them is attached to a Thai unit below regimental level, and all are stringently enjoined from accompanying the Thai on antiguerrilla sweeps. For a time, a U.S. helicopter unit was ferrying Thai security and development personnel; this unit was withdrawn in January when Thai helicopters and pilots took over the job. The insurgency is a Thai problem which they wish and expect to resolve themselves with our help but not with our participation. Our people on the spot are convinced that they can do it.

To sum up, the risk of ever-increasing American involvement which Dr. Buckout's article has conjured up simply does not accord with the facts. Thailand is not Vietnam: it possesses powerful forces for unity and stability which Vietnam has not yet developed; it faces a level of insurgency far lower than that already prevailing in South Vietnam long before the United States became significantly involved; it is governed by an effective regime which, if not popularly elected, enjoys wide support and respect; and it is proudly determined to put its own house in order and take care itself of preserving its freedom. There is good reason to believe that, with continued selective help from us, the Thai Government and people can do just that.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1967

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

The Reverend John R. Stanton, rector, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Newport News, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitude brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10595. An act to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966.

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

S. 320. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to release certain use restrictions on a tract of land in the State of North Carolina in order that such land may be used in connection with a proposed water supply lake, and for other purposes;

S. 633. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the U.S. Information Agency through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corps; and

S. 2428. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Washington certain lands in the counties of Yakima and Kittitas, Wash., in exchange for certain other lands, and for other purposes.

RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Government of little Rhodesia, its head figuratively bloody but unbowed, observed the second anniversary of its declaration of independence from British rule.

For 2 long years the British Government, inexplicably joined by the President of the United States, has boycotted the anti-Communist government of Rhodesia in a brutal attempt to destroy it. The boycott has failed because the governments of South Africa and Portugal have refused to support it and the proud Rhodesians have refused to bend the knee to their persecutors in London and Washington.

Meanwhile the thoroughly unscrupulous British traders-for-profit blithely go their way helping supply the Communists of North Vietnam and Cuba's Communist Castro while British warships are used to intercept cargoes bound for Rhodesia. And President Johnson blinks at this international immorality.

Perhaps those who voted against my amendment last Wednesday to the foreign aid bill, which would have cut off all trade with nations helping supply those whose chief business is the killing of Americans, would like to explain to the public why President Johnson on one hand joins in persecuting a nation that is arrayed against communism and on the other perfidiously supports the British who, for a profit, treacherously support the Communist conspiracy and the enemies of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point 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. 382]

Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Andrews, Ala.	Harsha	Reinecke
Annunzio	Hathaway	Resnick
Ashley	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Aspinall	Herlong	Rivers
Bell	Laird	St. Onge
Broomfield	McClory	Scherle
Brown, Mich.	McEwen	Steed
Button	MacGregor	Stephens
Clawson, Del	Martin	Ullman
Conte	Mathias, Calif.	Utt
Dorn	Mathias, Md.	Vander Jagt
Everett	Moss	Williams, Miss.
Foley	Multer	Willis
Fountain	Poage	
Giaimo	Purcell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE LATE GEN. BRUNO A. HOCHMUTH, U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the death in Vietnam this morning of Maj. Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth is a stunning blow to both the Marine Corps and my own city of San Diego.

Early radio reports indicate General Hochmuth was killed when his helicopter exploded in flight. It is still not clear whether the explosion was caused by a malfunction or by sabotage.

In San Diego, General Hochmuth is well remembered for his outstanding community services while he commanded the Marine Corps Recruit Depot from November 1963 until February of this year.

His interest in the local Red Cross chapter was typical.

Although a two-star general with important and time-consuming command responsibilities, he never missed a meeting of the Red Cross Board. He would not take the easy way out and send an aide, and instead always attended personally.

General Hochmuth was involved in many other community and civic activities during his 39 months as commanding general of the Recruit Depot. He was

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

truly one of San Diego's most valuable citizens.

He lent his personal support to the United Community Services drive.

He opened up the Recruit Depot to numerous San Diego groups, thus strengthening the ties between the military installation and the surrounding civilian community.

In the words of Bill Quirk, a former president of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, General Hochmuth was "one of the most outstanding commanders we ever had" in San Diego.

I share that sentiment precisely.

Over the years there have been many outstanding military officers assigned to San Diego, a vital center of Navy and Marine Corps strength.

But few have rivaled Bruno Hochmuth as a leader of men both on and off the base.

On behalf of the community he served so well, I extend deepest sympathies to his widow, Mary, and to his daughters, Mary Lynn and Joan Elizabeth.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in expressing regret at the passing of Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth, whom I had the pleasure of visiting in April of this year in Vietnam. He was an outstanding officer, and our country has sustained a great loss in his passing.

We can ill afford the loss of the great man who has been taken from us. We can find comfort in the realization that General Hochmuth was where he wanted to be at the time of his misfortune—in Vietnam defending the principles for which his country stands. He sought the assignment to Vietnam because he realized that he could best serve us all in putting into action the vast ability that he had. For that dedicated attitude I express my gratitude to our fallen marine friend.

To his grieving family I express my heartfelt sentiments of profound sympathy in their personal loss of such a great kinsman.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] in paying respect to the memory of Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth. I visited General Hochmuth in the 3d Division last April. He had the respect of his fellow officers and the confidence and affection of all of his men. He was indeed a fine officer.

Notwithstanding the very strenuous combat duties that he was performing at that time, he nevertheless took the time to offer his personal assistance and attention to an orphanage in Vietnam that was sponsored by the International Orphans, Inc. He was a man of high professional ability and a great humanitarian.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] in paying my deep respects to the memory of Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth and to extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I also had the pleasure of visiting with General Hochmuth last April in Vietnam as a member of a delegation under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

General Hochmuth took us over the demilitarized zone and over the same area where he apparently was shot down yesterday. He displayed in our presence the same kind of courage and determination that is in the highest tradition of the Marine Corps, and which we found deeply impressive.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best tribute we as a people can render to the memory of Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth would be to unite in support of the brave Marines whom General Hochmuth led with such courage and such ability. They deeply believe in the cause for which they are fighting and they will long miss, as we will, General Hochmuth's firm and inspired field leadership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be in Vietnam along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], who just addressed the House, on a visit as a member of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives. On that occasion I rode in an armed helicopter over a considerable part of the area just below the demilitarized zone.

I must say that General Hochmuth impressed me tremendously as a great soldier, a dedicated American, and an able leader. His death is a tragic loss. But I am sure that all who met him and who came to know him recognize the great leadership that our country has in our magnificent Marine Corps, in our Navy and in all of our armed services.

General Hochmuth was doing a terrific job, working with his whole heart with the men under his command. He shall certainly be missed.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from San Diego in expressing my extreme regret in the passing of Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation and particularly the people of San Diego were shocked at the news received today of the untimely death of Marine Maj. Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth in a helicopter crash in Vietnam.

Bruno Hochmuth was a beloved first citizen of San Diego, where he served on three different occasions during his distinguished career.

One of his first assignments was with the 2d Battalion of the 6th Marines in San Diego in 1936. Six months later he was sent to Shanghai, China, where he served 2½ years with the 4th Marines.

During World War II, he fought in the campaigns at Saipan and Tinian as assistant operations officer and later took command of the 3d Battalion of the 4th Marines in the Okinawa campaign. For his meritorious service during the assault on Okinawa, he was awarded the Legion of Merit with Combat "V." As executive officer of the 4th Marines, he made the initial landing on Japan on August 29, 1945, and on September 2 of the same year attended the formal surrender ceremony at Yokosuka.

Bruno Hochmuth had a distinguished career as a Marine officer. His numerous decorations included the Legion of Merit, the Navy Commendation Medal, and the Presidential Unit Citation.

General Hochmuth returned to San Diego for the second time in 1957 where he served 2 years as chief of staff at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot. In 1963, he became commanding general of the depot and besides running an outstanding base delved into the civic activities of our community. He served on the board of directors of the United Community Fund, Navy Relief Society, YMCA, the USO, the Salvation Army, and the San Diego Symphony Association.

General Hochmuth was a real man, a real marine, and a real hero. The Nation is bereaved at his passing, and I feel a distinct personal loss as well. I join his many friends in extending sincere condolences to his wife, Mary Elizabeth, and their two daughters.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I share in the sorrow of our country at the passing of a fine general and leader, Gen. Bruno C. Hochmuth. I did not know the general personally, but in many years of Marine Corps reserve activity and active service in two wars I have heard his name mentioned repeatedly, first as a strong junior officer and later as one of the corps' finest leaders. The Marine Corps has a great tradition, and the nucleus of that tradition are men like General Hochmuth. We depend on men like him to bear our burdens in wartime and to keep our country strong in times of tranquillity. His tragic death, reported in the papers today, tells us again that violence does not respect rank and that all the fine Americans serving in Vietnam share risks we here can only suspect. We owe this man, and others like him, all the gratitude and support a free country can give, realizing that they risk all in our cause. It is too late for gratitude to General Hochmuth, but his division continues its work in the pattern of his leadership and his example. These boys deserve the support of a determined and united nation, and I am sure this support is all the tribute the general would have wanted.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN]. As

chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Constructon I went to Vietnam last March, accompanied by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and other Members of the House.

I too wish to say that Gen. Bruno A. Hochmuth was one of the finest men I met on that trip. He answered all of our questions, and went out of his way to be helpful. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and I rode over the demilitarized zone with the general, and on every question we had he was there to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, I too extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Mary, and his children.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California for this fine tribute to a great general and I join in the remarks made by our chairman on the trip last spring, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE].

I share with my colleagues deep regret and sadness at the loss of another great military leader of our country. General Hochmuth was indeed one of our finest.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened indeed this morning as I know a lot of others were, when I learned of the unfortunate death of Maj. Gen. Bruno Hochmuth of the U.S. Marine Corps, in Vietnam. General Hochmuth was a graduate of the Texas A. & M. University, College Station, Tex., and was a personal friend of mine of some 35 years. He is one of four Texas A. & M. graduates serving as general officers in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Earlier this year, I had the pleasure of spending a whole day with General Hochmuth along the DMZ in South Vietnam. We visited among his troops at Camp Carroll, Conthien, Hill 881, and Hill 861. It was quite evident to me that all of his men in these places of danger shared in the high esteem which General Hochmuth was held by his superiors such as General Cushman, General Walt, and General Westmoreland. During a brief talk I had with one of his headquarters sergeants, I was told that their headquarters had been hit by rockets and completely destroyed. General Hochmuth had been wounded, but refused medical attention in order that the records would not show his wounds. This was done, the sergeant told me, because he had convinced his wife that he was not in any danger.

America has lost a great military leader, a good marine, but more than that a patriotic American.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late General Bruno A. Hochmuth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE GEN. BRUNO A. HOCHMUTH

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is at a moment like this when we have lost a man who had leadership of a very rare kind that one needs words to carry one over.

I want to give you what I have given you many times, these words based on a translation from the Bhagavad-Gita:

BHAGAVAD-GITA (SONG CELESTIAL)

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams!
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit for ever;
Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems! . . .

Nay, but as when one layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And, taking new ones, sayeth
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its garb of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

Mr. Speaker, I think these words are particularly suitable today, because we do not know that that was the moment he should go. We do know he has not gone far.

CLEAN AIR ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies, expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles, provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions, authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 916)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies, expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles, provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions, authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Air Quality Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. The Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857l), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—AIR POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

"SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, including injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this title are—

"(1) to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress. It is the intent of Congress that no agreement or compact entered into between States after the date of

enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, which relates to the control and abatement of air pollution in an air quality control region, shall provide for participation by a State which is not included (in whole or in part) in such air quality control region.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution;

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities;

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution in cooperation with any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency of if, in his judgment, such problem may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located;

"(4) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of air pollution to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and proposals and to avoid duplication of research.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, for purposes stated in subsection (a)(1) of this section;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological effects of varying air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof; and

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the health or welfare of persons by the various known air pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(d) The Secretary is authorized to construct such facilities and staff and equip them as he determines to be necessary to carry out his functions under this Act.

"(e) If, in the judgment of the Secretary, an air pollution problem of substantial significance may result from discharge or discharges into the atmosphere, he may call a conference concerning this potential air pollution problem to be held in or near one or more of the places were such discharge or discharges are occurring or will occur. All interested persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard at such conference, either orally or in writing, and shall be permitted to appear in person or by representative in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary. If the Secretary finds, on the basis of the evidence presented at such conference, that the discharge or discharges if permitted to take place or continue are likely to cause or contribute to air pollution subject to abatement under section 108(a), he shall send such findings, together with recommendations concerning the measures which he finds reasonable and suitable to prevent such pollution, to the person or persons whose actions will result in the discharge or discharges involved; to air pollution agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges will originate; and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in the jurisdictional area of which any such municipality is located. Such findings and recommendations shall be advisory only, but shall be admitted together with the record of the conference, as part of the proceedings under subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 108.

"RESEARCH RELATING TO FUELS AND VEHICLES

"SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary shall give special emphasis to research and development into new and improved methods, having industrywide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels. In furtherance of such research and development he shall—

"(1) conduct and accelerate research programs directed toward development of improved, low-cost techniques for control of combustion byproducts of fuels, for removal of potential pollutants from fuels, and for control of emissions from evaporation of fuels;

"(2) provide for Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, and contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, or persons, for payment of (A) part of the cost of acquiring, constructing, or otherwise securing, for research and development purposes, new or improved devices or methods having industrywide application of preventing or controlling discharges into the air of various types of pollutants; and (B) carrying out the other provisions of this section, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5): *Provided,* That research or demonstration contracts awarded pursuant to this subsection (including contracts for construction) may be made in accordance with, and subject to the limitations provided with respect to research contracts of the military departments in, section 2353 of title 10, United States Code, except that the determination, approval, and certification required thereby shall be made by the Secretary: *Provided further,* That no grant may be made under this paragraph in excess of $1,500,000;

"(3) determine, by laboratory and pilot plant testing, the results of air pollution research and studies in order to develop new or improved processes and plant designs to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale;

"(4) construct, operate, and maintain, or assist in meeting the cost of the construction, operation, and maintenance of new or improved demonstration plants or processes which have promise of accomplishing the purposes of this Act;

"(5) study new or improved methods for the recovery and marketing of commercially valuable byproducts resulting from the removal of pollutants.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary may—

"(1) conduct and accelerate research and development of low-cost instrumentation techniques to facilitate determination of quantity and quality of air pollutant emissions, including, but not limited to, automotive emissions;

"(2) utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories;

"(3) establish and operate necessary facilities and test sites at which to carry on the research, testing, development, and programing necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section;

"(4) to acquire secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, and an interest in lands, plants, and facilities, and other property or rights by purchase, license, lease, or donation; and

"(5) cause on-site inspections to be made of promising domestic and foreign projects, and cooperate and participate in their development in instances in which the purposes of the Act will be served thereby.

"(c) For the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $35,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $90,000,000. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION PLANNING AND CONTROL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 105. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of planning, developing, establishing, or improving, and grants to such agencies in an amount up to one-half of the cost of maintaining, programs for the prevention and control of air pollution and programs for the implementation of air quality standards authorized by this Act: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies within the meaning of sections 302(b)(2) and 302(b)(4) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of planning, developing, establishing, or improving and up to three-fifths of the cost of maintaining regional air quality control programs. As used in this subsection the term 'regional air quality control program' means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution or the implementation of air quality standards programs as authorized by this Act, in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities whether in the same or different States.

"(2) Before approving any grant under this subsection to any air pollution control agency within the meaning of sections 302(b)(2) and 302(b)(4), the Secretary shall receive assurances that such agency provides for adequate representation of appropriate State, interstate, local, and (when appropriate) international, interests in the air quality control region.

"(3) Before approving any planning grant under this subsection to any air pollution control agency within the meaning of sections 302(b)(2) and 302(b)(4), the Secretary shall receive assurances that such agency has the capability of developing a comprehensive

air quality plan for the air quality control region, which plan shall include (when appropriate) a recommended system of alerts to avert and reduce the risk of situations in which there may be imminent and serious danger to the public health or welfare from air pollutants and the various aspects relevant to the establishment of air quality standards for such air quality control region, including the concentration of industries, other commercial establishments, population and naturally occurring factors which shall affect such standards.

"(b) From the sums available for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall from time to time make grants to air pollution control agencies upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. In establishing regulations for the granting of such funds the Secretary shall, so far as practicable, give due consideration to (1) the population, (2) the extent of the actual or potential air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective agencies. No agency shall receive any grant under this section during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for other than nonrecurrent expenditures for air pollution control programs will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year; and no agency shall receive any grant under this section with respect to the maintenance of a program for the prevention and control of air pollution unless the Secretary is satisfied that such grant will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State, local, or other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such grant be made available for the maintenance of such program, and will in no event supplant such State, local, or other non-Federal funds. No grant shall be made under this section until the Secretary has consulted with the appropriate official as designated by the Governor or Governors of the State or States affected.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the total of funds appropriated or allocated for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section shall be granted for air pollution control programs in any one State. In the case of a grant for a program in an area crossing State boundaries, the Secretary shall determine the portion of such grant that is chargeable to the percentage limitation under this subsection for each State into which such area extends.

"INTERSTATE AIR QUALITY AGENCIES OR COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 106. (a) For the purpose of expediting the establishment of air quality standards in an interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107(a)(2), the Secretary is authorized to pay, for two years, up to 100 per centum of the air quality planning program costs of any agency designated by the Governors of the affected States, which agency shall be capable of recommending to the Governors standards of air quality and plans for implementation thereof and shall include representation from the States and appropriate political subdivisions within the air quality control region. After the initial two-year period the Secretary is authorized to make grants to such agency in an amount up to three-fourths of the air quality planning program costs of such agency.

"(b)(1) Whenever the Secretary deems it necessary to expedite the establishment of standards for an interstate air quality control region designated pursuant to section 107(a)(2) he may, after consultation with the Governors of the affected States, designate or establish an air quality planning commission for the purpose of developing recommended regulations setting forth standards of air quality to be applicable to such air quality control region.

"(2) Such Commission shall consist of the Secretary or his designee who shall serve as Chairman, and adequate representation of appropriate State, interstate, local and (when appropriate), international, interests in the designated air quality control region.

"(3) The Secretary shall, within available funds, provide such staff for such Commission as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions effectively, and shall pay the other expenses of the Commission; and may also accept for the use by such Commission, funds, property, or services contributed by the State involved or political subdivisions thereof.

"(4) Each appointee from a State, other than an official or employee thereof, or of any political subdivision thereof, shall, while engaged in the work of the Commission, receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 3109) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"AIR QUALITY CONTROL REGIONS, CRITERIA, AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES

"SEC. 107. (a)(1) The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, define for the purposes of this Act, atmospheric areas of the Nation on the basis of those conditions, including, but not limited to, climate, meteorology, and topography, which affect the interchange and diffusion of pollutants in the atmosphere.

"(2) For the purpose of establishing ambient air quality standards pursuant to section 108, and for administrative and other purposes, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate State and local authorities shall, to the extent feasible, within 18 months after the date of enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967 designate air quality control regions based on jurisdictional boundaries, urban-industrial concentrations, and other factors including atmospheric areas necessary to provide adequate implementation of air quality standards. The Secretary may from time to time thereafter, as he determines necessary to protect the public health and welfare and after consultation with appropriate State and local authorities, revise the designation of such regions and designate additional air quality control regions. The Secretary shall immediately notify the Governor or Governors of the affected State or States of such designation.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall, after consultation with appropriate advisory committees and Federal departments and agencies, from time to time, but as soon as practicable, develop and issue to the States such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be requisite for the protection of the public health and welfare: *Provided,* That any criteria issued prior to enactment of this section shall be reevaluated in accordance with the consultation procedure and other provisions of this section and, if necessary, modified and reissued. Such issuance shall be announced in the Federal Register and copies shall be made available to the general public.

"(2) Such criteria shall accurately reflect the latest scientific knowledge useful in indicating the kind and extent of all indentifiable effects on health and welfare which may be expected from the presence of an air pollution agent, or combination of agents in the ambient air, in varying quantities.

"(3) Such criteria shall include those variable factors which of themselves or in combination with other factors may alter the effects on public health and welfare of any subject agent or combination of agents, including, but not limited to, atmospheric conditions, and the types of air pollution agent or agents which, when present in the atmosphere, may interact with such subject agent or agents, to produce an adverse effect on public health and welfare.

"(c) The Secretary shall, after consultation with appropriate advisory committees and Federal departments and agencies, issue to the States and appropriate air pollution control agencies information on those recommended pollution control techniques the application of which is necessary to achieve levels of air quality set forth in criteria issued pursuant to subsection (b), including those criteria subject to the proviso in subsection (b)(1), which information shall include technical data relating to the technology and costs of emission control. Such recommendations shall include such data as are available on the latest available technology and economic feasibility of alternative methods of prevention and control of air contamination including cost-effectiveness analyses. Such issuance shall be announced in the Federal Register and copies shall be made available to the general public.

"(d) The Secretary shall, from time to time, revise and reissue material issued pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) in accordance with procedures established in such subsections.

"AIR QUALITY STANDARDS AND ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"SEC. 108. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this title, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (c), (h), or (k).

"(c)(1) If, after receiving any air quality criteria and recommended control techniques issued pursuant to section 107, the Governor of a State, within ninety days of such receipt, files a letter of intent that such State will within one hundred and eighty days, and from time to time thereafter, adopt, after public hearings, ambient air quality standards applicable to any designated air quality control region or portions thereof within such State and within one hundred and eighty days thereafter, and from time to time as may be necessary, adopts a plan for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such standards of air quality adopted, and if such standards and plan are established in accordance with the letter of intent and if the Secretary determines that such State standards are consistent with the air quality criteria and recommended control techniques issued pursuant to section 107; that the plan is consistent with the purposes of the Act insofar as it assures achieving such standards of air quality within a reasonable time; and that a means of enforcement by State action, including authority comparable to that in subsection (k) of this section, is provided, such State standards and plan shall be the air quality standards applicable to such State. If the Secretary determines that any revised State standards and plan are consistent with the purposes of this Act and this subsection, such standards and plan shall be the air quality standards applicable to such State.

"(2) If a State does not (A) file a letter of intent or (B) establish air quality standards in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to any air quality control region or portion thereof and if the Secretary finds it necessary to achieve the purpose of this Act, or the Governor of any State affected by air quality standards established pursuant to this subsection petitions for a revision in such standards, the Secretary

may after reasonable notice and a conference of representatives of appropriate Federal departments and agencies, interstate agencies, States, municipalities, and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of air quality consistent with the air quality criteria and recommended control techniques issued pursuant to section 107 to be applicable to such air quality control region or portions thereof. If, within six months from the date the Secretary publishes such regulations, the State has not adopted air quality standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of this Act, or a petition for public hearing has not been filed under paragraph (3) of this subsection, the Secretary shall promulgate such standards.

