. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to consolidate certain provisions assuring the safety and effectiveness of new animal drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10160. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 10161. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 10162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 10163. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10164. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 10165. A bill to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 10166. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen instruction in health education and to provide for training institutes for personnel engaged in health education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 10167. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 10168. A bill to provide the Coast Guard with authority to conduct research and development for the purpose of dealing with the release of harmful fluids carried in vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 10169. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize assistance to law schools for training programs in the conduct of criminal cases involving indigent persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 10170. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain veterans who were prisoners of war shall be deemed to have a service-connected disability of 50 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 10171. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 10172. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 10173. A bill relating to the appointment of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10174. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10175. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10176. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10177. A bill to amend the act of July 22, 1963 (77 Stat. 88), to extend the time for the purchase of certain public lands by the city of Henderson, Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 10178. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10179. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promote the fluoridation of public water supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 10180. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 10181. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 10182. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize Federal grants under the open-space land program for the development and redevelopment of existing open-space land and for the acquisition of outdoor and indoor recreational buildings, centers, facilities, and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10183. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Institute on Emphysema and Respiratory Diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10184. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland:

H.R. 10185. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct an inequity with respect to the application of postage rates to publications admitted as second-class mail having original entry at independent cities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10186. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that imported articles which are exported and thereafter reimported to the United States for failure to meet sample or specifications shall, in certain instances, be entered free of duty upon such reimportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MCCLURE and Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia):

H.R. 10187. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 10188. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to make available, through a new program of mortgage insurance, additional financing for the construction of needed nonprofit hospital facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10189. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to authorize certain surplus property of the United States to be donated for park or recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 10190. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide additional sources of financing for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 10191. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 10192. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from the overtime compensation provisions of that act employees of boat sales establishments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 10193. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide an alternate method of making loans for acquisition and improvements of the farm, needed by farm families, including young farmers, and to provide the borrower family with adequate standards of living and the consumer with reasonable prices for dairy and other agricultural products, as well as to maintain and improve national health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10194. A bill to establish a Federal Motor Vehicle Insurance Guarantee Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 10195. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 10196. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September in 1967 as Bible Translation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 353. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to aggression in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 354. Concurrent resolution to declare the week of June 18 National Coal Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H. Con. Res. 355. Concurrent resolution relating to a world free trade association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. Res. 481. Resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that we do hereupon call upon the President of the United States to direct and order the Attorney General to enforce section 12(a) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act and section 2388 of title XVIII of the United States Code as these sections apply to persons to whom the Department's attention has been directed as having violated these laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Res. 482. Resolution extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of Blakely Borough of Lackawanna County, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H. Res. 483. Resolution concerning law en-

forcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

199. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the election of the President by a direct vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to a public investigation into the apparent existence of a Soviet-dominated Communist regime in the Republic of Cuba; to the Committee on Rules.

201. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to H.R. 2158, the proposed Federal Interstate Taxation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to oil pollution of waters off Cape Cod; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

203. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to enlarging the area of eligibility of Public Law 1021 to include the 33 counties in eastern Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10197. A bill for the relief of Milo Downing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 10198. A bill for the relief of Eun Hi Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 10199. A bill for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbisier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 10200. A bill for the relief of Bertha Margoth Freire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 10201. A bill for the relief of Helen Tziminadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 10202. A bill for the relief of Linda Morris and Herbert Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10203. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Cuciuffo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10204. A bill for the relief of Maria Luz Suarez Castro (alias Maria Suarez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10205. A bill for the relief of Manuel Falza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10206. A bill for the relief of Mario A. Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10207. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Heredia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10208. A bill for the relief of Valentine Ponce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10209. A bill for the relief of Pedro Sing Tak Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10210. A bill for the relief of Lorna Leonie Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 10211. A bill for the relief of Amprobe Instrument, Division of Soss Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 10212. A bill for the relief of Miss Emilie N. Argonza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

88. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Lowell, Mass., relative to appropriations for the HUD program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

89. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the maintenance of a newspaper reading room in the White House; to the Committee on Appropriations.

90. Also, petition of Itoman Town Council, Itoman, Okinawa, relative to the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

91. Also, petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, Vicksburg, Miss., relative to the mutilation of the U.S. flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. Also, petition of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D.C., relative to resolutions adopted by the 76th Continental Congress of the DAR, April 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

93. Also, petition of the City Council, City of Elizabeth, N.J., relative to permitting free postage for packages sent to servicemen and women serving in Vietnam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to 10th Anniversary of Williamsburg Film

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to visit Colonial Williamsburg, the restored 18th-century capital of the Virginia Colony. It was for me, as it has been to millions of Americans, a unique adventure back to the very beginnings of our great land. Here, where Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Patrick Henry, and others laid so much of the groundwork for the beginning of our country, Americans and visitors from abroad have a remarkable opportunity to look deeply into the days and lives of those noble patriots. Whether it is sitting in a burgess' seat in the Hall of the House of Burgesses, or witnessing a muster of the colonial militia, or even a quiet stroll down historic Duke of Gloucester Street, the impression is the same: an experience which helps one to understand the basic principles of our way of life.

There is, in addition, a singular experience in Williamsburg worthy of note and commendation. I refer to Colonial Williamsburg's orientation film which launches thousands of visits to the historic area. This film, "Williamsburg—The Story of a Patriot," is a moving and graphic representation of the values and heritage encompassed in this historic city. It is difficult to imagine a more fitting medium for conveying the message Williamsburg holds. The basic American tenets of freedom of choice, self-government, integrity of the individual, individual liberty and opportunity, all of which were in the minds of our early patriots 200 years ago, are simply but effectively conveyed for young and old alike.

I understand that nearly 7 million people—Americans and others—have seen this remarkable film in Williamsburg in the past 10 years. It already holds the distinction as having the world's longest run in one location. It has been estimated that more than 700,000 members of the armed services have seen this touching story.

My first reaction at seeing this film was no doubt the same as that of many others: would it not be a great thing if all Americans could have this opportunity. I am pleased to have learned that so many already have.

Therefore, on the occasion of the film's 10th anniversary, I would like to commend those at Colonial Williamsburg who have given the people of the world this all-American shrine and the film that is much a part of the Williamsburg message.

I would add only one thing more: On the occasion of the film's premier, Colonial Williamsburg Board Chairman Winthrop Rockefeller, now Governor of Arkansas, and whose father, the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr., made Colonial Williamsburg possible, cited the film as a "culminating effort on the part of Colonial Williamsburg to fulfill its deeply-felt responsibility to make visits here an historically moving experience." I would contend that that responsibility has been remarkably fulfilled.

Tribute to the Late Herbert J. Jacobi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday afternoon, while in my office, the telephone rang and I learned the sad news of the loss of a very dear and close friend of many years, the Honorable Herbert J. Jacobi, who was affectionately and accurately known by his many admirers