"(3) If at any time prior to thirty days after standards have been promulgated under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Governor of any State affected by such standards petitions the Secretary for a hearing, the Secretary shall call a public hearing for the purpose of receiving testimony from State and local pollution control agencies and other interested parties affected by the proposed standards, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the air quality standards will take effect, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State which would be affected by such standards shall be given an opportunity to select a member of the hearing board. Each Federal department, agency, or instrumentality having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the hearing board and not less than a majority of the hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The members of the board who are not officers or employees of the United States, while participating in the hearing conducted by such hearing board or otherwise engaged in the work of such hearing board, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703, title 5, of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. At least thirty days prior to the date of such hearing notice of such hearing shall be published in the Federal Register and given to parties notified of the conference required in paragraph (2) of this subsection. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall within ninety days unless the Secretary determines a longer period is necessary, but in no event longer than one hundred and eighty days, make findings as to whether the standards published or promulgated by the Secretary should be approved or modified and transmit its findings to the Secretary. If the hearing board approves the standards as published or promulgated by the Secretary, the standards shall take effect on receipt by the Secretary of the hearing board's recommendations. If the hearing board recommends modifications in the standards as published or promulgated by the Secretary, the Secretary shall promulgate revised regulations setting forth standards of air quality in accordance with the hearing board's recommendations which will become effective immediately upon promulgation.

"(4) Whenever, on the basis of surveys, studies and reports, the Secretary finds that the ambient air quality of any air quality control region or portion thereof is below the air quality standards established under this subsection, and he finds that such lowered air quality results from the failure of a State to take reasonable action to enforce such standards, the Secretary shall notify the affected State or States, persons contributing to the alleged violation, and other interested parties of the violation of such standards. If such failure does not cease within one hundred and eighty days from the date of the Secretary's notification, the Secretary—

"(i) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(ii) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law, or, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to secure abatement of the pollution.

In any suit brought under the provisions of this subsection the court shall receive in evidence a transcript of the proceedings of the hearing provided for in this subsection, together with the recommendations of the hearing board and the recommendations and standards promulgated by the Secretary, and such additional evidence, including that relating to the alleged violation of the standards, as it deems necessary to complete review of the standards and to determination of all other issues relating to the alleged violation. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the technological and economic feasibility of complying with such standards shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment and orders enforcing such judgment as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(5) In connection with any hearings under this section no witness or any other person shall be required to divulge trade secrets or secret processes.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would be otherwise applicable.

"(d)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the Governor and the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary may, after consultation with State officials of all affected States, also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate. The Secretary shall invite the cooperation of any municipal, State, or interstate air pollution control agencies having jurisdiction in the affected area on any surveys or studies forming the basis of conference action.

"(D) Whenever the Secretary, upon receipt of reports, surveys, or studies from any duly constituted international agency, has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) which endangers the health or welfare of persons in a foreign country is occurring, or whenever the Secretary of State requests him to do so with respect to such pollution which the Secretary of State alleges is of such a nature, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in the jurisdictional area of which such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies. The Secretary shall invite the foreign country which may be adversely affected by the pollution to attend and participate in the conference, and the representative of such country shall, for the purpose of the conference and any further proceeding resulting from such conference, have all the rights of a State air pollution control agency. This subparagraph shall apply only to a foreign country which the Secretary determines has given the United States essentially the same rights with respect to the prevention or control of air pollution occurring in that country as is given that country by this subparagraph.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. The Secretary shall deliver to such agencies and make available to other interested parties, at least thirty days prior to any such conference, a Federal report with respect to the matters before the conference, including data and conclusions or findings (if any); and shall give at least thirty days' prior notice of the conference date to any such agency, and to the public by publication on at least three different days in a newspaper or newspapers of general circulation in the area. The chairman of the conference shall give interested parties an opportunity to present their views to the conference with respect to such Federal report, conclusions or findings (if any), and other pertinent information. The Secre-

tary shall provide that a transcript be maintained of the proceedings of the conference and that a copy of such transcript be made available on request of any participant in the conference at the expense of such participant.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(e) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State, interstate, or municipal air pollution control agency (or to all such agencies) that the necessary remedial action be taken. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(f)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and each Federal department, agency, or instrumentality having a substantial interest in the subject matter as determined by the Secretary shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board, and one member shall be a representative of the appropriate interstate air pollution agency if one exists, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters. All interested parties shall be given a reasonable opportunity to present evidence to such hearing board.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(g) If action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons (A) in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, or (B) in a foreign country which has participated in a conference called under subparagraph (D) of subsection (d) of this section and in all proceedings under this section resulting from such conference, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(2) in the case of pollution of air which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law or, at the request of the Governor of such State, shall request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to secure abatement of the pollution.

"(h) The court shall receive in evidence in any suit brought in a United States court under subsection (g) of this section a transcript of the proceedings before the board and a copy of the board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability of complying with such standards as may be applicable and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(i) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (f) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(j)(1) In connection with any conference called under this section, the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, based on existing data, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such a report. After a conference has been held with respect to any such pollution the Secretary shall require such reports from the person whose activities result in such pollution only to the extent recommended by such conference. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(2) If any person required to file any report under this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(3) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary, upon receipt of evidence that a particular pollution source or combination of sources (including moving sources) is presenting an imminent and substantial endangerment to the health of persons, and finding that appropriate State or local authorities have not acted to abate such sources, may request the Attorney General to bring suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to immediately enjoin any contributor to the alleged pollution to stop the emission of contaminants causing such pollution or to take such other action as may be necessary.

"STANDARDS TO ACHIEVE HIGHER LEVEL OF AIR QUALITY

"SEC. 109. Nothing in this title shall prevent a State, political subdivision, intermunicipal or interstate agency from adopting standards and plans to implement an air quality program which will achieve a higher level of ambient air quality than approved by the Secretary.

"PRESIDENT'S AIR QUALITY ADVISORY BOARD AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"SEC. 110. (a)(1) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Air Quality Advisory Board, composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and fifteen members appointed by the President, none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this Act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with air pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of air pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

"(2) Each member appointed by the President shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first taking office pursuant to this subsection shall expire as follows: five at the end of one year after the date of appointment, five at the end of two years after such date, and five at the end of three year after such date, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, and (C) the term of any member under the preceding provisions shall be extended until the date on which his successor's appointment is effective. None of the members shall be eligible for reappointment within one year after the end of his preceding term, unless such term was for less than three years.

"(b) The Board shall advise and consult with the Secretary on matters of policy re-

lating to the activities and functions of the Secretary under this Act and make such recommendations as it deems necessary to the President.

"(c) Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board and such other advisory committees as hereinafter authorized shall be provided from the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(d) In order to obtain assistance in the development and implementation of the purposes of this Act including air quality criteria, recommended control techniques, standards, research and development, and to encourage the continued efforts on the part of industry to improve air quality and to develop economically feasible methods for the control and abatement of air pollution, the Secretary shall from time to time establish advisory committees. Committee members shall include, but not be limited to, persons who are knowledgeable concerning air quality from the standpoint of health, welfare, economics, or technology.

"(e) The members of the Board and other advisory committees appointed pursuant to this Act who are not officers or employees of the United States while attending conferences or meetings of the Board or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 111. (a) It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interest of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"(b) In order to control air pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, the Secretary may establish classes of potential pollution sources for which any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the air of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for such discharge, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith.

"TITLE II—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'National Emission Standards Act'.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

"SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary shall by regulation, giving appropriate consideration to technological feasibility and economic costs, prescribe as soon as practicable standards, applicable to the emission of any kind of substance, from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgment cause or contribute to, or are likely to cause or to contribute to, air pollution which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, and such standards shall apply to such vehicles or engines whether they are designed as complete systems or incorporate other devices to prevent or control such pollution.

"(b) Any regulations initially prescribed under this section, and amendments thereto, with respect to any class of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines shall become effective on the effective date specified in the order promulgating such regulations which date shall be determined by the Secretary after consideration of the period reasonably necessary for industry compliance.

"PROHIBITED ACTS

"SEC. 203. (a) the following acts and the causing thereof are prohibited—

"(1) in the case of a manufacturer of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines for distribution in commerce, the manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, or the introduction or delivery for introduction into commerce, or the importation into the United States for sale or resale, of any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine, manufactured after the effective date of regulations under this title which are applicable to such vehicle or engine unless it is in conformity with regulations prescribed under this title (except as provided in subsection (b));

"(2) for any person to fail or refuse to permit access to or copying of records or to fail to make reports or provide information, required under section 207; or

"(3) for any person to remove or render inoperative any device or element of design installed on or in a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine in compliance with regulations under this title prior to its sale and delivery to the ultimate purchaser.

"(b)(1) The Secretary may exempt any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine, or class thereof, from subsection (a), upon such terms and conditions as he may find necessary to protect the public health or welfare, for the purpose of research, investigations, studies, demonstrations, or training, or for reasons of national security.

"(2) A new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine offered for importation by a manufacturer in violation of subsection (a) shall be refused admission into the United States, but the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, by joint regulation, provide for deferring final determination as to admission and authorizing the delivery of such a motor vehicle or engine offered for import to the owner or consignee thereof upon such terms and conditions (including the furnishing of a bond) as may appear to them appropriate to insure that any such motor vehicle or engine will be brought into conformity with the standards, requirements, and limitations applicable to it under this title. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, if a motor vehicle or engine is finally refused admission under this paragraph, cause disposition thereof in accordance with the customs laws unless it is exported, under regulations prescribed by such Secretary, within ninety days of the date of notice of such refusal or such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations, except that disposition in accordance with the customs laws may not be made in such manner as may result, directly or indirectly, in the sale, to the ultimate consumer, of a new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine that fails to comply with applicable standards of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under this title.

"(3) A new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine intended solely for export, and so labeled or tagged on the outside of the container and on the vehicle or engine itself, shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (a).

"INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 204. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to restrain violations of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 203(a).

"(b) Actions to restrain such violations shall be brought by and in the name of the United States. In any such action, subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a district court in any district may run into any other district.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 205. Any person who violates paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 203(a) shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000. Such violation with respect to sections 203(a)(1) and 203(a)(3) shall constitute a separate offense with respect to each new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine.

"CERTIFICATION

"SEC. 206. (a) Upon application of the manufacturer, the Secretary shall test, or require to be tested, in such manner as he deems appropriate, any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine submitted by such manufacturer to determine whether such vehicle or engine conforms with the regulations prescribed under section 202 of this title. If such vehicle or engine conforms to such regulations the Secretary shall issue a certificate of conformity, upon such terms, and for such period not less than one year, as he may prescribe.

"(b) Any new motor vehicle or any motor vehicle engine sold by such manufacturer which is in all material respects substantially the same construction as the test vehicle or engine for which a certificate has been issued under subsection (a), shall for the purposes of this Act be deemed to be in conformity with the regulations issued under section 202 of this title.

"RECORDS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 207. (a) Every manufacturer shall establish and maintain such records, make such reports, and provide such information as the Secretary may reasonably require to enable him to determine whether such manufacturer has acted or is acting in compliance with this title and regulations thereunder and shall, upon request of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at reasonable times to have access to and copy such records.

"(b) All information reported or otherwise obtained by the Secretary or his representative pursuant to subsection (a), which information contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of such section 1905, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act. Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Secretary or any officer or employee under his control, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

"STATE STANDARDS

"SEC. 208. (a) No State or any political subdivision thereof shall adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines subject to this title. No State shall require certification, inspection, or any other approval relating to the control of emissions from any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine as condition precedent to the initial retail sale,

titling (if any), or registration of such motor vehicle, motor vehicle engine, or equipment.

"(b) The Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, waive application of this section to any State which has adopted standards (other than crankcase emission standards) for the control of emissions from new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines prior to March 30, 1966, unless he finds that such State does not require standards more stringent than applicable Federal standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions or that such State standards and accompanying enforcement procedures are not consistent with section 202(a) of this title.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall preclude or deny to any State or political subdivision thereof the right otherwise to control, regulate, or restrict the use, operation, or movement of registered or licensed motor vehicles.

"FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPING VEHICLE INSPECTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 209. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to appropriate State air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing meaningful uniform motor vehicle emission device inspection and emission testing programs except that (1) no grant shall be made for any part of any State vehicle inspection program which does not directly relate to the cost of the air pollution control aspects of such a program; and (2) no such grant shall be made unless the Secretary of Transportation has certified to the Secretary that such program is consistent with any highway safety program developed pursuant to section 402 of title 23 of the United States Code.

"REGISTRATION OF FUEL ADDITIVES

"SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary may by regulation designate any fuel or fuels (including fuels used for purposes other than motor vehicles), and after such date or dates as may be prescribed by him, no manufacturer or processor of any such fuel may deliver any such fuel for introduction into interstate commerce or to another person who, it can reasonably be expected, will deliver such fuel for such introduction unless the manufacturer of such fuel has provided the Secretary with the information required under subsection (b)(1) of this section and unless any additive contained in such fuel has been registered with the Secretary in accordance with subsection (b)(2) of this Section.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Secretary shall require (1) the manufacturer of such fuel to notify him as to the commercial identifying name and manufacturer of any additive contained in such fuel; the range of concentration of such additive or additives in the fuel; and the purpose in the use of such additive; and (2) the manufacturer of any such additive to notify him as to the chemical composition of such additive or additives as indicated by compliance with clause (1) above, the recommended range of concentration of such additive, if any, the recommended purpose in the use of such additive, and to the extent such information is available or becomes available, the chemical structure of such additive or additives. Upon compliance with clauses (1) and (2), including assurances that any change in the above information will be provided to the Secretary, the Secretary shall register such fuel additive.

"(c) All information reported or otherwise obtained by the Secretary or his representative pursuant to subsection (b), which information contains or relates to a trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code, shall be considered confidential for the purpose of such section 1905, except that such information may be disclosed to other officers or employees of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this title. Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Secretary or any officer or employee under his control, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

"(d) Any person who violates subsection (a) shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of $1,000 for each and every day of the continuance of such violation, which shall accrue to the United States and be recovered in a civil suit in the name of the United States, brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business. The Secretary may, upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for in this subsection, and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures.

"NATIONAL EMISSIONS STANDARDS STUDY

"SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary shall submit to the Congress, no later than two years after the effective date of this section, a comprehensive report on the need for and effect of national emission standards for stationary sources. Such report shall include: (A) information regarding identifiable health and welfare effects from single emission sources; (B) examples of specific plants, their location, and the contaminant or contaminants which, due to the amount or nature of emissions from such facilities, constitute a danger to public health or welfare; (C) an up-to-date list of those industries and the contaminant or contaminants which, in his opinion, should be subject to such national standards; (D) the relationship of such national emission standards to ambient air quality, including a camparison of situations wherein several plants emit the same contaminants in an air region with those in which only one such plant exists; (E) an analysis of the cost of applying such standards; and (F) such other information as may be appropriate.

"(b) The Secretary shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the feasibility and practicability of controlling emissions from jet and piston aircraft engines and of establishing national emission standards with respect thereto, and report to Congress the results of such study and investigation within one year from the date of enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967, together with his recommendations.

"DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE II

"SEC. 212. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'manufacturer' as used in sections 203, 206, 207, and 208 means any person engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, or importing such vehicles or engines for resale, or who acts for and is under the control of any such person in connection with the distribution of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, but shall not include any dealer with respect to new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines received by him in commerce.

"(2) The term 'motor vehicle' means any self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or highway.

"(3) The term 'new motor vehicle' means a motor vehicle the equitable or legal title to which has never been transferred to an ultimate purchaser; and the term 'new motor vehicle engine' means an engine in a new motor vehicle or a motor vehicle engine the equitable or legal title to which has never been transferred to the ultimate purchaser.

"(4) The term 'dealer' means any person who is engaged in the sale or the distribution of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines to the ultimate purchaser.

"(5) The term 'ultimate purchaser' means, with respect to any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine, the first person who in good faith purchases such new motor vehicle or new engine for purposes other than resale.

"(6) The term 'commerce' means (A) commerce between any place in any State and any place outside thereof; and (B) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia.

"TITLE III—GENERAL

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 302. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"(g) All language referring to adverse effects on welfare shall include but not be limited to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 303. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the

authorities and responsibilities, under any other provison of law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"(b) No appropriation shall be authorized or made under section 301, 311, or 314 of the Public Health Service Act for any fiscal year after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for any purpose for which appropriations may be made under authority of this Act.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 304. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examinations to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act.

"COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC COST STUDIES

"SEC. 305. (a) In order to provide the basis for evaluating programs authorized by this Act and the development of new programs and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations by fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, the Secretary, in cooperation with State, interstate, and local air pollution control agencies, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act; a comprehensive study of the cost of program implementation by affected units of government; and a comprehensive study of the economic impact of air quality standards on the Nation's industries, communities, and other contributing sources of pollution, including an analysis of the national requirements for and the cost of controlling emissions to attain such standards of air quality as may be established pursuant to this Act or applicable State law. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and the results of such comprehensive study of cost for the five-year period beginning July 1, 1969, and the results of such other studies, to the Congress not later than January 10, 1969, and shall submit a reevaluation of such estimate and studies annually thereafter.

"(b) The Secretary shall also make a complete investigation and study to determine (1) the need for additional trained State and local personnel to carry out programs assisted pursuant to this Act and other programs for the same purpose as this Act; (2) means of using existing Federal training programs to train such personnel; and (3) the need for additional trained personnel to develop, operate and maintain those pollution control facilities designed and installed to implement air quality standards. He shall report the results of such investigation and study to the President and the Congress not later than July 1, 1969.

"ADDITIONAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 306. Not later than six months after the effective date of this section and not later than January 10 of each calendar year beginning after such date, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward implementing the purpose and intent of this Act including but not limited to, (1) the progress and problems associated with control of automotive exhaust emissions and the research efforts related thereto; (2) the development of air quality criteria and recommended emission control requirements; (3) the status of enforcement actions taken pursuant to this Act; (4) the status of State ambient air standards setting, including such plans for implementation and enforcement as have been developed; (5) the extent of development and expansion of air pollution monitoring systems; (6) progress and problems related to development of new and improved control techniques; (7) the development of quantitative and qualitative instrumentation to monitor emissions and air quality; (8) standards set or under consideration pursuant to title II of this Act; (9) the status of State, interstate, and local pollution control programs established pursuant to and assisted by this Act; and (10) the reports and recommendations made by the President's Air Quality Advisory Board.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 307. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 308. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 309. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, other than sections 103(d) and 104, $74,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $95,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $134,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 310. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
BIRCH BAYH,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 780) to amend the Clean Air Act to authorize planning grants to air pollution control agencies, expand research provisions relating to fuels and vehicles, provide for interstate air pollution control agencies or commissions, authorize the establishment of air quality standards, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for technical, clerical, conforming, and clarifying changes.

APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATIONS

The bill as passed by the Senate authorized appropriations totalling $700 million over a 3-year period, fiscal years 1968 through 1970. The House amendment provided authorizations totalling $428.3 million over the same period. The conference substitute provides the same total authorization as is contained in the House amendment, $428.3 million, but revises the amounts for each of the fiscal years concerned.

The Senate bill authorizes a total of $375 million for research into combustion byproducts of vehicles, with $100 million for fiscal 1968, $125 million for fiscal 1969, and $150 million for fiscal 1970. The House bill contained no authorization specifically earmarked for this program. The conference substitute authorizes $35 million for fiscal 1968 for this program, and $90 million for fiscal 1969, with no authorization for fiscal 1970.

For general operating expenses, other than for research into combustion byproducts, and for facilities construction, the bill as passed by the Senate authorized a total of $325 million, with $75 million authorized for fiscal 1968, $100 million for fiscal 1969, and $150 million for fiscal 1970. The House amendment authorized a total of $428.3 million for all purposes under the Act, other than facilities construction, for the same three fiscal years, with $99 million authorized for fiscal 1968, $145 million for fiscal 1969, and $184.3 million for fiscal 1970.

The conference substitute authorizes appropriations for the same three fiscal years for activities under the Act, other than funds specifically earmarked for combustion byproducts and facilities construction, a total of $303.3 million, with $74 million authorized by fiscal 1968, $95 million for fiscal 1969, and $134.3 million for fiscal 1970.

COMBUSTION BYPRODUCTS RESEARCH

The Senate bill contained a separate section 104 providing specific authorization for research into combustion byproducts of fuels, authorizing the grants and contracts for such research with public or private organizations and institutions, and authorizing specific amounts for this purpose over the 3-year period fiscal 1968 through 1970. The House amendment contained no specific authorization for this program, but would have permitted such research, in the amounts determined by the administration, out of the overall appropriation authorization contained in the amendment.

The conference substitute follows the Senate version, with modifications. The conference substitute provides a separate section authorizing research into combustion byproducts of fuels, but eliminates the portion of the Senate bill which would have authorized grants to private profit-making organizations. Because of the elimination of private profit-making organizations from participating in the grant program contained in the bill, the conferees agreed to the deletion of the provision contained in the Senate bill restricting grants to not to exceed three-fourths of the cost of projects.

As agreed to by the conferees, the new program of specific earmarking of research funds contained in the Senate bill is limited to two years by the conference substitute rather than three years as contained in the Senate bill, and limits the authorization for this program to a total of $125 million for fiscal 1968 and 1969, rather than $375 mil-

lion for three years as authorized by the Senate.

FUEL ADDITIVES

The Senate bill provided for the registration of fuels containing additives, and required the filing of information concerning additives contained in such fuel. The House version limited the requirements with respect to registration to the additives involved, and provided that the Secretary should make provisions with respect to such additive as in his judgment is necessary to protect trade secrets and is necessary in the interest of national security.

The conference agreement provides that the manufacturer of fuels is required to notify the Secretary as to the name, the range of concentration, and the purpose in use of any additive contained in any fuel delivered in interstate commerce. The additive manufacturer is required to register the additive and to furnish information as to chemical composition, recommended range of concentration, recommended purpose in use, and where available, the chemical structure of such additive. The conference agreement follows the language of the Senate bill with respect to protection of trade secrets, except that information relating to trade secrets may be disclosed only in proceedings under title II of the Act relating to motor fuel emissions, rather than in all proceedings under the Act.

The House conferees feel that the language of the conference agreement with respect to protection of trade secrets, and with respect to registration of fuel additives, are adequate to protect against disclosure of any information which might adversely affect the national security, and cannot be construed to require that the Secretary may require that research be conducted by the manufacturer of such additive relating to health or other effects of such additive as a prerequisite to registration.

AIR QUALITY CONTROL REGIONS; HEARING BOARDS

The House bill provided that air quality control regions must be designated by the Secretary within 18 months after the date of enactment of the bill. The conference substitute provides that to the extent feasible such regions must be established within 18 months, but authorizes the revision of any prior designation, or the establishment of additional regions, after the expiration of such 18 months to the extent the Secretary determines such revision or designation to be necessary to protect the public health and welfare. Such revision or designation may take place only after consultation with appropriate city and local authorities. It is expected that the revision of designated air quality control regions will take place only where necessary to meet changing circumstances, in order to minimize the impact of such revisions on State and local authorities and industries within or outside the designated regions.

The House bill provided that where a State requests a hearing upon air quality standards prescribed by the Secretary in those cases where State action has not provided within the time specified in the Act for such air quality standards, the findings of the hearing board must be issued within 90 days, unless the Secretary determines that a longer period is necessary. The conference substitute follows the language of the House amendment, but provides that the 90-day period may not be extended by the Secretary for more than an additional 3 months.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The House amendment proposed to delete a provision of existing law encouraging States to enter into compacts for the control of air pollution, stating that no such compact should become effective until ratified by the Congress. This provision was deleted in the House amendment on the theory that it was unnecessary; however, a number of questions were raised concerning the possible implications of action by the Congress in repealing this section. The managers on the part of the House therefore agreed to reinsert this language into the bill in section 102(c), so that with respect to this language, the substitute restates existing law. The conferees also agreed to the retention of the provision contained in the House amendment stating it to be the intent of the Congress that agreements or compacts hereafter entered into relating to the control and abatement of air pollution in air quality control regions should not provide for participation by States not included (in whole or in part) in such region.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
JOHN JARMAN,
PAUL G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
ANCHER NELSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, conferees on the part of the House met yesterday with the conferees on the part of the Senate for some 3 hours and worked out what we think is a good bill.

At this time I would like to commend and to thank the House conferees—Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois, Mr. NELSEN, of Minnesota, Mr. JARMAN, of Oklahoma, and Mr. ROGERS of Florida—for their hard work in order to bring back to the House a bill as near as possible to the bill which was passed in the House.

I might say to the Members of the House that the bill is quite similar with the bill as passed by the House. There were 17 areas of disagreement between the House and Senate versions of the bill, most of them minor, but we were able to resolve all of the differences in one meeting. All of the conferees shared the common objective we all have—the establishment of a strong and effective program to clean up the Nation's air and we believe that the bill we now have will accomplish that objective.

There were three major areas of disagreement between the House bill and the Senate bill. One related to appropriation authorization, one relating to the earmarking of funds for research into combustion byproducts of fuels and one relating to fuel additive registration.

The Senate bill authorized a total of $700 million over a 3-year period for the control of air pollution, while the House bill provided a total of $428.3 million for the same period. The conference agreement provides the same amount as was contained in the bill passed by the House, $428.3 million; however, there is some revision in the conference agreement in the manner in which these funds are distributed over the 3 years.

The House bill provided appropriations in a lump sum for the entire program under the Clean Air Act; the Senate version, however, provided appropriation authorization for two programs: one for research into combustion byproducts of fuels and the other authorization for other programs under the act.

The Senate bill provided a total of 3 years' authorizations for research into combustion byproducts of fuels, with a total of $375 million authorized for this purpose. Our bill did not contain this specific authorization but lumped this program in with the others. The conference substitute provides for a research program, with funds specifically earmarked just as the Senate version provided; however, we revised the program, and we limited the funds. Instead of a total of $375 million for 3 years, the conference agreed to a total of $125 million over 2 years, and deleted the provision in the Senate bill authorizing grants to profitmaking organizations.

For the remaining programs under the bill, the Senate bill authorized a total of $325 million, and the conference substitute authorizes for this purpose a total of $303.3 million over a 3-year period.

Another area of difference between the Senate and House versions involved the specific earmarking of funds for research into combustion byproducts of fuels. We deleted this provision in the Senate bill on the theory that it was unnecessary. The Senate conferees insisted on the retention of this provision, and I think they made a very good case. They pointed out that the initiative in air pollution legislation has traditionally been with the Congress beginning with the initial air pollution legislation passed in 1954.

This program was initially established at the initiative of the Congress, and except for the last two bills in 1965 and 1966, the air pollution legislation that has become law has originated in the Congress, and not as the result of executive branch communications.

We are retaining congressional initiative in this particular case and determining for ourselves the extent of emphasis that should be given to research in this important area rather than leaving it to administrative discretion.

The other principal area of disagreement between the two bills involved registration of fuel additives. Stated simply, the Senate bill provided for registration of fuels; the House bill provided for registration of additives; the conference substitute provides for registration of additives and the filing of information with respect to fuels containing additives.

We think the bill is essentially the one that passed the House some time ago and recommend that the House agree to the conference report.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois such time as he might require.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House would first want to know how much money is involved in the conference report. As the bill came over from the Senate it provided $700 million. As finally written by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and as finally passed in this body, the bill provided $428 million. The bill comes back to you with an authorization for $428 million, exactly as it went from this chamber.

The Senate wanted $500 million as the minimum compromise. It was in this area that most of the discussion took place.

I believe that your conferees adequately represented you in maintaining that this body would not approve more than the figure which you passed here a few days ago. The discussion of this question was rather heated. Two conferees on the part of the other body felt that they could not go below a figure of $500 million. I would estimate that two-thirds of the amount of time spent in the conference was devoted to the question of how much money should go into this program. The conferees from the other body surrendered completely on the question of money.

We rearranged the money slightly, but it does not exceed the figure which went from this body to the conference.

We agreed on support money for a 3-year program. Those who have watched this committee through the years know that we do not go beyond a 3-year program in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There are 3 years of money supplied for the support of the program.

We did put the research money into 2 years, 1968 and 1969, and we did not provide any research money for the third year, 1970. There was a reason for this. It was because the other body, at the end of the second year, intends to review the program. It is possible that we also may review the program at the end of 2 years, but if we do not there still will be adequate support money for the program for the 3-year period.

I believe this is the major portion of the bill in which we are interested.

There were one or two other compromises. The Senate bill provided for the registration of fuels. The House bill provided for the registration of additives. The conference substitute provides for the registration of additives but for the filing of information with reference to fuels.

On the question of compacts between States, there were many questions asked on that in the House when we considered the bill. The Senate language is restored in that particular instance, and I believe with very good reason.

It was the feeling of our conferees that we won our position almost entirely. I believe, from reading the conference report, Members will find that we did.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

So the $375 million for research will end at the end of 2 years, is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman talking about the extra money the Senate provided?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. That was cut out.

Mr. GROSS. That was cut out?

Mr. SPRINGER. We did not surrender. They did not get it.

Mr. GROSS. How much money for research is there in the bill now?

Mr. SPRINGER. For research now there will be $35 million in 1968 and $90 million in 1969.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman like to have the support money for the years involved?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The support money for 1968 is $74 million, for 1969 is $95 million, and for 1970 is $134.3 million, which makes a total of $303.3 million for support.

Mr. GROSS. And the bill has been held to the House figure of $428,300,000?

Mr. SPRINGER. Exactly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN BANKS AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FROM FOSTERING OR PARTICIPATING IN GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10595) to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "publicize, or keep any record of" and insert "or publicize".

Page 2, line 13, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 15 and insert "or selling".

Page 3, after line 8, insert:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit a national bank from acting as agent of a State operating a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

Page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike out "publicize, or keep any record of" and insert: "or publicize".

Page 4, line 13, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 15 and insert: "or selling".

Page 5, after line 8, insert:

"(d) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit a State member bank from acting as agent of a State operationg a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

Page 5, line 24, strike out all after "advertise," over to and including "of" where it appears the first time in line 1 on page 6 and insert: "or publicize".

Page 6, line 14, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 16 and insert: "or selling".

Page 7, after line 10, insert:

"'(d) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit a State nonmember insured bank from acting as agent of a State operating a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"'(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"'(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"'(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State.'"

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

Page 7, lines 22 and 23, strike out "publicize, or keep any record of" and insert: "or publicize".

Page 8, line 11, strike out all after "buying," down to and including "way" in line 13 and insert: "or selling".

Page 9, after line 8, insert:

"'(d) Nothing contained in this action shall prohibit an insured institution from acting as agent of a State operating a lottery, or as agent of an officer or employee of such State who is charged with the administration of such lottery, for the purpose of—

"'(1) distributing lottery tickets to duly authorized sales agents of such State for sale by them;

"'(2) receiving from such sales agents the proceeds of their sales for delivery, payment, or transfer to such State; or

"'(3) distributing or paying to winners in such lottery the prizes payable to them by such State.'"

Page 9, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert: "(e)".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if all amendments are germane to the bill as it passed the House. It is difficult to understand what all of these amendments mean. I want to be sure that the amendments that were adopted are germane to the House bill.

Mr. PATMAN. May I proceed for about 2 minutes to explain the bill, and then I will try to answer the questions of the gentleman.

The acceptance of the Senate version of this bill would not destroy the basic thrust of the legislation as passed by the House. We passed the bill in the House in July. It was intended to prevent any national bank or any bank that is insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from selling lottery tickets anywhere. That has nothing to do with the lottery law in any State, but it just prohibits Federal agents, in other words, from selling lottery tickets for any State or any political subdivision.

The House passed the bill by quite a

substantial vote of about 71 percent. The Senate took up the bill either last week and debated it again yesterday and passed the bill by a much bigger majority than did the House. There was a vote on a motion to recommit which was defeated by a vote of 56 to 17. Even those who opposed the bill did not ask for a rollcall vote with the statement that the Senate was obviously overwhelmingly in favor of it and a rollcall on its final passage would not be asked for.

The Senate made some amendments to the bill, which are all right as far as I am concerned, because we never intended to cover the areas that the Senate covered in their amendments. Our proposal was just to prohibit the people working for banks that were connected with the Federal Government from selling lottery tickets. That was done for the obvious reason that it is really inconsistent with our traditional practice in the Federal Government to discourage gambling. We encourage thrift and saving instead.

If we were to allow banks to sell lottery tickets, they would have one lottery ticket window and one thrift window. Even people who had pension checks to cash would be placed in the unusual position of getting their checks cashed at the same window where they were asked to buy a lottery ticket. This, of course, just does not make too much sense in the usual banking practice. Now, I do not know of any banks that really want this situation. I just do not know of any. I do not think the banks of any State want to do that. However, under the peculiar situation they were in a position where great pressure was brought to bear on them to do it. The Senate amendment provides that the banks can still carry accounts for people as they have in the past.

You know, there is a lot of gambling going on besides just lotteries. Any gambling institution now can carry an account in a bank and receive a report and statement thereon, just like anyone else.

This law was not intended to stop them from doing that at all. It was only intended to stop the bank itself from permitting its employees to sell lottery tickets. In other words, matters connected with gambling. Personally, I agree with this concept.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, if the questions which I shall propound to the chairman of the committee can be answered satisfactorily. However, I am not wholly satisfied with what the Senate amendment does.

In my opinion this language will open the door to banks to enter other business than banking business. The language, I think, would permit the banks, possibly, to computerize the lotteries and, perhaps, even selecting the winning numbers of the lottery.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if that is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, it is not contemplated. The manner in which the Members of the other body explained it to me, and as the amendments would indicate to me, as I gather it, I share the views of the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri that banks should not have an unrelated business. I have been in opposition to that over the past many years as has the distinguished gentlewoman. I share her views entirely.

But, there is nothing in these amendments that would indicate that we would be setting a precedent for the purpose of a bank in the future to be permitted to engage in that kind of operation should they ask us to allow them to do it. This is not a precedentmaking language situation as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri that it is not the intent to allow the banks to get into any other unrelated business.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say for the record that insofar as the handling of the accounts are concerned I can see no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. But I think there should be in the legislative history the fact that they will not be able to do anything else except handle the accounts with reference to the lottery money.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree thoroughly with the distinguished gentlewoman.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, RESERVE FORCES BILL OF RIGHTS AND VITALIZATION ACT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of the National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, HÉBERT, HARDY, BATES, and BRAY.

MAKING IN ORDER DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under clause 8, rule XXIV, shall be in order on Monday, November 20.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader clarify for the Members of the House the intent of this particular request, and this rule?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri, District of Columbia business would be made in order by this rule.

Mr. HALL. And it is intended to take up the District of Columbia business on which day?

Mr. ALBERT. On Monday next. It does not displace the regular order of business.

Mr. HALL. It does not displace the regular order of business?

Mr. ALBERT. No, it does not.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

OKINAWA "TALKS"

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Sato of Japan was scheduled to talk with President Johnson last afternoon, and among the topics indicated for discussion, was the future status of Okinawa.

While it is a pleasure to have any sovereign nation's Prime Minister as a guest in Washington, I hope the President will not make the same mistake in regard to Okinawa that he has made in regard to Panama. Under no circumstances should the United States consider at this time any change in the status of Okinawa and our sovereignty thereover. Okinawa is a vital bastion of our Pacific defense perimeter, and is a vital and essential cog in our Vietnam supply line. Americans paid a heavy cost in lives in World War II to secure Okinawa from Japanese control, and there is no reason to believe that the inhabitants of these islands would benefit from a return to Japanese control.

The United States has made a tremendous economic investment in Okinawa as evidenced by the bill recently considered by the House and Senate resulting in a compromise $17 million expenditure. There are no doubt many great problems deserving of attention when the President meets with Prime Minister Sato. But the question of sovereignty over Okinawa is not among them.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. 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. 383]

Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Pool
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton, Tenn.	Purcell
Andrews, Ala.	Giaimo	Railsback
Annunzio	Halpern	Reinecke
Ashbrook	Harsha	Resnick
Aspinall	Heckler, Mass.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Herlong	St. Onge
Broomfield	Howard	Scherle
Button	Kleppe	Stafford
Clawson, Del	Laird	Steed
Conte	McClory	Steiger, Ariz.
Cowger	MacGregor	Stephens
Davis, Ga.	Martin	Thompson, Ga.
de la Garza	Mathias, Calif.	Ullman
Derwinski	Mathias, Md.	Utt
Dickinson	Miller, Calif.	Van Deerlin
Dorn	Multer	Vander Jagt
Everett	Myers	Williams, Miss.
	Poage	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN BANKS AND SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FROM FOSTERING OR PARTICIPATING IN GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10595) to prohibit certain banks and savings and loan associations from fostering or participating in gambling activities, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I objected earlier to the unanimous-consent request that we concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It is an antieducation bill and it is an anti-New York State bill, posing under the guise of morality and in opposition to gambling. I intend to do what I can to delay its enactment into law as long as possible.

Mr. Speaker, as a practical matter, this bill is an attempt to tell the sovereign State of New York and its voters who have adopted this lottery by a referendum election—and I did not support that proposal and my congressional district did not support it, but the people did overwhelmingly support it—to tell the people of New York State that they cannot carry on that lottery and cannot use the funds from that lottery, funds which are being directed toward education in our State. Shall we tell the people of New York they cannot raise money in that way? Shall we tell them that the entire burden will fall upon the shoulders of the taxpayers to raise that money instead from their own pockets? If so that is going to represent quite a problem to our State, and to the children in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, just because the other body has passed it seems to me no reason at all for us in this House to hasten the enactment of this unwise, unfortunate, and highly discriminatory legislation against the voters and the children of New York State.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10805, TO EXTEND THE LIFE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10805) to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, RODINO, ROGERS of Colorado, MCCULLOCH, and BIESTER.

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY 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 further consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 further consideration of the bill S. 2388, with Mr. ROONEY of New York in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee arose on yesterday, it had agreed that section 102 of the committee substitute amendment would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to section 102?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLENBACK: On page 154, after line 7, strike out everything through line 13 on page 168 and insert:

"SEC. 102. (a) Parts 'C' and 'E' of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are redesignated 'Part F' and 'Part G', respectively; sections 121 through 126 are redesignated respectively as sections 171 through 176, and section 141 is redesignated as section 181, which is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 181. Each of the programs under this title shall be carried out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. From the amounts appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this title in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, there is hereby directed to be allocated the sum of $38,500,000 for Part B, the sum of $100,000,000 for Part C (less any amount expended in such year prior to the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 for the in-school programs authorized under Part B of title I of this Act), the sum of $5,000,000 for Part D, and the sum of $100,000,000 for Part E (less any amount expended in such year prior to the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 for the out-of-school programs authorized under Part B of title I of this Act), of which $70,000,000 is reserved for carrying out the Industry Youth Corps program authorized under section 163.'

"(b) Parts B and D of title I of such Act are repealed, and replaced by new Parts B, C, D, and E, to read as follows:

"'PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR ADULTS

"'STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"'SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will help unemployed or low-income adults, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

"'COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"'SEC. 121. (a) The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

"'(b) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to a community action agency or to a public agency or private organization to carry out one or more component programs.

"'(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"'ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

"'SEC. 122. (a) The Secretary may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:

"'(1) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

"'(2) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupa-

tional training to facilitate career advancement;

"'(3) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, and within those rural areas having substantial outmigration to urban areas, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

"'(4) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

"'(5) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

"'(6) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: *Provided*, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Secretary shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

"'(7) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

"'(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

"'(c) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this title.

"'SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"'SEC. 123. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"'(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"'(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed.

"'(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

"'(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"'(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"'(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"'(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"'SEC. 124. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Secretary, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"'(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"'(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"'ELDERLY

"'SEC. 125. The Secretary shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part time, and short-term staff in component programs.

"'PILOT PROJECTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"'SEC. 126 (a) The Secretary may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

"'(b) The Secretary shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

"'(c) Before the Secretary may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

"'(d) The Secretary may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

"'ROLE OF THE STATES

"'SEC. 127. The Secretary may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

"'(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 126(d), with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

"'(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

"'(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable price sponsor; and

"'(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

"'EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"'SEC. 128. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Secretary shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 122(a)(3); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 122, the Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

"'LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"'SEC. 129. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 122 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 223(c).

"'PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

"'SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

"'(b) The Secretary shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training pro-

grams authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"'(c) The Secretary shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 122, 126(d) and 127.'

"PART C—SECONDARY SCHOOL WORK STUDY PROGRAM

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 131. It is the purpose of this part to enable needy young men and women to continue or resume their education at the secondary school level through work-study programs carried out in the school or by public or private nonprofit organizations.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK STUDY

"SEC. 132. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a work-study program for secondary school students to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary').

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 133. (a) From the sums allocated to carry out this part for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve such amount, not in excess of 2 per centum, as he may determine, and shall allot the amount so reserved among 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. The remainder of such sums shall be allotted among the States so that the allotment to each such State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such reminder as the number of related children aged fourteen to twenty-one, both inclusive, living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in such State bears to the number of related children of such ages living in such families in all such States.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this part shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Secretary may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Secretary estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; 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 from funds allocated for this part shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 134. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this part shall submit to the Secretary a State plan, in such detail as the Secretary deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State educational agency as the agency which shall, through arrangements with local educational agencies or other public or private, nonprofit agencies, act as the sole agency for the administration of the plan;

"(2) sets forth procedures under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 133 will be expended for work-study programs meeting the requirements set forth in section 139, and by which such funds will be held apart from general State funds;

"(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies or other local public or private, nonprofit organizations for work-study programs;

"(4) 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 agency or organization) under this title;

"(5) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(6) provides a standard of income of participants and their families that takes due account of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining, subject to the Secretary's approval; and

"(7) provides for participation of non-public-school students comparable to the participation of public school students.

"ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 135. (a) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 134(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 136. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 134(a) or with his final action under section 135, 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 the clerk of the Court to the Secretary. The Secretary shall thereupon 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 Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the Court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary 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. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The Court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary 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.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 137. From the amounts allotted to each State under section 133, the Secretary shall pay to the 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.

"BYPASS OF STATE AGENCY

"SEC. 138. In the absence of a satisfactory State plan, or satisfactory implementation thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make grants from such State allocation directly to community action agencies or substitute agencies qualified under title II of this Act, in order that work-study programs may be provided by contract arrangements or otherwise.

"QUALIFICATIONS OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

"SEC. 139. A work-study program shall not be considered eligible by the State or the Secretary for assistance under this part unless—

"(1) the program will enable students to resume or maintain school attendance;

"(2) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided, or will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of the natural resources of the State or community or to the development, management, or protection of State or community recreational areas;

"(3) the students will be employed by public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations including recipients of funds themselves either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private, nonprofit organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious worship, or involving the conduct of any sectarian religious activity;

"(4) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers, jeopardize the potential employment of workers not aided under this part, or impair existing contract for services;

"(5) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical area, and proficiency of the employee, and in no event shall exceed the rate of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(6) the program will be coordinated to the maximum extent feasible, with vocational training and educational services adapted to the special needs of students in such program and sponsored by State or local public or private educational agencies: *Provided, however*, That where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, and coordination of such services with the cooperation of, or where appropriate, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary;

"(7) the employer during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall contribute at least 10 per centum, and during any fiscal year thereafter at least 25 per centum, of the total cost of employing any such student (such contribution to be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant equipment or services); and

"(8) in States in which participation of all non-public-school students is permitted, students in such non-public schools are admitted to the program on an equitable basis.

"ENROLLEES IN PROGRAM

"SEC. 140. (a) Selection for enrollment in programs assisted under this part shall be made by participating school systems in ac-

cordance with agreements with the Secretary.

"(b) No person may participate as an enrollee in programs under this part unless—

"(1) he is a student in ninth through twelfth grades;

"(2) his and his family's income does not exceed the standards of income established under section 134(a)(6);

"(3) he is in need of remunerative employment to resume or continue his secondary level education.

"(c) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(d) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part, the Secretary may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and referral services to youths through public agencies or private, nonprofit organizations.

"OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

"SEC. 141. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to enrollees in programs assisted under this part and to all officers and employees any part of whose salaries are paid from sums made available under this part.

"PART D—COUNSELOR PROGRAM

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 151. It is the purpose of this part to assist needy youths to find part-time employment with private profitmaking employers, and with public or private nonprofit organizations on a work-study arrangement, which will enable them to continue or resume their education at the secondary level, through the services of a counselor who will counsel such youth and will seek out, obtain job openings for and place such youth in such openings.

"OPERATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 152. (a) To carry out the purpose of this part, the Secretary is authorized to contract with local public or private, nonprofit, educational agencies for the hiring of a counselor, to be located in the school, who will (1) provide counseling and testing to determine students' capabilities and needs, and (2) seek out, obtain job openings for, and place such youth in such openings on a work-study basis for needy students with private profitmaking employers and with public or private nonprofit organizations, with such employers and organizations paying 100 per centum of the students' wages.

"(b) The Secretary shall give preference to applications submitted by local public or private, nonprofit, educational agencies serving large numbers of youths from low-income families.

"(c) The Secretary shall not approve the application of a local public or private, nonprofit, educational agency which is already carrying on a program described in section 152 unless he has received satisfactory assurances that such agency will not reduce its expenditures for such program.

"(d) In no event shall the Federal payment under this part exceed 50 per centum of the salary paid to the counselor.

"PART E—WORK TRAINING PROGRAM; INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 161. It is the purpose of this part to provide needy, unskilled, and unemployed young men and women who have terminated their formal education with on-the-job training opportunities which will enable them to become self-sustaining in a vocation.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK TRAINING PROGRAM

"SEC. 162. (a) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Secretary') shall establish in the Department of Labor a work training program which shall be administered locally wherever possible through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist public and private, nonprofit, employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. Such program shall be administered in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with public and private, nonprofit employers (other than a political party or organization) in the area served by such agency to provide on-the-job training and necessary related services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such public and private, nonprofit employers to carry out the purposes of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and the reimbursement of not more than 75 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such public and private, nonprofit employers during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the reimbursement of not more than 50 per centum of the cost of such wages paid during each succeeding fiscal year.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 163. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Labor an Industry Youth Corps program to be administered locally wherever possible through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist private, profitmaking employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services, such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. The Secretary shall encourage farmers and other employers in agriculture and agriculturally related enterprises to participate in such program by hiring eligible youths for training in farm occupations for which there is a potential of long-term employment.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with private, profitmaking employers in the area served by such agency to provide such training and services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such private, profitmaking employers to carry out the purpose of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and not more than 25 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such private, profitmaking employer.

"CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 164. (a) Any contract made with an employer under section 162(b) or 163(b) shall provide that eligible youths will be hired under terms of employment which provide that—

"(1) an integral part of such employment shall consist of on-the-job training in an appropriate vocational skill area (including supplemental classroom instruction where appropriate), with opportunity for reasonable progression and pay raises consistent with individual performances;

"(2) the employer will, whenever possible, offer suitable long-term employment to any individual who successfully completes his on-the-job training, or assist such individual to find suitable long-term employment elsewhere: *Provided*, That such employer shall not displace previously employed workers or impair existing employment contracts;

"(3) the employer will provide adequate and safe facilities, and adequate personnel records of attendance and progress;

"(4) such youths will be compensated at reasonable rates comparable to, but in no event in excess of, the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(5) the term of employment shall not exceed one year, except that such term may be extended for one additional year if it is ascertained by the employer that (A) such youth would be unable to qualify for suitable employment at the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services without reimbursement of a portion of the employer's wage costs attributable to the employment of such individual, and the reasonable costs of providing on-the-job training and related services to such individual; and (B) the employed youth probably will benefit from an additional year of on-the-job training; and

"(6) the determination of eligibility of any youth shall be made by the employer, in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary.

"(b) Any contract under sections 162(b) and 163(b) shall be negotiated with due consideration for minimizing forms and procedures imposed upon the contracting employers.

"(c) Under no circumstances shall any contract be made under sections 162(b) and 163(b) unless there is assurance that the obligations of the employer under such contract and under any arrangements he may make with an eligible youth will be discharged in good faith.

"(d) The employer of any eligible youth pursuant to the provisions of this part shall have the same authority to supervise, assign, provide working conditions for, and discharge such youth as he has with respect to regular employees.

"ELIGIBLE YOUTHS

"SEC. 165. (a) For purposes of the programs authorized by this part, an eligible youth shall be an individual—

"(1) who has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two at the time he contracts for employment with such employer;

"(2) whose income (together with his family's income if he is a dependent thereof) does not exceed a standard of poverty set forth in rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary on the basis of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of such youth to be self-sustaining;

"(3) who is unemployed and unable to obtain employment in an appropriate vocational skill area; and

"(4) who has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and as to whom there are no immediate prospects of returning to school for additional education or vocational training.

"(b) Eligible youths employed pursuant to programs authorized by this title shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 166. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemploy-

ment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this title shall be used within any one State.

"COORDINATION WITH STATES

"SEC. 167. The Secretary shall consult with any State assisted under title II of this Act to achieve the most effective coordination feasible of programs assisted under this title with programs assisted under that title.

"OATH

"SEC. 168. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to eligible youth in programs assisted under this part."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point. It is the same amendment that is in 1(b) in the so-called opportunity crusade.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say merely this: We have made the point on several occasions before, before this body, that it appears to us on this side of the aisle that some of those who have spoken on these matters have not been thoroughly aware of the specifics of our proposals. We are prepared to consider the amendment as having been read so long as it is understood that if there are any questions about it whatsoever that there will be questions raised in the course of the discussion. It is not true that this is entirely the same as the suggestions that have been made in the opportunity crusade. The first section is somewhat different in this regard, and we will explain it in the course of the discussion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman makes a good point. It seems to me that on a complicated amendment like this, the gentleman would have made arrangements for copies to be available for Members on the floor to see and to read. From just the reading of this amendment now, nobody really can have a thorough understanding of what is in this amendment. I hope the gentleman is going to explain it and I would like to see a copy of it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If I may answer my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, you will find that in the course of the discussion we will point out to you where you already have in your hands, partly in the committee's proposal and partly in the opportunity crusade, the written specifics of this amendment. I let this go on this long in part to call clearly to the attention of the majority party where it was that this could be found so there could be no question.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I would say to the gentleman from New York that all changes involved in the amendment here come from the opportunity crusade. They are before you in print. There is no question about that. There is a portion that does not strike the entire section of your committee bill. That part is unchanged and that is before you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I can see that the gentleman is consistent. Obviously, the gentleman from New York does not know what the gentleman from Oregon is proposing so far as the opportunity crusade is concerned. The gentleman from New York says there is no change from the opportunity crusade and the gentleman in the well said there are substantial changes. Why do not you two gentlemen get together and let the Committee know what you are doing.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman misunderstood the words spoken very clearly by the gentleman in the well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is before you breaks down into four parts.

The first part is part B, work and training for adults. This bears very considerable similarity to a program which is set forth in the committee amendment which is part B thereunder, part B, sections 102 and subsequent.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-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. 384]

Anderson, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Poage
Andrews, Ala.	Hansen, Wash.	Pool
Annunzio	Hays	Purcell
Ashbrook	Heckler, Mass.	Railsback
Aspinall	Herlong	Reinecke
Bell	Kelly	Resnick
Broomfield	Kirwan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Button	Laird	St. Onge
Clark	Landrum	Scherle
Clawson, Del	McClory	Smith, Calif.
Conte	MacGregor	Springer
Conyers	Martin	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Mathias, Calif.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	Mathias, Md.	Ullman
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Utt
Everett	Moorhead	Vander Jagt
Fountain	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.	Willis
Giaimo	Pike	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 2388, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 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 Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK] is recognized.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we have proposed is about a 34-page amendment. In view of the fact that we consider this of major importance, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the gentleman make the request at the end of his first 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, we have here in this amendment a proposal to take the various work-training programs which are in part in the present law and in part in the committee proposals as amendments and in part new and put them in this one particular amendment.

Part B of the proposal which is this amendment is the part B of the committee proposal which is the old parts B and D of the present law, with these two changes therein.

First. This is now a work-training program for adults—not for youths and adults.

Second. We have taken a section of the law where the responsibility is in the hands of the Office of Economic Opportunity but delegated to the Department of Labor, and we have provided that the responsibility be given by statute to the Department of Labor.

Part C of the amendment which is before us deals with secondary school work study.

We have here another section of the law where a portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, covering youngsters in school, at the present time in the hands of the Office of Economic Opportunity is delegated to the Department of Labor.

This is essentially an education-oriented program.

We therefore propose in this section to separate the inschool Neighborhood Youth Corps and out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. We take the in-school program and see it for what it is, an education-oriented program, and place the responsibility in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We also in this particular proposal provide for the institution of a State plan. A State plan after being proposed would be checked by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would be subject to judicial review if there be a dispute as to the action taken by the Secretary.

In addition to this, there is a bypass provided and there is here provision for employment. This is a program designed for young people who ought to be in school to help keep them in school. We here provide for contribution toward salaries by both the Federal Government and by private employers or public nonprofit employers on a 90–10 basis for the first year and on a 75-percent Federal contribution and 25 percent for public or private nonprofit agencies basis every year thereafter.

This is part C, the secondary school work-study program.

In part D we have a new program

which is not in the present law and is not in the committee amendments. It is called a counselor program. Here is where we have, Mr. Chairman, one of the particularly significant advances proposed by the opportunity crusade.

Part D is in the opportunity crusade. To anyone who has not already read the proposal in full which is before each one of us in H.R. 13894, I refer them to this particular section where they can read in detail any part that they may want to read.

The counselor program is part D. This program provides essentially that Federal funds would be used on a matching basis with local school districts to employ work counselors, counselors who will deal with the young people, talk about what their goals are, find out what their job interests are, make sure there is active solicitation in the community as to the availability of jobs, as to the stirring up and seeking for jobs, and then to take the very significant step of seeking to have these people placed in those jobs.

Later speakers will dwell in detail on this particular program. This is one of the particularly significant additions of the opportunity crusade.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLENBACK was given an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, one more word on this counselor program. We are here talking, you see, about Federal funds going into only one phase of the operation, namely, helping to provide counselors who will perform these important functions. When jobs are found for the young people, it is expected that private enterprise will pay the full cost of those salaries paid to the young people.

Here we see one of the significant breaks in the whole concept of the opportunity crusade. It is not a case of using Federal funds to create jobs where the full salary or where even the bulk of the salary is paid by Federal moneys. We are here talking about Federal moneys being seed moneys to help find the jobs, to help stir up jobs, to help place in jobs.

Part E of the proposal which is before us is a combination of Work Training and Industry Youth Corps. The Work Training is a modification of the old out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Part of the essential difference in this regard is, one, that under the old law this is in the hands of the Director of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Economic Opportunity, delegated to the Department of Labor. We would provide that this be placed by statute in the hands of the Department of Labor. We would provide here that there be 75 percent Federal money, 25 percent employer money initially, the first year, and that this progress to a 50-percent Federal money and a 50-percent employer money for all years thereafter, instead of the 90-percent Federal and 10-percent employer money which is implicit and runs through both the present law and the proposals of the administration.

I stress this point as I go by it because, again you see, we are here making the significant point that it is through procedures like this that Federal moneys ought properly to be used. Federal moneys ought not to be used to pay all or substantially all of the salaries of the jobs we are seeking to find and to place young people in. Federal moneys ought to be seed money to stir up these jobs and place young people in them.

The second half of this part E, the Industry Youth Corps, is here as a new program. We are here talking about a situation where Federal moneys could be used to pay a portion of salaries. Young people would be placed in this instance in private profitmaking jobs. Here again is a second very significant feature involved in the Republican opportunity crusade, because again, you see, we do not have enough Federal moneys to take care of payment in full of salaries or even a substantial portion of all salaries. We are here talking about a situation where we turn to private industry and we say, "We have young people who need jobs. We want you to take them on. You tell us that you cannot take them on at full salary initially because they are not worth that to you and you cannot subsidize them. We say to you that if you take them on at 75 percent of what you need to pay them to get them, the Federal Government will supply the other 25 percent of this money to make the marginal difference." The result is that it is worth a private employer's rising to the subsidy, a subsidy limited in percent and limited in time.

Through this we would stir private enterprise to reach out and pick up a part of the job themselves, to do the training that needs to be done, because private enterprise knows the jobs it wants young people to fill. And it would pay the bulk of the salaries involved.

So far as the dollars are concerned, under part B we would provide $38.5 million Federal money. Under part C we would provide for $100 million, less what has been spent on this portion of the program during the year to date. Under part D we would provide only $5 million, for the counselor program, because the vast influx of money here would come from outside employers. Under part E we would provide for $100 million of Federal money, less what has been spent to date on this portion of the program.

That would be a total Federal expenditure of approximately $243 million. The present committee proposals in this regard, if we total them up, are about twice this amount, or about $461 million, but one cannot stop there. The $243 million of Federal moneys under our proposal would act as an incentive, would act as seed to bring into the program at least four times that much.

If we look at the Community Youth Corps, where we would be paying 25 percent of the wages, we would expect that 75 percent would come from outside, and as a result we are talking about another $210 million involved in this.

If we look at the counselor program, with a total Federal injection of money of $5 million, we would conservatively estimate, on the basis of the best predictions we can put forward, that we should be dealing with at least another $500 million. Some of the estimates we have been able to secure in this regard indicate it would be double this amount.

So we have at least between $700 million and $1.2 billion of additional moneys going toward the root causes of poverty under our proposal.

What we are here talking about—I repeat this point again, because I do not want any question about anyone missing it—is, this would increase manifold the total funds striking at the causes of poverty.

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

Mr. Chairman, here again we see a move to cripple most useful programs that are contained in part B.

First, discussing the Neighborhood Youth Corps, this has served 1.3 million youngsters in the past 2½ years in school and out of school, and has assisted others to become employed, between the ages of 16 and 22. These, all, have been disadvantaged youngsters.

It is proposed, for all intents and purposes, to destroy a very effective program.

In the amendment it is proposed to transfer this to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the original crusade it was to be transferred to the Office of Education.

Do Members know the next requirement? According to language in the amendment, if Members will read the opportunity crusade, there would be required a State plan for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. Another lengthy step, another bureaucratic layer to be penetrated in bringing needed programs to youth who need the job experience, who need the training, who need the income to continue in school.

Mr. Chairman, this is a workable program, an efficient program.

NYC is preparing poor people to compete for jobs by giving them work experience and training; it is helping to improve community services by putting the unemployed to work in fields, such as health, which suffer from a shortage of personnel; and it is a major factor in moving people off the welfare rolls into permanent, dignified employment.

NYC is primarily a community program. Projects are sponsored by local organizations on the State, county, municipal, and neighborhood level. The Labor Department lays down the guidelines and funds up to 90 percent of the cost. The day-to-day administration is in the hands of the local sponsor, who locates the worksites, recruits the youngsters, and arranges for supportive services. Many enrollees are placed in jobs in hospitals. Others are sent to libraries, cafeterias, museums, police and fire stations, housing projects, schools, parks and nursing homes.

Boys and girls in the in-school and summer projects are paid $1.25 to $1.40 an hour, earning that extra bit of money that usually means the difference between completing their high school educations or becoming dropouts.

The in-school program allows youngsters to work in their spare time up to 15 hours a week. In the summer and out-of-school projects, they spend up to 40 hours a week working or taking advantage of supportive services such as remedial education or job related training.

When the Neighborhood Youth Corps

was organized in 1964, sponsorship was limited to nonprofit groups, and enrollees had to be 16 through 21 years old. The idea was to give poverty-level youngsters work experience that would help them qualify for jobs, to make them self-sufficient, and to expand community services. Three years of trial and experimentation have led the Labor Department to refine that original concept. NYC now enrolls boys and girls as young as 14, when it is easier to persuade them to remain in school. Private industry has been brought into the picture to supply worksites and to aid in training and placing the youngsters, thus giving NYC the benefit of business' know-how and vast resources. Local sponsors in many areas are now training youngsters for specific jobs, thus easing the transition from NYC into permanent employment.

By June 30, the end of the 1967 fiscal year, the Neighborhood Youth Corps had made available 1,327,000 job opportunities for disadvantaged youth in every State and U.S. territory at a cost to the Federal Government of $753,504,000. In fiscal year 1967, NYC provided 521,000 job opportunities in 1,459 home town projects at a cost to the Federal Government of $362,425,000.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has proved highly effective in keeping disadvantaged youngsters in school. A study completed in May 1967 by the Pittsburgh Board of Education of all high schools in the city for the previous school year disclosed that the dropout rate for NYC enrollees was only a little over 4 percent compared with an 8½-percent dropout rate for non-NYC students. An NYC summer work program in 1965 and 1966 at three high schools in Washington, D.C., cut the normal dropout rate for these schools from 20 percent to 2 percent by June 1967. Six school districts in Texas and Oklahoma reported a 7-percent dropout rate among their regular student bodies as compared only to 3 percent among NYC enrollees.

Dr. Louis J. Kishkunas, assistant superintendent of Pittsburgh's schools, attributes NYC's remarkable "holding power" to the money it puts into empty pockets and the sense of pride and responsibility that goes with an NYC job. In other words, boys and girls earning a little extra money can buy the books and clothes they need to keep up with their more fortunate schoolmates.

As for the out-of-schoolers, the NYC wage rate of $1.25 to $1.40 an hour would have little holding power if enrollees were given deadend, make-work jobs. Supportive services play a vital role in rechanneling these neglected youngsters into the mainstream of American society. The counseling and remedial education made available by local NYC projects to out-of-schoolers build a solid foundation for future work, training or education. A recent study of the out-of-school program by Dunlap and Associates, Inc., revealed that approximately 9 months after termination from NYC, 35 percent of the former enrollees were working at permanent jobs, 6 percent were in military service, 18 percent were in advanced training programs or had returned to school and 11 percent were housewives—a total of 70 percent.

An impressive example of how the out-of-school program salvages dropouts is revealed in an article appearing in the September 1967 issue of Hospital & Community Psychiatry, a journal of the American Psychiatric Association. It also reports how NYC channels the Nation's youthful manpower into those sectors of the economy suffering from a severe shortage of personnel. For nearly 2 years now, a statewide NYC program in Pennsylvania has been training youngsters in job assignments at the State's mental hospitals and school for the retarded. The first project was completed in July 1966. Of the 240 NYC enrollees who completed the 24 weeks of training and work experience, 100 obtained jobs and 63 were hired by the institutions where they trained.

A second project, from August 1966 to February 1967, produced an even higher employment rate.

The magazine reported:

Exactly 50% or 132 of the 264 enrollees, were in jobs when the training ended, 93 in the hospitals where they trained. Of the 156 NYC trainees who were hired by the hospitals after the first two projects, 102 were assigned to the nursing services after they passed the state civil service examination for attendant-trainees.

The project sponsors mobilized a variety of public and private agencies to insure the success of this program. Hospital staff members, public assistant caseworkers, employment counselors, and YMCA employees all worked together to establish the work assignments and training procedures—which include 96 hours of training, averaging 4 hours a week.

NYC's success in rehabilitating so many of these youngsters is particularly significant because out-of-school enrollees are recruited from the ranks of high school dropouts and the hard-core unemployed. Historically, more than 26 percent have come directly from families receiving public assistance. More than 48 percent in fiscal 1967 projects had only a ninth-grade education or less. Almost 90 percent had been out of school and unemployed for 3 months or longer. Almost 27 percent had been out of school for 13 to 24 months. More than 60 percent reported that most of their earnings were used for the support of their families.

It should not be surprising that the young corpsmen also get into less trouble with the police after they enroll. As Winston Churchill once said:

Everyone should do a good day's work and be accountable for some definite task and then they do not make trouble for trouble's sake or to cut a figure.

Community after community reports a reduction in juvenile crime, thanks to NYC. In San Antonio, for example, juvenile delinquency declined 12.6 percent in the slum areas last year, where NYC was operative, while it jumped 5.5 percent during the same period in the higher income areas of the city and county.

A letter early in 1967 from a local judge stated that juvenile delinquency decreased 30 percent in the Dayton, Ky., area and he gave the credit to NYC. Police in other cities report reductions in juvenile crime ranging from the lowest rate of increase in 5 years in Washington, D.C., to an 80-percent decline since the initiation of the NYC program in Kinloch, Mo. The Los Angeles Times reported in May 1967 that only 1 percent of the enrollees in a project in that city had been convicted of a crime since enrolling, though 50 percent had previous criminal records. Four other California cities with NYC projects report a reduction in crime last year: Oakland, a 25-percent decrease; San Francisco, 10 percent; Stockton, 15 percent; and San Jose, 28 percent.

Youngsters active in juvenile crime often find themselves on the right side of the law after joining the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Labor Department figures show that in September 1967 more than 2,500 enrollees were working in public safety jobs. Their job titles varied. Some were called police cadets, others sheriff's aides or correction officer's aides, still others public safety cadets or police aides. Many of them had previous police records. All served a common purpose. They helped relieve a shortage of personnel in a crucial area of public service, while preparing themselves for permanent jobs.

The police cadet programs are worthy of special attention. Jersey City, Paterson, Newark, Detroit, and Kansas City, have all funded police cadets with NYC money. The cadets promote good relations between law enforcement officials and the residents of low-income neighborhoods where the youngsters live by introducing poverty level youth to the work and problems of the local police force. These cadets and other young people enrolled in NYC won high praise from police officials for their work during the riots that hit several cities during the summer of 1967.

The performance of the Newark cadets was called "magnificent" by Police Director Dominick A. Spina. And in Detroit, Hubert G. Locke, administrative assistant to Police Commissioner Ray Girardin, called the help of the cadets "invaluable" during that city's summer calamity. Mr. Spina reported that he had his command post at the fourth precinct and that on the worst night of the riots, four of the cadets showed up to help. He said there were snipers all about, and the building was being pelted with rocks and bottles. The precinct was rushed three times, once with Molotov cocktails. But Mr. Spina said "the kids were right there." The rest of the cadets reported for duty at police headquarters.

The cadets in Newark and Detroit worked 12-hour shifts. They manned police department telephone switchboards and performed other routine but important tasks, freeing regular officers for riot duty. In Detroit, during a brief telephone breakdown that caused a "communication chaos," as Locke described it, the cadets served as messengers to keep information flowing throughout police headquarters.

Mr. Locke said:

It was in critical moments like these that these young men proved their worth.

The cadets were not the only NYC enrollees to risk their necks to help restore order.

Thirty-five enrollees in Newark, many of them girls, reported for duty at city hospital, in the heart of the riot area. Working 12-hour shifts they relieved exhausted nurses, prepared food, and helped wherever needed. Enrollees working for the Newark Housing Authority aided in everything from emergency food distribution to loading and unloading trucks. They went door-to-door in the low-income public housing areas to locate people needing help.

One of the best stories involving the Neighborhood Youth Corps was one that did not make headlines. Mansfield, Ohio, stayed out of the news because the NYC project director and corpsmen managed to cool a riot before it started. As rumors of trouble began to grow in July in Mansfield's ghetto area, the NYC project director, backed by a local CAP official, went into the area. The two men knew many of the youths personally, and at a meeting with some 70 of them, encouraged the young people to air their gripes and promised immediate action on their legitimate grievances.

The youths organized into a group with a dual purpose: to better living and recreation conditions for the community and to prevent the city from exploding.

The two youths who assumed leadership of the group were both NYC "graduates" who became the driving force in getting the group organized. At one time considered troublemakers, the two boys now have full-time jobs and are responsible citizens, thanks to NYC.

Because of the help he had received from NYC, one of the leaders said:

> I owe something to this community so let's maintain law and order.

In East Harlem in New York City more than 1,860 NYC youths were deployed to use their influence to help overcome grievances and prevent disorder. The corpsmen visited the street corners, poolrooms and other teen hangouts and recruited several hundred frustrated, angry youths into the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Their efforts helped East Harlem keep "cool."

A new avenue for training out-of-school, unemployed youth was provided by the 1966 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. For the first time Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees are now permitted to receive job training in private industry. Known as "Work Training in Industry" these projects extend worksites for NYC'ers and allow the private sector of the economy to play a more prominent role in developing the employment potential of thousands of disadvantaged youth. Private firms in different cities give enrollees job training, wages, and fringe benefits, while NYC continues to provide additional services such as remedial education, medical attention, and counseling.

Traditionally, NYC has worked closely with private labor and business groups in order to provide the best services for enrollees.

In California, the Alameda County AFL–CIO this year is pioneering a new type of NYC project to teach 410 school dropouts good work habits and basic job skills. Skilled union craftsmen employed by the Alameda labor organization supervise and instruct enrollees in clerical work, landscaping, remodeling and other construction projects. Those youths who perform satisfactorily in the work experience phase are offered additional training in marketable job skills such as welding, auto mechanics, carpentry, office machine operation, and office procedures. Trainees are paid from $1.35 to $1.60 an hour for a 32-hour workweek.

A private corporation joined with the NYC project in Paterson, N.J., to create a business skills training center for out-of-school youngsters in that city. One purpose of the project was to encourage the local business community to participate in job training and placement programs for disadvantaged youths. Another was to demonstrate the tremendous source of skilled workers such a program can produce. Enrollees attended classes approximately 8 hours a week where they were trained in typical office practices, typing, key punch operation, bookkeeping, data processing, and proper work habits. The company trained two specialists to develop and administer the program, in addition to providing curriculum materials. After 3 months of training, the first 30 graduates were honored at a ceremony in Paterson in June 1967. The NYC project director in Paterson said that almost all the young people had jobs waiting for them in the community when they graduated. By actual count, Olivetti located 102 openings for these graduates.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps during 1967 has proved itself a flexible instrument for tackling the problems of the disadvantaged. Within its legislative framework, it was able to experiment with a variety of innovative projects that can guide the Nation's manpower programs into fruitful and previously uncharted paths. NYC in 1967 launched an attack on the migrant problem, explored new ways of improving medical services to the poor, and took dramatic steps to secure college scholarships for enrollees with only average or below average grades.

A pilot project to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their children move out of the cycle of poverty into the mainstream of American society was jointly funded in June by the Labor Department—through NYC—the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the U.S. Office of Education. The $2 million experimental program included basic and remedial education, occupational rehabilitation, health and food services, economic support, and work experience for 1,000 youngsters aged 14 to 21 in Florida, California, and Texas, and their families.

A medical program was a summer project in Chicago and Los Angeles. Medical and health students and 155 NYC youngsters worked side by side in poverty-stricken neighborhoods to bring better medical services to the poor. Purpose of the experimental program was to acquaint NYC youths with the world of medicine and to interest them in biomedical careers. It was also to acquaint the medical students, most of them from well-to-do families, with the health problems of the poor.

One of the most promising innovations is the success of many NYC project directors in securing college scholarships for their enrollees, despite average or below average grades. By hard work and diligence, they have been taking advantage of the flood of scholarships that have become available in the last year or so from public and private sources, designed to give college education to disadvantaged boys and girls showing great promise.

In Philadelphia, NYC director Louis P. Goldstein secured scholarships for 37 of his charges. In Charleston, S.C., project director James E. Clyburn reaped a harvest of 29 scholarships to Wilberforce University for his enrollees. The Charleston Evening Post said:

> Apparently Clyburn's youngsters walked off with all the Wilberforce awards made in the Southeast.

The history of the Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot be recounted by numbers and statistics alone, satisfying and reassuring though these may be. NYC has meant the reshaping and the reordering of the lives of the individual youngsters. It is the story of Trudie Archie in Louisville. It is the story of 18-year-old Haston Pulley of Little Rock, Ark., a Negro youth who no longer draws welfare and gets in trouble with the law but who now uses his leadership abilities to organize recreation programs for other poor children. It is the story of Sue Pederson in Minneapolis, only 18, who finished high school, got off the welfare rolls, found a permanent job at Minneapolis General Hospital and is now helping support her mother and the four other children in the family. It is the story of Annette Dowdell, 18, of Jacksonville, Fla., no longer on welfare, working full time in the laboratory at the State board of health, and supporting herself and her two children.

These are true stories. They are but a few of many. They tell of the people who were down and out, and who now have fresh hope and a new chance in life. They no longer draw welfare money and no longer find it necessary to be paid by NYC. They are standing on their own two feet, competing successfully in the job market, earning their own money for themselves and their families. These youngsters illustrate what the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the war on poverty are all about. As Abraham Lincoln said about another war:

> It is a struggle . . . to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the path of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance in the race of life.

This amendment is most damaging. I am hopeful that none of the Members of this House will be gullible enough to support an amendment that will destroy the effectiveness and deny hundreds of thousands of youngsters the opportunity to participate in a program of this type.

Now, what else do they do? They cut the funds to the bone. In our program during the next fiscal year we propose to spend for the Neighborhood Youth Corps $321 million. Their total expenditures for title I(b) are $243.5 million. These projects have gotten off the ground and are doing well.

We have in here in the committee bill

something that will serve 106,000 youngsters for the in-school program. We have funds in here that will serve 50,000 youngsters for the out of school Neighborhood Youth Corps and for the summer program 80,000 for the rural areas and the metropolitan areas of this country.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PERKINS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. They talk about all the spending and the program activity that this so-called opportunity crusade is going to generate from the expenditure of $1.4 billion. There are indications that a significant number of on-the-job-training positions for Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees can be developed in the private sector. This effort has the potential of becoming an effective, economical method of easing the transition from training to the work situation. Increased emphasis will also be placed on research, evaluation and demonstration activities, in a concerted effort to further improve the effectiveness and efficiency of program operations.

As in the past, enrollee wages and fringe benefits will continue to constitute the largest single element of the Federal contribution: approximately 80 percent of the in-school, 85 percent of summer and 79 percent of regular out-of-school program wages and benefits.

The full-term enrollment opportunity levels for fiscal 1968 reflect a decrease over those funded with fiscal 1967 appropriations. It is anticipated, however, that the actual number of enrollment opportunities in operation in fiscal 1968, will be at or slightly above the fiscal 1967 level, due to the continued operation in fiscal 1966 of projects funded in fiscal 1967, except for the summer program.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Not right at this moment because I do not have enough time to yield to the gentleman. It takes a real sleight of hand to attempt to sell an amendment on the basis that it will reach more young people with a 50-percent cut in funds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we come down to the adult training programs. Under the proposed amendment, adult training programs would be authorized only $38 million as contrasted with $258 million in the committee bill. But the crusade advocates are making some progress. In the original version no funds were provided for adult training.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH].

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that the opposition to this amendment is again trying to gloss over what the real issue is. This, perhaps, is the most constructive amendment that we have presented or will present to this entire bill. It presents one thing, and one thing clearly. It states that right now, in our educational system, if you do not go to college, you are regarded as a "second-class citizen" in our educational system. And, Mr. Chairman, it strikes hard at that question. It proposes that we must place the highest priority upon developing an effective work-study program within the present educational structure. This is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the major thrust is this: It emphasizes the need for counselors: adequately trained, adequately placed, effective, functioning counselors within the school system and within the community. And, it provides Federal funds for these counselors. Now just what will these counselors do? The counselors will recognize the job possibilities that are available within a given community and then fill those openings through the provision of job-related programs in cooperation with secondary schools and community colleges.

Nowhere in the present bill do we have this emphasis. The one need that we have had demonstrated again and again throughout this country by educators and employers alike is the need for adequately trained counselors to find the jobs that are available; then, secondly, to find the people to fill those jobs, training those people adequately in the process.

That is the thrust of this amendment.

I urge those on both sides to forget the idea that this amendment is destructive. This is the most constructive amendment that we can put on any bill of this nature in this Congress this year.

Now what is the second impact of this amendment? The second feature of this bill proposes that we are going to enroll in the war on poverty, private industry, and it sets up a vehicle through which we can enroll private industry in the war on poverty.

It has always been my understanding that any time a nation is fighting a war that they utilize to the fullest extent possible all of their resources. This amendment does just that: It utilizes the private sector, encouraging the private sector and private industry in cooperative work-training programs. That is the second major thrust of this amendment.

Now the philosophy behind the amendment presents the concept that those young men and young women who were dropouts can be made productive citizens of our communities. This is in contrast to the make-work programs where we place young people on these make-work programs, just to get them employed, to get them off the streets, but we give them no long-range hope. In contrast, this amendment gives them training and opportunity to be contributing members of our society.

Now, make no mistake. Decide your vote on these questions:

Do you or do you not want to involve the private sector? Do you or do you not want to have counselors involved in effective programs throughout this country? Or do you want to continue the present cycle?

Do you or do you not want to have the cycle of a young man at age 16 waiting to get out of school to get a job, to get a car, to become delinquent, or to get drafted, or do you want to break that cycle with an effective program of one, counselors; and two, effective work and training programs involving the private sector, and the present educational structure?

If you answer these questions correctly you will vote for this amendment, no matter which party you belong to. This is the most pressing need we have in our country today. How long are we going to let the non-college-bound students in our high schools remain second-class citizens? That is the question you have to answer here today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult—and I noticed two of the previous speakers asked for extensions of their time—to discuss a 34-page amendment in 5 minutes or, indeed, in 50 minutes. I will try to discuss several aspects of it in the most logical way that I can in these few minutes. Mr. Chairman, this is an area of activity in which there has not been a great deal of partisanship in the past, and I do not want to inject any partisanship here, but I would respectfully disagree with the conclusions of the proponents of this 34-page amendment.

They indicate they are motivated by a desire to involve private industry. I might say to the gentleman who has spoken in this vein, so am I, and indeed we have made some very notable improvements along this line in the manpower training provisions of title I in the committee bill.

I think perhaps the outstanding new feature of these manpower programs in the committee bill is the involvement of private industry in a much more significant way.

I think too that a very considerable problem arises from the different kind of involvement our Republican friends propose. In effect, they propose that the community action agencies in each community shall have the power to select certain employers and pay 25 percent of the wage cost for disadvantaged youths hired by them. That could continue for one year. Thereafter if the employer decided that he would like to have them for another year and that they are still not the kind of people to whom he would want to pay a full wage, even after the first year, he can have them for another year at a subsidized wage.

Now, I want to involve private industry, but I want to do it in a careful way. I do not know how I would explain to employers in my community how it happened that a community action agency was paying 25 percent of the wages of the employees of their competitor. I do not know if you want to try taking that one on, to explain it to some employer in your district whose competitor is having his wage cost subsidized by the local community action agency. But I would prefer to avoid that explanation if I could.

Finally, as to this business of generating additional money. Of course, the amount authorized is less than half of the amount authorized by the committee bill. But we are told this would generate private money. It is said that if we spent,

let us say, $50 million on counselors, it will produce $300 million of private wages for those counseled. Well, if the problem was that simple, we shouldn't stop at $50 million for counselors. We ought to put the whole $2 billion into counselors and we would really be in business.

I wish the problem were that simple but it is not.

We have in this program a carefully rounded, well thought-out manpower training program. I think it is an excellent manpower training program in terms of flexibility and of the linkage of one element to another so that it does a complete job for the individual who needs it, tailored to his needs. I think we already have the best manpower program that has ever appeared in any piece of legislation. I hope the Committee will agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close at 2:30 p.m.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman that he withhold his request? It has been our experience, and as we saw yesterday, that when a request is made to limit the time, a great many Members stand up to be recognized under the limitation of time. I think we might finish debate on this amendment before 2:30 o'clock without limiting the time. Certainly, we might go along without a time limitation for 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's observation, I withdraw my request.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ESCH], in his exceedingly eloquent support of this amendment, paid some great attention, and wisely so, to the counselor provisions. Let me try and respond briefly to the remarks of the ther gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], because I think, while we may on the surface appear to be going in the same direction in involving private industry, the bill, in my judgment, is woefully inadequate to truly provide the kind of involvement that will be meaningful to those for whom we are attempting to provide training.

For example, Sar Levitan testified in his testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor—

> A major problem of NYC has been that most enrollees were assigned to "make work" projects. The public and nonprofit agencies that sponsor the vast majority of programs contribute only 10 percent of the cost of a project which can be made in kind. In most cases, NYC labor is free labor. As a result, it is not surprising that NYC enrollees are frequently assigned to perform only marginal work. Requiring public and nonprofit agency sponsors to increase their contributions in hard cash might improve the situation. I am not at all sure, however, that many areas which need NYC the most could or would raise more funds to finance NYC projects.

In the study of the National Analysts, Inc., of the NYC they found—

> The attitudes toward the NYC are grossly negative, primarily because the salary is seen as too low and the status of the jobs they perform is very low.

I think that is a critical factor. The question here is whether we will continue, as the committee bill proposes, to operate on the basis that the Federal Government ought to be sponsoring simple, make-work jobs, or whether we can, in fact, move to redirect the program through the kind of amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Interestingly enough, the cost per enrollee in the in-school NYC program is estimated by the Labor Department to be $650 for fiscal 1968, and 138,000 youths are enrolled in the in-school program. The universal need, according to the Labor Department, of children ages 14 through 21 who are in school and need financial assistance to remain in school amount to 2.1 million and the fiscal 1968 projection for this program will only reach 7 percent of those youths.

Again, are we to continue on the age-old story of paying a large amount of money to service only a very small number of people?

The cost per enrollee in the out-of-school NYC program is estimated by the Labor Department for fiscal 1968 to be $3,050. The Labor Department has also estimated the universal need for this program or the total youths who are eligible as 660,000. They have also stated the projection for fiscal 1968 will only cover 10 percent of this need for the program.

If the Industry Youth Corps were adopted with private industry paying three-fourths of the wage, as is provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon, the number of youths who could be reached would more than triple and for the same amount of money approximately 225,000 or roughly one-third of the estimated need for this program could be filled, as compared to the committee's bill, which covers only 10 percent.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon makes good sense both in terms of more completely and more cooperatively involving private industry to expand the service that is available and reducing the cost to the Federal Government so that we do not continue on the age-old treadmill of simply having the Federal Government pick up most of the cost, and therefore limiting the number of young men and women who could be served. If we want to open the doors of opportunity, I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be adopted.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, as one who has had some training and certainly a great deal of interest in the subject, of this amendment, I am distressed by the manner in which the business of counseling is bypassed with the language that this is simply an attempt to cripple the present legislation. In fact, in the summer employment programs under our present legislation it has always been related that one of the best features is the counseling service, which is very meager.

This I know: If we are to keep students in school, if we are to direct their educational and vocational capabilities and motivations, it is imperative that regular, continuing, and complete guidance and counseling services be provided. It is incongruous that members of the committee now minimize the importance of counseling. They again put politics ahead of pedagogical truths.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. I am surprised, really, at the offhand manner in which this amendment is completely rejected by the administration forces.

We see here another case of administration myopia. They just cannot see anything beyond the bill which has been reported by the committee.

It is also interesting to see the test which is used time after time by the administration forces. They measure every program in terms of Federal dollars. The amount of Federal dollars appropriated is their test of worth of the program.

The fact that one can involve private enterprise through the Industry Youth Corps, in this amendment, just does not impress them at all. This would not appropriate enough in the way of Federal dollars.

As I say, this is a case of complete myopia. They cannot see the worth of any other program.

One of the speakers took the well and said, "Why, if you are so proud of this program for counselors, why do you not put the whole $2 billion in the program?"

Is that not a fine way to comment on what I believe is a very thoughtful proposal?

The counselor program provided for in this amendment could do a great deal toward developing the youths in school, seeing that they remain in school and do not become dropouts, and seeing that they gain during their school years some worthwhile work experience—and without a vast Federal expenditure.

But, of course, one cannot put a Federal price tag on this. If we could appropriate $2 billion or $5 billion, then this would be a fine program, in the opinion of the administration apologists because we would have the Federal dollars which is their test of value.

The administration forces talk so glowingly about the partnership between the Federal Government and private industry in the Job Corps. Then they just completely deprecate any partnership in an Industry Youth Corps or a work-study program.

Let us compare the Federal partnerships in the two instances.

What kind of a partnership do we have in the Job Corps between the Federal Government and private industry? Is this a partnership in which each is contributing of its talents and its resources? Of course it is not. This is totally federally funded. All private industry does is to contract with the Job Corps to furnish certain services. They are not furnishing, as a part of the partnership, any of the financing. They are not producing anything. They are merely competing for contracts that are available through the Job Corps.

That is not a partnership in the sense we are talking about, a partnership between Government and industry, the private sector, in the Industry Youth Corps. Here we would have a meaningful participation by industry, not just a competition to get the Federal dollar. Here would be a contribution by industry in the training of youths, paying them from their own finances, partially, and having that part which represents the difference between the value of the services the youth performs and what they have to pay him under the minimum wage standards picked up by the Federal Government.

This would be a meaningful partnership between the Federal Government and industry.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Illinois has talked so much about the substitute generating so much employment. I wonder whether he feels this substitute bill might not even produce one extra cent, for the simple reason that it would allow recipients of assistance to count their existing non-Federal expenditures toward meeting the matching requirements in the bill?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am sorry. I just do not follow the gentleman's question. I am talking about the Industry Youth Corps and its participation.

Mr. PERKINS. That is exactly what I am talking about.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has completely misunderstood the amendment. There is an allegation being made about another section dealing with community action. We did not talk about that matter. That is not involved in this amendment at all.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I did not think it was, and I did not follow the gentleman's question. It did not seem to be related to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I admire Mr. DELLENBACK who supports this amendment and spoke for it. He has been a thoughtful and creative member of this committee but I do not detect any worthwhile purpose behind this amendment. Our Republican colleagues speak of involving the private sector. It is deeply involved. Last week I read a roster of several dozen firms that were only symbolic of the hundreds participating across the country. The National Association of Manufacturers itself is involved as a consultant and a professional resource. The chamber of commerce is heavily involved in cities across the country. In San Francisco the chamber of commerce is involved in developing over 1,000 jobs. Of the elements in the poverty program, the job training and employment elements in I–B, are the most successful and the least controversial elements we have. They are working quietly, effectively, and solidly across the face of America in every State of the Union, with the total support of the civic, industrial, business, and banking leaders who are designing these programs.

Our Republican colleagues say we can improve a noncontroversial program of this kind designed to give job training and employment by interlarding in its direction and control the community action agencies. It is a strange way to continue a classically noncontroversial program.

They tell us we can involve more kids with better training by cutting the budget more than 50 percent.

We all know neither of these basic approaches is true. We have a program which is working, which is accepted, which is productive, and which is getting kids who have failed in their high school careers, for whatever reason—and we do not have to assign guilt or blame now—to succeed in absorbing education and job training in a job environment. There is not one of the hundreds of the private corporations giving these job training and placement services that has not involved job counseling as the essence of the job they are performing. The counseling proposal would simply duplicate in providing what is a built-in ingredient in all of these training employment programs.

I suggest we get on and defeat this amendment and leave intact without change the most successful single element in the bill, the job training and employment programs which have heavily and meaningfully involved the private sector of our economy and provided perhaps the outstanding example in this bill of total participation by the business leadership of America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dellenback amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the reaction from some of our colleagues who oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, prior talks with them at various times seem to indicate to me that they favored, very strongly, involving all of private enterprise in these very programs for such privately productive jobs, as an alternative to money now spent to create public jobs that are not available. It would provide employment money for real jobs instead of making jobs available for which there is no real purpose. Unfortunately, the latter has too often happened in the past in this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have had the hearings which were conducted upon this subject for the period of some 6 weeks filled with testimony to this effect.

We in this proposed amendment do not eliminate the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It remains to employ youngsters in public and nonprofit agencies, but we would like to divert some of that money to the community action agencies so that they may have the flexibility needed to apportion these funds and to employ these youngsters between the age of 16 and 22. I refer to profitmaking organizations, our smaller businesses—if you will, our businesses that are run by members of minority groups. It will be administered at the local level.

Mr. Chairman, community action agencies will have complete flexibility on this. We are not setting up a major overall national program structure so that there will not be the problem which has developed under the Manpower Retraining Act wherein smaller employers have refused to participate to any large degree. There are just too many forms to be filled out and there is too much trouble involved in connection therewith.

Mr. Chairman, they have to deal with Department of Labor representatives, inspectors, national regulations and so forth. Large companies have refused to participate in any large numbers because they have such programs on-going and they would rather not be bothered with the administrative redtape involved in obtaining a small Government subsidy.

So, Mr. Chairman, under the job training program, as it operates at the Department of Labor today, we have the middle-sized companies participating. Where they do participate and where the private employer is providing on-the-job training, we have had the best results. They get some training, they receive some training directed toward the specific job available. They do not have to look for a job when they get through learning the specific skill involved. The employer takes them on for on-the-job training, because he wants to fill some positions or jobs which he feels these people have the potential to fill.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a practical approach.

As has been mentioned here, under the Industry Youth Corps, you do not have to pay 100 percent of the wages with the money of the taxpayers, because these youngsters are working in profitmaking organizations. Obviously, the profitmaking employer should pay most of the wages involved. Those of us who are in favor of minimum wage legislation—some of us at least—recognize that it does in some instances restrict job opportunities. There are certain employers who will not pay the minimum wage for unskilled youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22. So, they bypass them with automated processes or get along without them in some other fashion.

Mr. Chairman, we have a growing problem in this country and have had such a growing problem during the last 10 years with reference to our 16- to 18-year-old group. This has been an area where we have had an employment increase whereas the general unemployment rate has decreased to some extent.

The unemployment rate for young people in the 16- to 22-year age group has been largely unaffected by general economic conditions in the past 10 years.

When we talk about riots, one of the things that all of us agree on is that one of the issues in these riots has apparently been the lack of jobs, the lack of meaningful jobs with a future, productive jobs. They do not want to have summer jobs for 2 months that try to keep them off the streets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, these youngsters do not want to be put on some kind of a make-work job for the summer with the clear intention to take them off the streets, and to keep them from getting into trouble; these youngsters are looking for something with a future. That is what we are trying to do in getting private enterprise involved.

The statement has been made several times in opposition to this amendment that you can already do this under the present program. Well, they are not doing it today. They do not feel in the administration of the program that they can do it. There is no language in the present law that authorizes this. This would authorize community action agencies to pay a portion of the expense of the on-the-job training, this would authorize them to pay one-quarter of the wage of the youngster, and then the employer would pay three-quarters for up to a year. Then if it is justified they could extend it for another year, if the youngster has made progress and there is hope and promise that there will be the opportunity of full-time employment.

Mr. Chairman, that is the thing we should be trying to establish. That is where we can use the Federal tax money as seed money, and thus it goes four times as far because then we are involving outside sources of income to put money into the pockets of the poor. And they are earning it. They are learning to earn. These are the practical approaches we believe should be brought into this concept of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, without destroying the basic approach of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In many cases such jobs can be and have been provided that are useful and productive, and they can continue to be provided, but we would add the private sector in it. The counselor program in the schools has the same objective. Instead of just concentrating on public jobs that are paid for 100 percent, through the Federal tax dollars, we can get them private jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GIBBONS. I would be glad to yield ordinarily, but I believe we are about to wind this up. I thought we had an agreement that we were going to vote on this at 2:15. Am I right or wrong?

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman had asked for a time limitation until 2:30, and we said there was a very real possibility we could finish before then, and I believe there is. But if the gentleman wishes to impose a time limitation——

Mr. GIBBONS. No, I do not wish to impose a time limitation.

Mr. GOODELL. Additionally, we would probably have the problem we usually do, that if once we ask for a time limitation, then we see a number of people stand up who perhaps may not otherwise have asked for time, and they will receive the 1½ minutes to speak.

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not want to yield any further time.

This is real interesting. This is the first time I have heard a lot of this.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not want to yield any more of my time.

Mr. GOODELL. We have been discussing this steadily for 2 years, and the gentleman has not been listening.

Mr. GIBBONS. No. I decline to yield any further in my very limited time.

I see the fellow is riding shotgun on my time over there.

Mr. Chairman, I really believe we ought to call this "Scotch tape, Xerox, Government Printing Office" amendment. If you were to walk up behind me, as I did a while ago, and look at those papers that have been put together, you could not call it a serious amendment. I think you would laugh at it, because evidently they started out by typing it, and then they got tired so they started to Xerox it, then they got tired of doing that, so they took some pages from another amendment and then stapled them together into a 42-page document. And I really cannot consider it as a really serious amendment.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. No, I cannot yield any further of my time. I will turn back any time that I do not consume.

As I started to say, Mr. DELLENBACK has gotten through talking about the opportunity crusade that we have been hearing about for 2 years, because the first thing he says is that, "Oh, no, this is not the opportunity crusade, we did a few things to it." That was when my interest became aroused, and that is when I went up to look at the amendment, and it is really ridiculous.

I would invite everyone of you to go up and look at it and see how ridiculous it is.

Let us talk about what they are striking out of this bill. That is the important part. They are striking out on page 154 everything that was put into this bill in an open markup session not only on a bipartisan basis but on the basis of unanimous consent.

I checked this out before I came here. This bill was marked up in open session. We may have had a little trouble getting a quorum, and you may have read or heard about that when we were marking up the bill, but we came to this section of the bill in the general marking up in the Committee on Education and Labor, we put in this provision on page 154 by unanimous consent. Not a soul objected to it. You do not hear all this said here on the floor now when they put this Scotch tape, Xerox, GPO amendment together while they are trying to think up some way of spending enough time to keep us here Wednesday and Thursday and Friday and Lord knows how long—that is how serious they are.

I had hoped at this stage of the game that we could be united on the manpower programs for we have in the bill before us a provision on manpower that went into the bill by unanimous consent. It covers about 7, 8, 9, or 10 pages and it is all printed.

Go up to the clerk's desk and ask to read this ridiculous thing they put out. Now there is a way to legislate and there is a way not to legislate. One of the worst ways to legislate is to bring something in at the last minute that is pinned together and typed out, part of it written out in long hand, and some of it scratched out, and then something written in in ink. If what I say is not true, you can go up there and look at it and then deny it, if it is not true.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I just want to answer in one sentence the allegation just made. Everything in this amendment was in the opportunity crusade and was before our committee. We struck out one section, the military career centers section, and we added one section that was added in committee and we felt it was valid. There were no other changes, scotch tape or otherwise.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, I discussed the use by many employees of the United Planning Organization in Washington of their connection with OEO as a springboard for promoting radicalism.

If you catch a burglar on the scene, and he has a record of burglary, is carrying a burglar's tool kit and a burglar's loot in his pocket, he becomes a suspect. Not necessarily one that will wind up in jail, or, if he does, one who will stay there, but a suspect nonetheless.

If you catch a man with blood on his hands and a dead body nearby, he is likely to be detained even under the current legal versions of arrest and confinement.

If you catch a known firebug at the scene of a conflagration, with a can of kerosene in his hands, the logical, but far too often not legal conclusion is that he is a likely candidate for a grand jury.

As I pointed out last week, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity is loaded with people of questionable background and association who have

been placed in positions of responsibility, and who are supposed to be training others to become useful and productive citizens. I stated at that time that I felt we are sowing the seeds of our own destruction when we provide financing for large numbers of radicals who use their working hours and the people they are supposed to train, to plan ways of turning their trainees against our Government and our way of life.

I have been asked for more specific details, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to name here a few of these public servants and tell you something about them.

Beginning at the top, a Mr. Hal Witt was Acting Executive Director of UPO from May until last month, and is now Deputy Director at $21,000 a year.

Mr. Witt is the son of Nathan Witt, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He is on the executive board of SANE—a regular sponsor of antiwar demonstrations. He is a frequent attendant, if not a member, of the Washington American Forum, successor to the Progressive Party here. He is on the Washington Area Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. His name is on the mailing list of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. His police record reveals that when charged with disorderly conduct in 1960 he chose as his attorney, Joseph Forer, the leading attorney for the Communist Party, described by a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as one of the most important Communists in the District of Columbia. According to information from FBI files, Mr. Witt has close and frequent association with many known Communist Party members as well as financial backers of the Communist Party.

I do not say Mr. Witt is a Communist, Mr. Chairman. I do not know. I do know that a very real question as to his loyalty should prohibit his employment by a public agency.

The Daily Worker, January 10, 1965, advertised a meeting in New York City to honor the 40th anniversary of the Communist publishing firm, International Publishers. Listed as a featured speaker was Marion Barry, now a $50-a-day consultant at UPO. Barry was head of SNCC's New York office then, and moved to Washington in June 1965 to expand the SNCC office here. He had been arrested and convicted on various charges in Memphis and Knoxville, Tenn., and in Chicago. He became somewhat infamous in the District last year by kicking a door of a paddy wagon while being arrested. He led a march on the Capitol under the label of "Assembly of Unrepresented People," protesting the Vietnam war; led a bus boycott protesting fare increases; mapped the "Free D.C. Movement," boycotting merchants who refused to sign home rule petitions and contribute funds to home rule causes.

One of Barry's close SNCC associates is Rev. Channing Phillips, who heads the Housing Development Corp., recipient of around $294,000 in 1966 from UPO and $100,000 from HUD. He joined in the merchants boycott, cochaired the Coalition of Conscience, led a sleep-in at Bolling Air Force Base; chaired the Committee for Community Action in Public Education, which sponsored the school boycott and paid much of the expenses of the Hobson against Hansen case which resulted in the resignation of Dr. Hansen from his position as Superintendent of Schools in the District.

We all know the antics of Hubert Geroid Brown, known as Rap Brown. He was a UPO employee from March 1965 until June 1966, when he resigned to take the SNCC chairmanship from Stokely Carmichael.

Also active in SNCC while at UPO were Alan and Margaret McSurely, who left here to go to Kentucky where they were charged with possessing seditious materials, including Communist literature and films. While Alan McSurely was director of suburban programs for UPO, he, with two other UPO employees, William N. Hobbs and John Robinson, threatened the Arlington chief of police during a march sponsored by a group known as ACCESS in which they participated.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] recently called to the attention of the House the fact that the same John Robinson was involved just last Tuesday in a violation of the Hatch Act, in passing out partisan political literature and working at the polls on election day. Here, Mr. Chairman, is an example of the Government paying a man for partisan political activity. The taxpayers of the United States will not tolerate this use of our funds.

Gaston Thomas Neil, a UPO worker in the Cardozo area, runs the New School of Afro Thought. He has spent time in St. Elizabeths Hospital after being found not guilty by reason of insanity on a number of narcotics charges. He now has other charges pending against him not yet resolved. Meanwhile, he and a companion bought two Russian-type carbines in Alexandria in August, for what purpose we can only guess.

Ralph Fertig, former executive director of UPO Southeast Neighborhood House, helped with the school boycott. He came to UPO from Chicago, leaving behind unpaid judgments and a record including protests against the Un-American Activities Committee and advertisements urging clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Dick Jones, a UPO community organizer, Herbert Kelsey, a UPO housing coordinator, and Michael Searles, UPO housing adviser, are all SNCC members. Mrs. Willie Hardy, UPO Neighborhood council director, is in both SNCC and CORE.

This list would not be complete without Ruby Evans, UPO girls' service coordinator, who although not involved with the militants, urged her girls to refuse birth control information, telling them they should not be prevented from having illegitimate children if they want them.

Finally, Rufus Mayfield, the young hoodlum who was there when a TV set went through a window; when the Redskin band had to leave a ball game under police protection; when a fire broke out in a dime store; when trouble developed at the Coliseum and looting followed; when poverty warriors marched on the White House. In spite of a concerted effort of the Washington press to show his activities in a favorable light, he is constantly skirting the edge of trouble, and hundreds of 13- and 14-year-old boys acknowledge him as their leader.

Mr. Chairman, one radical in these OEO-sponsored programs in a position to employ others can load a payroll with those who think and act as he does. This has happened in Washington, D.C., and may be happening all over the Nation. The decent people of this Nation—and I mean the decent poor as well as those living in better circumstances—deserve better leadership than UPO is giving them.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:30.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we first ascertain how many Members wish to speak on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon has already spoken, so that would leave four or five Members.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, could you make it 2:35 so that there would be adequate opportunity for those standing?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:35.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will not utilize 5 minutes, because I have only one question, and this is a question I would like to ask of the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK], if he would give me his attention, please.

I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK], as author of this amendment: Does his amendment transfer administrative authority of NYA from OEO to HEW?

Mr. DELLENBACK. It would take a portion of NYA and transfer it to HEW, and it would take a portion thereof and transfer it to Labor.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I have noticed in the past, and again at this time, that when a unanimous consent request to limit debate has been made, Members

who have already been recognized to debate the issue are again recognized under the unanimous-consent limitation. I wonder if this is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. When the request was made, the Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Louisiana had already been recognized.

Mr. ERLENBORN. I am not speaking of that, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman just announced that the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, would be recognized again, though he has already debated on this amendment. I wonder if Members can be recognized for a second time to debate the same amendment merely because a unanimous-consent request is made to limit time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must say to the gentleman that when the unanimous-consent request was made and agreed to it abrogated the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should like to ask if the gentleman from Oregon is also on the list? The gentleman was standing at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Oregon standing at the time?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from Oregon was standing.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman seeking recognition?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman was seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name will be added to the list of Members.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE].

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Oregon, and I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I say a few brief things? There are many things I would like to say, if there were more time.

The remarks the chairman of the committee made earlier about the multiplication of industry money were not correct. One cannot go off on flights of fancy in this regard.

Look at the difference between the formulas under the program put forward in the administration bill, and the Federal dollars involved—those are almost all Federal dollars under the administration bill—and the formulas involved in our proposal. There is a very clear multiplication provided for in our proposal through the involvement of private enterprise money, and this will make a significant difference as to how many dollars will get to the root causes of poverty.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am really surprised to see this amendment here. I rise to oppose it.

Of all the programs carried on under the Economic Opportunity Act, which we have had an opportunity to examine during the past 3 years, the program which has had the most universal support from both public and private observers has been the program that would be taken apart by this amendment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has in fact been a success not only in the big cities, but also in the suburbs, and in the rural parts of America. As a matter of fact, it has probably been one of the most effective rural training programs we have been able to develop. It has been the most rapidly developed program.

I am proud that in our State, although not in my district, in the city of Lansing, they had one of the very first programs in the country. It is looked upon as a model. Many people from around the country have journeyed to our State of Michigan to see that program, which does in fact function in connection with three major industries not only of that city but of our State.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Oregon for his creative work in trying to make something out of this program and to correct some of its obvious failings.

I want to say I join him in support of this amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK] regarding the proposed transfer of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

In reality, the entire Neighborhood Youth Corps program fits into the existing Governmental department structure and I refer here to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Walfare. In the main, only the "in-school" portion of this program has met with any real success under OEO and this was largely because it was being managed by school authorities.

I see no rationale or public purpose in scattering programs dealing with education and the manpower labor force outside of the Federal departments that were originally established for these purposes. Young men and women who are out of school and without jobs desperately need training to fit them for useful employment in private enterprise and in Government. They do not need a so-called make-work program described as "work experience"—which it is not.

In my judgment, there are many advantages to be gained from this proposed transfer of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The primary one, of course, is that it will provide meaningful jobs rather than "make believe" jobs. In addition, it will permit greater participation by private enterprise in the current program and it is private industry that is the principal job producer in this country. It will contribute to our economic growth and enhance our economic development by providing more jobs for more people than is now the case. And, it will establish dialog between the employer and the employee that will be mutually beneficial in determining the type and degree of training and experience needed in industry.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

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

I only have two things to say further on the balance of this time which is yielded to me and on my own time. One, there are good programs involved here such as the good portion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps which would be continued and enhanced under this program. Secondly, there is a need present which is a very great need. The present attempts through the present law to solve that need have not succeeded. Anyone can produce isolated examples of success, but our concern is not just for those isolated examples but for the many, many, many people whom these programs cannot reach. If we do not make some basic changes in the formula and the programs, those people in need of help will not be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment needs much more opposition. I think it will fall of its own weight. I am beginning to learn as we go through the debate what the meaning of the word "redirection" is when it is used by the minority. Evidently what they mean when they say the program is to be redirected is that they would like to take an express train off the tracks to see if it can go better cross country. Or, to use another example, of Republican redirection if you have an orderly convoy going down the highway, head it toward the nearest cliff and see if it can fly.

I urge the defeat of this redirection amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the primary arguments in the last 35 minutes by the opponents of this measure have gone off the basic issues and have lapsed into humor. This problem is too serious for humor. We cannot succeed in having meaningful programs under the law unless we can make some meaningful improvements in the law.

I urge that we adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to close debate.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I stated that this amendment would destroy title I–B of this bill. I reiterate that statement. Today we have a most effective Neighborhood Youth Corps and an in-school program for the rural areas of America. This amendment will completely destroy for all intents and purposes that program and will completely destroy the work-training program, because there are just not ample

funds in this amendment to do any service to the disadvantaged of this country. It will not do any service for them.

I ask the committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DELLENBACK and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 169.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] rise?

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman offering an amendment?

Mr. CEDERBERG. No. I just want to make a few observations.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate as it has gone on on this poverty bill. I further wish to say that I yield to no one in my concern for people who need help and are truly poverty stricken. I have supported the Vocational Education Act, I have supported the Manpower Training Act, higher education, and I have introduced the Human Investment Act. I have a deep and abiding concern for those who really need help.

But I want to say to the Members that in my opinion this poverty program has not been effective. Now, you cannot spend several billions of dollars without doing some good, but I do not believe we have been getting the return on the money that we have invested in trying to take people out of poverty and to assure them of an opportunity to take their rightful place in society as working citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to redirect this program. We should take the Headstart program and put it over in the Office of Education. If that is not education, I do not know what it is. Insofar as job training is concerned, what organization is better equipped than the Office of Vocational Education? What better place can we find than that to try to train people for meaningful employment?

How can we accept an expenditure request of something over $400 million in addition to what we spent last year amounting to $10 for each and every man, woman, and child in this country, when we will have a Federal deficit of some $28 billion to $30 billion next year? And the President is asking for a tax increase and also promising a reduction in spending, while he goes to New York and promises all the Great Society programs are going to go ahead and we are going to have guns and butter at the same time.

There is some inconsistency here some place.

Let me say this in addition. We have had new spending programs and Great Society programs and rather than reducing welfare costs they increase.

I believe in, and I will support amendments here, and I will support the crusade—the opportunity crusade—because I think it is the only chance to put this program into effective operation and to help those people who seriously need help.

Let me say it gives me some concern when we see a group marching from Baltimore down the Baltimore Parkway down to Washington to ask for more Federal help when in the Baltimore Sun newspaper of Monday there are four pages of help-wanted ads, with some of them with no experience being necessary. Most men, women, and young people who are asking for jobs can find them.

If any man or woman is able to walk from Baltimore to Washington, then he or she is able to walk to an employment office and walk to respond to some of these ads in the newspaper.

As far as I am concerned, the taxpayers of this country—and let me tell you what taxpayers—they are not the small taxpayers, they are not the rich taxpayers because they can take care of themselves all right—but the man who is trying to raise his family on $7,000 to $10,000 a year and he is having a rough time and you are throwing more of a load on him every day.

They are the mass of the taxpayers. That is the group that really puts up most of the money. You are going to have a taxpayers' revolt in this country unless you call a halt and unless you make these programs so that they effectively take care of the people who need help.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Is the gentleman not aware that most of the people who are trying to get jobs in America do not have the skills required for the jobs in those advertisements? Is the gentleman not aware that there is a critical unemployment problem and that 40 percent, according to the Secretary of Labor, is the true unemployment rate in the slums and ghettos across America?

Does the gentleman not recognize that the people who made that march were marching because of a sense of dignity and their desire to gain employment?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Yes; I know all of that. I know all of that. These ads are right in this newspaper here and they show that they can go to many of these places, get jobs, and also get training. Right now they are asking for people in many of these places.

Mr. CONYERS. I do not think that should be dragged into this kind of a discussion when we know what the unemployment problem is. I know what it is in my district. I do not know if the gentleman knows what it is in the slums or ghettos in his district, if he has any, but the unemployment problems in this country are enormous. People write to me trying to get jobs and, of course, I cannot provide them, and I will not hand them the want ads and tell them to fit a round peg in a square hole because it cannot be done.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Those people who need help should be given help. But we just voted down an amendment that was designed for that very purpose in support of the approach with reference to free private enterprise, as is being done in the city of Detroit to help these people. How much support did we get? None at all. That is the only way you are going to help these people.

We are not giving them any help by putting them in the poverty program or getting a job on the poverty program. Some can be trained, but we can do a better job if we let industry help to train them.

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman know how many jobs were placed by the Ford Motor Co. that started off with 10,000 and the next time I read in the paper it was 5,000. The next time I saw that they were working on placements. Does the gentleman know how many there actually were?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I know the Ford Motor Co. said they would take 5,000 and J. L. Hudson Co. said 500. I do not know how many the Chrysler Corp. said, or General Motors Corp., but it was a sizable amount.

But it seems to me that this is the kind of step that is in the right direction and ought to be encouraged instead of voted down.

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. First of all, let me say I do not think that marchers are going to influence this Congress. I think we have a little more dignity than that and I think anybody who starts one misjudges the gentlemen who sit here.

Second, I read those want ads and most of them, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] said, cannot be filled because the people do not have the skills. We are training them by these programs despite the debate here. We have programs that do these things.

Then we have another amendment that I hope the gentleman will join us in because I think it will bring some responsibility here, and that is on title II, C, section 210, and I think if you will join us in that in a bipartisan effort, we can make this program more effective.

I am not questioning whether we should train people who need help to be trained. They ought to be trained. I am saying that for the $4 billion that has been spent on the poverty program so far

we have not trained enough people. We have not done the job right. The program should be redirected so that the people who have the expertise to train them can do so. Then maybe we will make some sense out of it, and the taxpayers will get a break out of it, too.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman have any objection to citizens from Baltimore coming down here to witness what is going on in the House of Representatives?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have no objection to anyone marching here to sit unless they interfere with the traffic along the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Then I think there is some question about that. My argument is that if they spend as much time trying to find jobs, right in the city of Baltimore, where many jobs are being offered, they would be far better off. Some of them just will not work.

I remember the march from Cleveland, Ohio, to Columbus, Ohio, when the people on welfare were going to march to the State capital because they were not getting enough on welfare. If they can walk that far, they can get a job. They probably passed many help-wanted signs on the way.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is one of the easiest things on earth to criticize a program that is designed to help people who stand on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. For the enlightenment of the House, I would like to impose upon the time of the Committee of the Whole just a moment to read an editorial from the Johnston County Capital Democrat, a weekly newspaper in a small county in southern Oklahoma. The editor, John Lakey, lives in the county, knows the county well, and knows how the poverty program is working in his county. He gives us, I believe, some food for thought in the consideration of this matter and in weighing its merits and its demerits. This, in part, is what the editorial says:

The public image of the Poverty Program seems to be some young girl or boy who dropped out of school doing too little for too much money and riding a Honda while the taxpayers' kids walk.

We've had some of that here in Johnston county.

But the Poverty Program also has done this in Johnston county:

1. Given us our first county-wide health service.

2. Provide jobs for many students who needed the money in order to stay in school.

3. Hired workers that did more than loaf. They cleaned up cemeteries, the courthouse and our parks, sprayed for mosquitoes and worked on hauling trash from our homes, and helped clean up our roads.

4. It's sent help into the homes of the sick and bedfast.

5. Its Head Start program has given tiny tots a kindergarten program that heretofore only those with money could afford. It's paid to give these youngsters dental and medical attention.

6. It's provided rural areas with a planner and paper work do-er in the form of a CAF director to help capture federal aid projects. Heretofore only large city Chamber of Commerces could boast such work staffs—and that's where the projects went.

7. It's helped organize rural water districts, a peanut drying cooperative and investigated other proposals of self-help.

8. It's taken young men and women who thought college was beyond them in both brains and money and got them started "Upward Bound."

The Poverty Program has done all this in Johnston county and if now and then some undeserving lazy loafer has got a bit of the public money because someone thought he or she deserved a chance to do better, it was not unexpected.

The program is supposed to help these at the bottom of the economic barrel. It's not surprising then that the Poverty Program has turned up a few bad apples, but rather that it has turned up so many good ones.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I commend the gentleman for the statement that he has made. I commend the author of the editorial that the gentleman has quoted. May I say that what happened in that county in Oklahoma is not unique.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course it is not.

Mr. BOGGS. I live in a southern State, and I am proud of it. In that city at least 150,000 people have been helped by this program.

This program has made the most significant contribution to my city that I know of since I have been serving in Congress. The idea that we can live in peace and quiet and harmony in the suburbs when there is misery in the center of a big metropolitan area is one which has been rejected by every sensible student of this problem who has made a study of it.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 154, line 8, after "SEC. 102." insert "(a)".

On page 168, after line 13, insert the following:

"(b) Part E of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is redesignated as 'Part F', and section 141 is redesignated as 'section 151.' There is hereby added to title I of such Act the following new part E:

"PART E—INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 142. It is the purpose of this part to provide needy, unskilled, and unemployed young men and women who have terminated their formal education with on-the-job training opportunities which will enable them to become self-sustaining in a vocation.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF INDUSTRY YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 143. (a) The Secretary shall establish in the Department of Labor an Industry Youth Corps program to be administered locally wherever posible through grants to community action agencies qualified pursuant to title II of this Act, which program shall be designed to assist private, profitmaking employers to furnish on-the-job training (and necessary related services, such as testing, counseling, and job development services) for eligible youths as provided in this part. The Secretary shall encourage farmers and other employers in agriculture and agriculturally related enterprises to participate in such program by hiring eligible youths for training in farm occupations for which there is a potential of long-term employment.

"(b) Each agency to whom the Secretary makes grants under subsection (a) shall be authorized to contract with private, profitmaking employers in the area served by such agency to provide such training and services for eligible youths. In the absence of a qualified community action agency in any area, the Secretary shall contract directly with such private, profitmaking employers to carry out the purpose of this program.

"(c) The Secretary shall, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated and published by him, authorize the reimbursement of the reasonable costs of providing such training and services, and not more than 25 per centum of the cost of wages paid any youth employed by such private, profitmaking employer.

"CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 144. (a) Any contract made with an employer under section 143(b) shall provide that eligible youths will be hired under terms of employment which provide that—

"(1) an integral part of such employment shall consist of on-the-job training in an appropriate vocational skill area (including supplemental classroom instruction where appropriate), with opportunity for reasonable progression and pay raises consistent with individual performances;

"(2) the employer will, whenever possible, offer suitable long-term employment to any individual who successfully completes his on-the-job training, or assist such individual to find suitable long-term employment elsewhere: *Provided*, That such employer shall not displace previously employed workers or impair existing employment contracts;

"(3) the employer will provide adequate and safe facilities, and adequate personnel records of attendance and progress;

"(4) such youths will be compensated at reasonable rates comparable to, but in no event in excess of, the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services;

"(5) the term of employment shall not exceed one year, except that such term may be extended for one additional year if it is ascertained by the employer that (A) such youth would be unable to qualify for suitable employment at the rates of pay for regular employees performing similar services without reimbursement of a portion of the employer's wage costs attributable to the employment of such individual, and the reasonable costs of providing on-the-job training and related services to such individual; and (B) the employed youth probably will benefit from an additional year of on-the-job training; and

"(6) the determination of eligibility of any youth shall be made by the employer, in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary.

"(b) Any contract under section 143(b) shall be negotiated with due consideration for minimizing forms and procedures imposed upon the contracting employers.

"(c) Under no circumstances shall any contract be made under section 143(b) unless there is assurance that the obligations of the employer under such contract and under any arrangements he may make with an eligible youth will be discharged in good faith.

"(d) The employer of any eligible youth pursuant to the provisions of this part shall have the same authority to supervise, assign, provide working conditions for, and discharge such youth as he has with respect to regular employees.

"ELIGIBLE YOUTHS

"SEC. 145. (a) For purposes of the programs authorized by this part, an eligible youth shall be an individual—

"(1) who has attained age sixteen but has not attained age twenty-two at the time he contracts for employment with such employer;

"(2) whose income (together with his family's income if he is a dependent thereof) does not exceed a standard of poverty set forth in rules and regulations promulgated and published by the Secretary on the basis of the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of such youth to be self-sustaining;

"(3) who is unemployed and unable to obtain employment in an appropriate vocational skill area; and

"(4) who has not regularly attended school for a period of at least six months, and as to whom there are no immediate prospects of returning to school for additional education or vocational training.

"(b) Eligible youths employed pursuant to programs authorized by this title shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 146. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

"COORDINATION WITH STATES

"SEC. 147. The Secretary shall consult with any State assisted under title II of this Act to achieve the most effective coordination feasible of programs assisted under this title with programs assisted under that title.

"OATH

"SEC. 148. The provisions of section 106(c) shall apply with respect to eligible youth in programs assisted under this title.

"ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 149. The Secretary shall carry out the programs authorized by part E of this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year. For the purposes of carrying out part E, there is hereby directed to be allocated from the appropriation for this title for each of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, the sum of $70,000,000 to administer and conduct the Industry Youth Corps program authorized under section 143."

Mr. QUIE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I just want to ask, is this not the identical amendment we just voted on, as included in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has helped me with part of my speech and informed the Members that this is a part of the amendment already voted on. This is the Industry Youth Corps, but it is to be added to title I of this bill as a part E. I hope those who voted against it in the previous amendment did so because of the other parts of that amendment rather than the Industry Youth Corps part.

What the amendment would do is to provide that $7 million be allocated for this purpose, for the Secretary of Labor to operate a program whereby the private profitmaking employers might hire these youths and subsidize them up to 25 percent of their wages.

Under the Industry Youth Corps we find that the money would go about three to four times as far.

Presently in the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school program the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages. These young people in many cases are hired for make-work types of employment. Make-work type of employment does not have the dignity or the meaning to it which an on-the-job training program in private industry would. In private industry they gain the kind of experience which enables them to hold full-time jobs thereafter. However, a problem exists which prevents private employers from taking part in the manpower development and training programs for young youths of this type. The minimum wage laws or the wages that are required to be paid in these businesses are more than many of the youth are worth when first hired. The wages are greater than the worth of the young employee. There is a period of time in which the youth must learn to handle himself on the job and learn some of the skills of the job. During this period of time this amendment would permit private industry to be engaged in the employment and training of the youth. This will give jobs to three or four times as many youths as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. This will be meaningful jobs from the testimony we received, which indicated strong support for this. Let me mention a few examples.

An Oklahoma manufacturer said:

With your government regulation indicating a minimum of $1.40 per hour it is ridiculous for us to consider such a program. On one hand you ask us to hire a youth opportunity worker and on the other hand you tell us we would have to pay $1.40 per hour for work that would not be worth more than $.50 per hour. Therefore, to us your program is impractical and ridiculous.

Now I quote Vice President HUMPHREY, who says:

The Federal Government was not omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent enough to meet the challenges of the war against racial discrimination, unemployment, and inadequate training. The challenge cannot be met efficiently or adequately without the initiative, the investment, creative imagination, the flexibility, the capacity to work out details of specific problems that are the hallmark of a free enterprise system.

Mitchell Ginsberg, the head of the New York City poverty program, suggested subsidies for employers who train youngsters.

Mayor J. D. Braman, of Seattle, testified before our committee and said of the Industry Youth Corps:

I think it would work very well in Seattle. It has been my feeling that the best way to achieve training is to put a man on the job where he has the dignity of working and earning a wage but at the same time is learning.

As a longtime employer myself I recognize that we cannot expect employing units, most of whom are operating these days on rather narrow margins, to reduce the present efficiency of their work force and take on people who produce less than the value of the stipend they receive without some kind of compensation.

Mr. Edward Robie, vice president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, testified before our committee on behalf of the Industry Youth Corps, and he testified very clearly the efforts that the life insurance industry would make and that the 25-percent subsidies would not cover all of their costs, but with that kind of assistance from the Federal Government he was confident that other companies would engage in this kind of help to youth.

You may not have liked the substitute which has been offered and you may not have liked the idea that we would change the operation of the present poverty program, but this is an addition to the language that is presently in the bill. This is to use the same amount of money in section 2 of the bill for title I, but designated $70 million for this addition. I am confident anyone who has taken the time to read this amendment and study it and talk to employers about it will know that this will be an effective means of training youth, not make-work programs but in meaningful kinds of jobs.

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. The proposed amendment, it was called to my attention, in the District of Columbia alone for the summer program could have been worked out but was prevented because of minimum wage regulations which made it impossible for the employer to train the youths. I take it your amendment would take care of this problem. It would be my understanding this would also apply to the District of Columbia. Is that not true?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. QUIE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. It would give the opportunity for a small employer to take part in this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are no large industries, as the members of the Committee know, in the District of Columbia and the same thing is true in many areas of the country. Small businesses like the retail trade could participate in this program.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment is agreed to, then those people who come under the purview of the language of the amendment on the farms would be included as well. There is a great opportunity for employment of youth in rural area on farms if this subsidy were paid to get them started.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Is the program which the gentleman in the well proposes in addition to the programs that the Office of Economic Opportunity now undertakes to have industry train people?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how is your program going to be financed? Does your proposed program call for additional funds for the purpose of financing it?

Mr. QUIE. No. My amendment does not propose additional funds. There would be in title I that came up in section 2 yesterday the sum of $874 milion, a sum which I believe is greater than this Congress is going to appropriate. But it would be sufficient to fund my amendment.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this would be a very effective tool to be used in helping the small businessman to help himself in providing these services.

Mr. QUIE. That is right; it is similar to what the gentleman himself was engaged in in his flying industry before he came to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned the farmers. This, of course, spins off the delegated authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor.

Mr. QUIE. Exactly like the way it operates now, where the Office of Economic Opportunity has already delegated those programs to the Department of Labor.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Under your proposed independent Youth Corps, anyone so participating, including farmers, would be under the supervision of the Department of Labor? That is my question.

In other words, the farmers would have to deal with the Department of Labor, is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I do not think that is treating farmers unfairly, because they are having nothing but trouble now in dealing with the Department of Agriculture. All NYC programs in the rural areas are presently handled by the Department of Labor.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of my making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 3:25.

The question was taken and, on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE), there were—ayes 78, noes 55.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. ARENDS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 90.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the limitation of debate several Members were standing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make an announcement with regard to Members who were standing upon conclusion of the 5 minutes of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is a good idea. Had it not been for the action taken by the Committee with respect to the committee bill, I would have been inclined to support his amendment with some amendment.

As he indicated, the gentleman from Minnesota wants to involve private industry.

The trouble is the gentleman from Minnesota started talking about this too soon—about 6 months ago—and he convinced us.

So when this bill was before the committee, we inserted a provision designed to do just exactly what the gentleman from Minnesota has been talking about, by unanimous consent.

We have a provision in the committee bill designed to involve private industry in training programs under this act.

Let me read to you from page 160 of the bill where we say that the manpower program under this part shall include:

(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for unusual training costs for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. One provision stands out in my amendment, which permits the Federal Government to subsidize up to 25 percent of the wages. I see nothing in the committee language that permits the subsidization of the wages an employer must pay.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is precisely correct. I would like to direct my attention to that fact.

The difference between what the gentleman from Minnesota is offering and what the committee has already done—and this is the essential difference—is that the gentleman from Minnesota proposes a wage subsidy. The community action agency would have the power and the authority to pay a wage subsidy to some employer or to several employers in that community with respect to low-income youths employed by them.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It is, however, in the Neighborhood Youth Corps where we now pay a 100-percent wage subsidy with the liberal interpretation of 90 percent and a 10-percent contribution in kind. This would be a one-quarter wage subsidy for jobs in private industry.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would want—and every Member of this House should want—a good deal closer look at the whole idea of subsidizing wages for some private industries and not for others, for one employer and not for his competitor, before they get into this sort of thing.

If you do not mind my saying so, I am afraid that what this amendment would do would be to take a part of the bill that everyone agrees has been useful and constructive, and create controversy that would endanger the entire concept of job training for the unemployed poor. I do not want to take that kind of risk without thorough hearings and without a thorough exploration of all the implications of this kind of program.

I would welcome such hearings. As the gentleman knows, I am sponsoring a guaranteed employment bill, and I would like to have some hearings on this subject by our committee. But I do not want to get into a subsidy of wages for some private employers and not their competitors without a good deal more thought and consideration than this amendment has received.

MORE MONEY FOR JOB PROGRAMS—BUT WILL THEY HELP PEOPLE GET JOBS?

As much as 50 percent of all title II money would henceforth be available only for manpower programs proposed by the local job opportunities boards. The uncertainty arises from the fact that some part of this money would have to be made available for qualified substitute

agencies approved under State plans or by the OEO.

This is a drastic shift in the past uses of title II funds. The money set aside for manpower programs would presumably be in addition to other funds provided expressly for those purposes under other titles of the substitute proposal. Compared to other needs in particular communities, this may be a case of overkill.

In any event, the local job opportunities boards will be grossly unrepresentative both of organized labor and of many other relevant interests within their communities. At least half the membership of those boards must consist of representatives of private employers. The remainder shall be representatives of the poor. In other words, organized labor may be shut out completely from the development of programs which vitally affect its interests. Moreover, there will be no representation of public nonprofit agencies in the community service fields which constitute the second biggest labor market in the country today.

The kinds of programs which job opportunities boards may develop for use of this half of all title II assistance are curious, to say the least. They must be designed to eliminate conditions which inhibit or prevent the poor from seeking full-time jobs. Those conditions are relatively few: discrimination, physical disability, and the problem of mothers with small children. The basic employment obstacles suffered by the poor are those which prevent them from securing—rather than seeking—decent jobs. The sponsors of this proposal are apparently not concerned with underemployment, substandard wages, and other obstacles to employability of those who seek employment every day.

They certainly are not concerned with substandard wages, because they have made no provisions for a minimum wage rate in these programs.

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

At the time of the limitation of debate there were 12 Members standing. The Chair computes that each one shall be entitled to 20 seconds.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the difference in the manpower training programs operated under present law, the Manpower Development and Training Act, is that under that act we can fund on-the-job training and the expenses of on-the-job training, but we cannot fund the difference in wage that is necessary to pay an unproductive individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, on the question of wage subsidy to small private employers, we had extensive testimony directly on this subject during our hearings by the Secretary of Labor, who testified that this approach would be wasteful and extravagant, because the small businesses that got the subsidy would simply be hiring workers that they would hire anyway, and in any event were unable, because of their limited resources and capability, to establish the effective training and counseling programs which are indispensable to providing a real boost up the job career ladder.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I would say, in answering the comment just made, that we had a number of people come in on the hearings on the Industry Youth Corps proposal before the committee who testified in favor of this proposal, and they were employers. They were from private industry. They were academicians who said this should be tried. We can go directly to employers and give private employers the help they would need to employ the poor in productive jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us differs in no substantial way from the amendment we just voted down. I think the House has already expressed its understanding of the problem and its will, and I hope it will repeat the vote of just a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN].

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, this is the program which I believe we all understand is in addition to what is in the committee bill and what is now in the law. This program would in no way interfere with a continuation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps or the other programs in the community action field.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to understand the opposition to the amendment. This concept has been tried and proven. It is cheaper while being more effective. It offers challenge rather than charity. It involves people rather than politics. I urge you to rise above partisanship and support an honest effort to solve a problem of immense concern to us all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in 20 seconds one can hardly explain why this should not be treated in any manner different from what it was as a part of the overall package. One might conclude by saying that it is tacked together in even a less scientific manner than in the last amendment, which was defeated. We should defeat their amendment too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to bother the Members from the other side that the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the wages to private nonprofit agencies who might be competing with each other. We ask to have an opportunity to make a real, worthwhile program, in which we would subsidize a necessary amount of 25 percent of the wages in private enterprise only for the period of time that is necessary. Vote for my amendment and you will be proud of an effective antipoverty program.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked by the proponents' lack of knowledge of the program. Last year at this time, at the time of the debate, we made it possible, and it is possible, and it is being done now, to employ private industry in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

I do not know where the Members have been for the last year, but obviously they have not been involved in this debate.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, not only are we involving private industry in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, but we also are involving it in the MDTA in certain projects which are good projects. We are presently giving substantial financial assistance to programs in which private industry is participating. We have authority to do it.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. QUIE and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 104, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 102?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF WISCONSIN

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin: On page 157, line 24, strike the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided, however*, That all such programs shall be delegated, effective July 1, 1968, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be administered under

such delegation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare."

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we can agree upon a limitation of time here, say 15 minutes? This is the same amendment, essentially, upon which the House has previously acted. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, since we have already voted upon this amendment, I move that all debate thereon close in 15 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for that purpose.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER], the gentleman in the well, has stated that he does not yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for the purpose of making a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion which has been made by the gentleman from Kentucky is not in order. We have not as yet had any debate upon the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment, quite simply, is to solely transfer the authority for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps from the Department of Labor where it is now located to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], perhaps, did not clearly understand the amendment, since this is an amendment upon which we have not acted prior to this time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not interfere with, it does not diminish, or would not in any way impair the ongoing operations of the NYC program.

All it seeks to do is that come July 1, 1968, delegate by statute, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that which has already been delegated by the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, the chamber of commerce has recommended:

> The stated purpose of the in-school program and its operation by the public school system would make it advisable to transfer the in-school part of NYC to the Office of Education to be run in coordination with and funded through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, does not go quite that far. But it will provide for the coordination between those programs funded by ESEA and those programs which are similar in nature funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the Committee know, the stated purpose of the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps is, among other things, an attempt to find the basis on which we can insure that young men and women will be motivated to remain in school and not to drop out.

Mr. Chairman, as a training program, the NYC, in my judgment, has not done an extremely good job; it has failed in its role because of its delegation of authority to the Department of Labor.

If, in fact, we are going to be concerned with, as I think we should, attempting to prevent the dropout from ever occurring, then it would seem to me to make good sense to delegate the NYC program to the one office of our Federal Government which is that office responsible for educational programs, the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we might adopt this amendment as being a first step toward improving this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not offer this amendment in a destructive fashion. I do not offer this amendment for the purpose of hampering the program. But, I would think it would make a great deal of sense to attempt to coordinate something which is not now being coordinated.

The in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, which are serving some 138,951 young men and women, have some 35.8 percent of them now being sponsored by public schools throughout the country. Some 48,193 are serviced through community action agencies. As I say, the number of those enrolled in public school in-school NYC programs is larger than those enrolled in CAP agency programs, 49,774 to 48,193.

All of this is to indicate to the Members that I believe NYC's apparent lack of success demonstrates a need for increased and perhaps redirected counseling components in many projects which will emphasize treatment of problems which cause the youth to withdraw from school initially.

It is for that reason, Mr. Chairman, that I offer this amendment which can strengthen the present operations and which I hope that the chairman of the full committee will accept as a delegation of authority, not a transfer, for the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps program to a program which can serve well but which is not serving as well as it could be were it to be operated on a delegated basis with the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of this Committee will see fit to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it will serve no useful purpose for us to march up this hill and down again. This amendment would require OEO to delegate to HEW the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps and for this reason I oppose it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I regret to do this, but I was informed that there would be no other speakers on this amendment from the other side. I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close within 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I informed the gentleman that I did not think there were any other speakers on this side. I took 1 minute in order for the gentleman from Wisconsin to clarify one point. The gentleman now in the well is not on the committee, and I know of no one else who is going to ask for time.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ERLENBORN) there were—ayes 84, noes 65.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 76.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to transgress on your time, but I believe I have been present on the floor for 75 to 80 percent of this debate. While I do not serve on the legislative committee, I happen to serve on the subcommittee which will eventually fund this program, so we do have an interest in it.

Mr. Chairman, we have been involved in a debate for the past week over proposals to remove various programs from the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity and place them under the aegis of other Federal agencies involved in related areas.

I would like to suggest that perhaps these proposals would never have been made if the Office of Economic Opportunity had ever shown any willingness to listen to some constructive criticism. This is a new program and naturally it has had its problems in getting off the ground. But every time those of us on the committees overseeing the operation

of this program have raised a question concerning a problem area we have learned of, we are accused of trying to destroy the program, we are against the poor, and our questions are cleverly avoided. It would seem that OEO has developed a paranoid survival instinct and is spending more time and money trying to convince the Congress of what a good job they are doing than they are in trying to do the job we have assigned them.

For instance, last spring before our appropriations hearings, I requested cost figures on the individual Job Corps centers. We received only the royal runaround for over 2 months and to this date have never received the figures we requested.

On the other hand, we receive more than enough information concerning every complimentary article written about OEO programs. Every time an article appears in one of my district papers favorable to one of the poverty programs in our area, "Sarge" Shriver kindly sits down immediately and writes me a letter enclosing a copy of the article. He also manages to keep me informed on how our two Senators from Illinois vote on OEO programs. I often wonder if OEO has an employee assigned to following the news from my 18th District of Illinois. It might even be that they have someone assigned to each of us. With a public relations budget like theirs, this is quite possible.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that OEO takes cognizance of the fact that when the Congress is critical of a program, it is not necessarily trying to destroy it. After all, we created it. As representatives of the American people, we are charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that their tax dollars will be used in the most efficient manner—and to benefit the people these programs were designed to assist—not to assure perpetuity for a bureaucratic Minotaur.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ERLENBORN].

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest that we can continue this debate and finish our work on this bill much more expeditiously if the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor will cease making motions to limit debate before the Member who has offered the amendment even has the opportunity to explain it, as he did on this amendment. At the time the chairman made his second motion on which we voted there was only one Member standing seeking recognition. As long as the chairman continues to try to shut off debate on this side I will continue to object to his unanimous-consent request and ask for a division and tellers on every one of his motions to limit debate. We will use up a great deal more time that way than if we permit orderly debate to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have plowed this ground several times. The principle contained in this amendment is subject to the same conclusive arguments directed to previous amendments rejected by the Committee. I ask the Committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINO: On page 163, strike the period and insert a semicolon in line 6, and after line 6, insert the following:

"(5) no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party."

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple but necessary amendment. In a nutshell, it would prohibit OEO from financing any work training programs, including Neighborhood Youth Corps, which are administered by present or former members of the Communist Party.

To those who might suggest that I am trying to raise a red herring issue here—that nobody hires or would dare to hire ex-Communists to head critical programs involving the Nation's youth—let me remind them that we have already seen evidence of such employment.

In my own city of New York, unfortunately, the mayor not only hired an ex-Communist, but he bragged about it. The present director of the New York City Neighborhood Youth Corps is an ex-Communist named Robert Schrank. When I raised the question of Mr. Schrank's fitness to lead and guide New York City youth, the mayor's press assistant acknowledged Mr. Schrank's Communist background as follows, if I may quote the New York Daily News:

Robert Laird, his press assistant, said he understood that while Schrank had been a member of the Communist party for fifteen years, he gave up his membership prior to his Mobilization For Youth appointment three or four years ago.

The mayor of New York later admitted that he knew all about Schrank's subversive record when he hired him. Let me quickly point out that Schrank was thrown out of the Machinists Union for being a Communist and during the early 1950's he worked for the International Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, a notorious Communist front expelled from the AFL–CIO. Believe it or not, the mayor of New York went on to call this man a "distinguished public servant." And do you know what has happened since? Schrank has just been promoted to assistant commissioner of the New York City poverty war.

The amendment I am offering would prevent the poverty warriors here in Washington from giving taxpayer dollars to any work and training programs administered by a current or ex-Communist. My amendment would cut New York City's work and training programs off from Federal funds until the mayor of New York fires his "distinguished" ex-Communist, which he will never do unless he is forced.

I do not think I have to dwell on the interest that the Communist movement has in young people. They regard them as the most opportune target for their propaganda. I believe that we in Congress have an obligation to keep these Federal youth programs from coming under the domination of longtime Communists. I will say frankly that anyone who was a Communist during the Korean war is no man to be shaping the lives of our young people today and if the mayor of New York thinks so, then that is his shame, but I hope that it will not be the shame of this Congress.

I urge the adoption of my amendment to prohibit OEO from funding work-experience and other youth programs without making sure that the programs are free of present or former Communists.

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

Mr. FINO. I will be very happy to yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection if the language as we understand it reads.

(5) no person charged, in whole or in part, with responsibility for administration of the program is, or ever has been, a member of the Communist Party.

Is that your amendment?

Mr. FINO. That is the text of the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. We accept that amendment.

Mr. FINO. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 102? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

"(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, organizations, and interests and affected citizens, can be made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

"(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

"(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

"(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

"It is further declared to be the purpose of this title and the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to provide for basic education, health care, vocational training, and employment opportunities in rural America to enable the poor living in rural areas to remain in such areas and become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the purpose of this title or the policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity to encourage the rural poor to migrate to urban areas, inasmuch as it is the finding of Congress that continuation of such migration is frequently not in the best interests of the poor and tends to further congest the already overcrowded slums and ghettos of our Nation's cities.

"PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

"DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 210. (a) Community action agencies shall be a State or political subdivision of a State (having elected or duly appointed governing officials), or a combination of such political subdivisions, or a public or private nonprofit agency or organization which has been designated by a State or such a political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions, which—

"(1) has power to enter into contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations to assist in fulfilling the purposes of this title, and

"(2) is designated as a community action agency by the Director.

A community action program is a community based and operated program—

"(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

"(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

"(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

"(c) The community for which a community action agency is designated to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicity, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision); but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

"(d) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency as a community action agency other than a community action agency designated under subsection (a) for activities of the kind described in this title where he determines that the community action agency serving the community has failed, after having a reasonable opportunity to do so, to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program which meets the criteria for approval set forth in this title, or that neither the State nor any qualified political subdivision or combination of such subdivisions is willing to be designated as the community action agency for such community or to designate a public or private nonprofit agency or organization to be so designated by the Director.

"(e) No political subdivision of a State shall be included in the community action program of a State, or of any political subdivision or combination thereof, if the elected or duly appointed governing officials thereof do not wish to be so included. Such political subdivision, and any public or private nonprofit organization or agency designated by it, shall be eligible for designation as a community action agency on the same basis as other political subdivisions and their designees.

"(f) For the purposes of this title, a tribal government of an Indian reservation shall be deemed to be a political subdivision of a State.

"COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND BOARDS

"SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency which is a State or a political subdivision of a State, or a combination of political subdivisions, shall administer its program through a community action board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b). Each community action agency which is a public or private nonprofit agency or organization designated by a State or political subdivision of a State, or combination of political subdivisions, or is an agency designated by the Director under section 210(d), shall have a governing board which shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(b) Each board to which this subsection applies shall consist of not more than fifty-one members and shall be so constituted that (1) one-third of the members of the board are public officials, including the chief elected official or officials, or their representatives, unless the number of such officials reasonably available for such service is less than one-third of the membership of the board, (2) at least one-third of the members are persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the area served, and (3) the remainder of the members are officials or members of business, industry, labor, religious, welfare, education, or other major groups and interests in the community. Each member of the board selected to represent a specific geographic area within a community must reside in the area he represents. No person selected under clause (2) or (3) of this subsection as a member of a board shall serve on such board for more than three consecutive years, or more than a total of six years.

"(c) Where a community action agency places responsibility for policy determinations with respect to the character, extent, and administration of programs to be carried on in a particular geographic area within the community in a subsidiary board, council, or similar agency, or where it places substantial reliance on the recommendations of such an agency in making such policy determinations affecting particular areas, such subsidiary board, council, or similar agency shall meet the requirements of subsection (b).

"(d) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which shall be not less than 50 per centum of the total membership), procedures, establishment of committees, and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that boards which are subject to subsection (b) provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such standards or rules shall not preclude any such board from appointing an executive committee or similar group, which fairly reflects the composition of the board, to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.

"(e) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

"SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assist-

ance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

"ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently, and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible, rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to improve agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regulations governing matters relating to partisan or nonpartisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

"EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 214. (a) In determining whether, in what amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assistance to a new community action program, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity to the purposes of this title. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on such a program, consistent with needs and with due allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific function and duties to this end. The Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering: the number and incomes of persons or families served and seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the extent to which those persons and families have been aided in establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those goals; the extent to which resources have been committed which are over and above the contributions required by this title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor and area representatives, have actively participated in the formulation and implementation of the program in question; the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements among agencies operating different components and related agencies in the community; and the extent to which activities or approaches initiated as part of the program have been incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

"(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by him or by community action agencies, the Director may provide for, or require community action agencies to provide for, independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

"PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of community action programs, the Director may provide general financial assistance to those programs in accordance with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be used, as approved by the Director, by community action agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning, coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsibilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be used for the development and operation of approved program components which are necessary for a fully effective program and for which assistance is not available, as needed, from other sources. These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment; to make better use of available income in connection with efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills needed for employment, family self-help, or successful participation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain housing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake family planning consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent and effective use of programs available to help in overcoming specific problems. Components providing these or other services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly, the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance, but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family participation and progress.

"(b) If the Director determines that a limited purpose project or program involving activities otherwise eligible under this section is needed to serve needs of low-income families and individuals in a community, and no community action agency has been designated for that community pursuant to section 210, or where a community action agency gives its approval for such a program to be funded directly through a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, he may extend financial assistance for that project or program to a public or private nonprofit agency which he finds is capable of carrying out the project in an efficient and effective manner consistent with the purpose of this title.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public

officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of his title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as 'Project Headstart' focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which (A) will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, and (B) will provide for direct participation of the parents of such children in the development, conduct, and overall program direction at the local level.

"(2) A program to be known as 'Follow Through' focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential.

"(3) A 'Legal Services' program to provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information, as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

"(4) A 'Comprehensive Health Services' program to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high proportions of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with necessary related facilities and services, except in rural areas where the lack of even elemental health services and personnel may require simpler, less comprehensive services to be established first; and

"(B) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary, to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.

"(5) A program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary education success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate.

"(6) A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services' designed to provide on a temporary emergency basis such basic foodstuffs and medical services as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. The Director shall arrange with other Federal and State agencies or officials to insure the availability of such foodstuffs and services through a community action agency where feasible, or by other means if no such agency exists or is able to administer such foodstuffs and services to needy individuals. Each community action agency shall be encouraged to develop projects such as the furnishing of information on nutrition, as will assist the poor to maintain an adequate and nutritious diet.

"(7) A 'Day Care' program to provide day care for children from families who need such assistance to become or remain self-sufficient or otherwise attain objectives related to the purposes of this Act. Projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed, together with necessary related facilities and services. Reference for enrollment in such projects shall be given to children whose parents desire to participate in programs under this Act and to other children whose parents have especially critical needs for day care service which could not be secured under any other program. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

"(8) A 'Family Planning' program to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Service officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

"(9) A program to be known as 'Senior Opportunities and Services' designed to identify and meet the needs of older, poor persons above the age of 55 in one or more of the following areas: development and provision of new employment and volunteer services; effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal, consumer, transportation, education, and recreational and other services; stimulation and creation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; modification of existing procedures, eligibility requirements and program structures to facilitate the greater use of, and participation in, public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation and service centers controlled by older persons themselves; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor and to assure them greater self-sufficiency. In administering this program the Director shall utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the Administration of Aging in accordance with agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) In developing programs under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private. The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under subsection (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

"(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include essential training, research, and technical assistance directly related to program development and implementation, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

"(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this section, including their impact in terms of the needs or problems at which they are directed, and their relationship to and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director

and other agencies, if any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to sections 220 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than $1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallotted, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallotted among the other States.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 22(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services, except that at least one-half of the non-Federal contribution shall be in cash.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise to qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personne which is needed in connection with thos programs or which otherwise pertains to th purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

"STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 604 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

"RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

"PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

"ASSISTANT DIRECTORS FOR COMMUNITY ACTION

"SEC. 240. The Director shall appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of the provisions of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

"RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 241. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty, including a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

"(b) In order to further implement the policy described in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the

early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

"COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE FUNDS

"SEC. 242. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice, information, or assistance, including the establishment of working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific problems of coordination arising under programs authorized in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range plans where justified by prior progress.

"(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

"SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 243. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this title. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

"FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 244. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

"(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

"(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprograming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 245. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

"(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

"(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 223 have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

"(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this title which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular educational assistance.

"(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

"LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

"SEC. 246. The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, shall issue such regulations, or impose such requirements, as may be necessary or appro-

priate to insure that programs assisted under this title are not carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with (1) any partisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or any voter registration activity. Rules or regulations under this section shall provide for enforcement procedures, which shall include provision for summary suspension of assistance or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis.

"DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 247. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 103, starting on page 168 and continuing to page 211, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 168, after line 16, strike out everything through line 4 on page 186 and insert in lieu thereof:

"TITLE II—COMMUNITY ACTION

"PART A—GENERAL

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title, as amended, to establish programs, policies, and structures through which the Director can play an appropriate role in assisting the States and urban and rural communities therein to rehabilitate the poor by dealing effectively with the principal causes of poverty. In undertaking this role, it shall be the policy of the Director to assist only those programs or activities which focus upon principal causes of poverty.

"The Director shall pursue the purpose of this title—

"(a) by involving in a meaningful way, at the State and local levels, the poor and other interested individuals, groups, and private and public agencies and organizations, including private enterprise and labor; and

"(b) by encouraging the creation and support of community action agencies and neighborhood organizations responsible for identifying causes and conditions of poverty in the community, and for discovering, planning, and executing programs aimed at breaking the poverty cycle, including, but not limited to, imaginative and innovative programs of education, job training, employment and improvement of services to enable the poor better to help themselves.

"It is the finding of Congress that the continued mass migration of the poor from rural America to the Nation's cities is not in the best interest of the Nation or of the poor since such migration tends to further congest already overcrowded slums and ghettos where opportunities for meaningful employment and a decent life are lacking. Therefore, it is declared to be the purpose of this title, and it shall be the policy of the Director, to place special emphasis upon arresting such migration by attacking the causes of poverty in rural America as well as urban America, so that the poor may become self-sufficient therein. It shall not be the policy of the Director to encourage or assist, directly or indirectly, such migration.

"RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DIRECTOR

"SEC. 202. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the 'Director') shall be responsible for the administration of this title.

"ASSISTANT DIRECTORS

"SEC. 203. There shall be appointed two assistant directors for the purpose of assisting the Director in the administration of this title. One such assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Rural Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the rural poor are so expended. The other assistant director, to be known as the Assistant Director for Community Action in Urban Areas, shall be responsible for assuring that funds allotted for assistance to programs or projects designed to assist the urban poor are so expended. Each assistant director shall have such additional responsibilities consistent with the foregoing responsibilities as the Director may hereafter assign.

"RESERVATION OF ALLOTMENTS

"204. (a) Not less than 10 per centum of each State's allotment under section 213 shall be reserved for grants to the State agency of such State pursuant to section 232.

"FEDERAL PRIORITY

"SEC. 205. Not less than 50 per centum of the sum allotted to each State under section 213(a) shall be reserved for the funding of programs proposed by job opportunities boards of qualified community action agencies or by qualified substitute agencies.

"POVERTY CRITERIA

"SEC. 206. After consultation with each commission (established pursuant to section 211) and on the basis of income, cost of living, differences between urban and rural life, and other relevant factors, the Director shall establish and promulgate appropriate criteria for determination of those individuals who shall be considered urban poor and rural poor for purposes of this title. Such criteria may vary within reasonable limits from State to State, as the Director and the State commission of each State, if any, may determine (or the Director acting alone if there is no such State commission in such State) deem appropriate, but the criteria must be uniform throughout any one State. The Director shall apply such criteria annually, using the most current information available from the Bureau of the Census, together with any additional data which may be furnished by the State commission or from other reliable sources, to determine the number of urban poor and rural poor in each State and in the Nation.

"PART B—STATE PARTICIPATION

"STATE RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 211. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant or otherwise participate under this title shall designate or establish a State agency to be known as the State community action commission (hereinafter referred to as the 'State commission' which shall be broadly representative of local community action agencies, public and private education, welfare, rehabilitation, manpower, health, and other public and private human resources agencies, Headstart agencies, business and labor organizations, minority racial groups, the elderly poor, and such other groups and organizations as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That no more than one-third of the membership of the State commission shall be State and local officials of their representatives.

"(b) A State commission established or designated pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

"(1) be the sole agency responsible for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under this title;

"(2) undertake to identify areas of concentration and general characteristics of the poor, and to determine fundamental causes of poverty in each State;

"(3) initiate and conduct comprehensive planning, including the determination of State priorities and policies (including criteria for the allocation of funds to qualified community action agencies or substitute agencies subject to the provisions of this title) to eliminate the causes of poverty in each State;

"(4) promulgate and submit to the Director and to each qualified community action agency and delegate agency in each State, in advance of each fiscal year after fiscal year 1968, at a time determined by the Director, a State plan for action, which shall review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning the funding of each of the programs proposed to be conducted by each qualified community action agency or substitute agency in the State in each fiscal year, taking into consideration any other relevant public or private program to assure that programs funded under this title are focused upon meeting those needs which cannot be or are not met by such other programs;

"(5) select, in accordance with the provisions of this title, qualified community action agencies and, when appropriate, qualified substitute agencies, to receive assistance or conduct programs under this title; and assign to any agency which is found an area over which it shall have jurisdiction for the administration of programs under this title, which area shall be coterminous with a major State political subdivision, such as a city, county, or parish, except that if such subdivision is not of a size or population to permit the agency to serve it efficiently and effectively, such area shall be coterminous with more than one such subdivision or a lesser portion of such subdivision, so long as due consideration is given to meeting the needs of the poor in the remaining portion of such subdivision;

"(6) consult with and provide assistance, including technical assistance, to community action agencies and qualified substitute agencies; assist in the preparation and administration of annual plans; assist in the training of personnel; assist in coordinating programs to be conducted by any such agency with other ongoing programs serving the same area or any of the poor therein; and assist in mobilizing and making maximum feasible use of public and private resources in carrying out the programs of such community action agencies;

"(7) review, evaluate, and approve or disapprove (in whole or in part) the annual plans of the community action agencies in accordance with criteria set forth in the approved State plan for action, taking into consideration any ongoing State or local programs of a similar nature to determine whether the programs proposed in the annual plan would duplicate or disrupt such ongoing State or local programs;

"(8) report to the Director on the expenditure of Federal funds in such State under this title during each fiscal year to enable the President and Congress to evaluate the progress of the States under this Act;

"(9) establish liaison with State commissions in other States to exchange ideas and information pertinent to comprehensive planning for the elimination of poverty and

the avoidance of inefficient or duplicative programs;

"(10) establish for the personnel of the State commission a salary schedule comparable to that of other agencies within each State: *Provided, however,* That the Director in his discretion may modify or adjust such schedule or any provision thereof; and

"(11) provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to insure proper disbursement of and accounting for all funds under this title, and to insure that in no case shall Federal funds be commingled with non-Federal funds in financing programs under this title."

On page 186, line 6, renumber section 222 as section 212; lines 12–13, strike "under sections 220 and 221" and insert in lieu thereof "elsewhere in this title".

On page 194, line 20, renumber section 223 as section 213; lines 22–23, strike "sections 220 and 221" and insert in lieu thereof "this title"; line 24, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212".

On page 195, line 24, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212".

On page 196, line 9, strike "pursuant to sections 220, 221 and 222 (a)," and insert in lieu thereof "under this title,"; line 22, strike "sections 220, 221, and 222(a)" and insert in lieu thereof "this title"; line 19, after "services" strike the comma and insert a period in lieu thereof; and strike the balance of line 19 and all of line 20.

Beginning on page 197, strike out all that follows line 11 thereon through line 8 on page 200, and insert in lieu thereof the following new part C:

"PART C—PARTICIPATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY; DELEGATE AGENCIES

"COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY DEFINED

"SEC. 221. (a) For the purposes of this title, a community action agency shall be a public or private nonprofit organization (other than a political party) which satisfies the following requirements and is designated as a qualified community action agency by the State commission under section 211(b)(5) or by the Director pursuant to section 233:

"(1) Policies are determined by a governing board or a constituent overall governing group thereof, such as an executive committee, the membership of which board or group shall be representative of various community interests as follows:

"(A) at least a third of the members represent the poor, which members are residents of the area served by such agency and selected by the residents of such area, by processes, such as elections or assemblies, in which the poor are given opportunity to participate to the maximum feasible extent; except that for the purposes of this section, any member who is selected by and represents a neighborhood organization as defined in section 222 shall be considered a representative of the poor;

"(B) officials (duly elected or appointed) of local government, or their representatives, not to exceed one-third of the membership of the board: *Provided, however,* That such officials or their representatives are available and willing to serve; and

"(C) the remainder of the membership of such board or group are representatives of and selected by educational, welfare, religious, business, labor, and other organizations, including, in areas served by cooperative extension services or technical action panels, representatives of such services and panels. No person selected under subparagraphs (A) or (C) above as a member of such board or group shall serve more than three consecutive years or more than a total of six years thereon.

"(2) Adequate authority and competence exist to enter into contracts with or receive grants from the State commission and the Director under this title and to carry out the programs for which it requests Federal assistance under this title efficiently, effectively and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this title either directly or by contract with delegate agencies pursuant to section 225.

"(3) Is willing and competent to assume the responsibilities which may be assigned to a community action agency under this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), any neighborhood organization as hereinafter defined shall be authorized to propose programs to be assisted or conducted by such community action agency, and to require such agency to terminate its assistance to or conduct of any program in the neighborhood represented or served by such organization, whenever in its judgment, such program is not in the best interests of the neighborhood.

"(c) The State Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Director, promulgate and publish rules and regulations relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums (which in the case of a community action board shall not be less than 50 per centum of its total membership), procedures, establishment of committees and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that community action boards provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on these boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs. Such rules and regulations shall not preclude any community action board from appointing an executive committee or similar group which fairly reflects the composition of the board to transact the board's business between its meetings. The quorum requirements for any such committee or group shall be established by the board.

"NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION DEFINED

"SEC. 222. For the purposes of this title, a neighborhood organization shall be any public or private nonprofit organization which represents the poor in a single impoverished neighborhood within the area assigned to a qualified community action agency and consists of residents of such neighborhood selected at least annually by residents thereof through processes such as elections and neighborhood meetings in which the poor participate to the maximum feasible extent.

"RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

"SEC. 223. It shall be the responsibility of any community action agency which desires to receive assistance under this title to—

"(1) mobilize and make maximum feasible use of public and private resources (including volunteered services of individuals) to eliminate the causes of poverty in accordance with the provisions of this title;

"(2) establish and appoint, within a reasonable time after such agency determines to seek assistance for job oriented programs, as provided in subparagraph 3 of this section, a Job Opportunity Board, a majority of whose members shall be representatives of business and at least one-third of whose members shall be representatives of the poor;

"(3) authorize and direct such Job Opportunities Board to develop programs designed to enable the unemployed and underemployed poor to rehabilitate themselves through meaningful job training, counseling, work experience, supportive services and placement for jobs, including special programs, where appropriate, to eliminate conditions which inhibit or prevent the poor from seeking full-time jobs;

"(4) further authorize and direct such Job Opportunities Board to—

"(A) encourage the contribution of or use of funds, services, facilities, and property from all sources public and private, to carry out the programs described in subparagraph (3) of this subsection;

"(B) encourage the participation, on a voluntary, nonpaid basis, of professional and nonprofessional individuals from the business community willing to devote their time and services to make personal contact with, counsel, advise, and otherwise assist unemployed or underemployed poor individuals to assess and develop potentially marketable skills, prepare for employment interviews and testing, and make the adjustment to full-time and productive employment;

"(C) through direct communication with community leaders and groups, including civic, religious, labor, business, professional, social, and educational, to develop an awareness of the needs of the unemployed and underemployed poor as well as an appreciation of the programs proposed by the Board to encourage support for and voluntary participation in such programs, and to secure commitments from such individuals, groups, and organizations to work for the elimination of unfair hiring practices and similar circumstances which raise obstacles to the employment of the poor;

"(5) submit to the State commission in advance of each fiscal year after fiscal year 1968 an annual plan which shall describe the various programs for which assistance is requested under this title in such fiscal year (including the various programs proposed for inclusion by the Job Opportunities Board pursuant to subparagraph (3) of this subsection), set forth a proposed budget for such programs as well as justifications for such budget, and evaluate the various programs on the basis of criteria established by the agency to assess the relative needs of the poor in the area served by the agency;

"(6) provide for reasonable public access to information, books, and records of the agency, its governing board (or any constituent group thereof), the Job Opportunities Board, and any delegate agency, including reasonable opportunity for hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, in accordance with regulations adopted by the Director;

"(7) seek the cooperation of agencies administering existing programs at the community level significantly affecting the poor; coordinate its own programs with existing programs in order to avoid or eliminate duplication, conflict, and waste; and refer the poor to services offered under existing programs whenever appropriate;

"(8) arrange with a reputable private, independent auditing firm to (A) review, prior to receipt of any assistance under this title, administrative procedures, the recordkeeping systems and fiscal controls of such agency, delegate agencies thereof, and the Job Opportunities Board, and (3) conduct a complete audit of each program included in each annual plan of such agency six months after final approval of such plan to insure that adequate procedures, records, and controls are kept and enforced;

"(9) expend sums granted to it under this title in a manner conforming to and at a rate not in excess of that proposed under its approved annual plan;

"(10) adopt and enforce (or require enforcement of) rules and regulations promulgated by the State commission (subject to approval of the Director) or by the Director governing the wages, benefits, and conduct in performance of duty of its own personnel and the personnel of delegate agencies and the Job Opportunities Board:

"(11) insure that all such personnel described in subparagraph (10) are informed of such regulations and standards therein described; and

"(12) adopt and enforce (or require enforcement of) rules and regulations promul-

gated by the State commission (subject to approval of the Director) or by the Director governing the payment of expenses to board members attending meetings of the governing board of the community action agency.

"APPROVAL OF DELEGATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 224. (a) Any community action agency may contract with one or more public or private nonprofit organizations described in subsection (b) of this section to act as a delegate agency to carry out programs approved for assistance under this title, but only if it determines that such organization—

"(1) has full authority to receive and spend as required by such contract any funds which it may receive thereunder;

"(2) is competent to administer and conduct such programs as may be contracted to it; and

"(3) provides assurances that it will comply with all statutory requirements, rules, standards, and regulations applicable to community action agencies under this title.

"(b) Such organization shall be—

"(1) a neighborhood organization as defined in section 222; or

"(2) any other local, public or private, nonprofit organization (other than a political organization) which has had experience in administration of similar programs.

"SUBSTITUTE AGENCIES

"SEC. 225. (a) In the absence of a community action agency, any organization which meets the requirements of a delegate agency under section 224 shall be eligible as a substitute agency to conduct programs under this title.

"(b) In the case of an area served by a community action agency, any organization which meets the requirements of a delegate agency under section 224 shall be eligible as a substitute agency to conduct programs under this title, provided that—

"(1) the program or activity to be conducted is of a demonstration or experimental nature and will not be in conflict with any program or activity being provided by the community action agency; or

"(2) the program or activity to be conducted is unsuitable for inclusion in the annual plan of the community action agency; or

"(3) the program or activity to be conducted is required to meet an urgent and temporary need of the poor, to which the community action agency and local public authorities, if any, are unable or unwilling to respond, when requested in writing by the State commission or the Director to do so."

Page 200, strike lines 9 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PART D—FEDERAL FUNCTIONS

"APPROVAL OF STATE PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 231. The Director may approve the participation under this title of any State which has accepted the responsibilities described in section 211, but he shall not finally disapprove the participation of any State without first affording it reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"GRANTS TO STATES

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make grants to the States out of moneys reserved under section 204 for the use of the State commission designated or established under section 211, to enable it to carry out its responsibilities under sections 211 and 243.

"(b) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission concerned, finds that such commission has failed to meet any of its responsibilities under section 211, he shall suspend grants to such commission and notify the commission in writing that he will make no further payments to the State under this title until such time as he is satisfied that the commission will meet its responsibilities; *Provided*, That, at his discretion, the Director may make further payments to the State during such period of suspension for activities not affected by such failure.

"FEDERAL REVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 233. (a) At his discretion, the Director may review the actions of the State commission in determining qualified community action agencies or qualified substitute agencies as provided in section 211(b)(5), and he may overrule such actions, determine that a community action agency is qualified or disqualified, as the case may be; and designate or redesignate, if need be, the area assigned to any such agency. In the absence of any action by the State commission pursuant to section 211(b)(5) and after reasonable time for the State commission to act upon a request, the Director, on his own initiative and in the manner prescribed for the State commission, may determine the qualifications and area of any organization seeking to be a community action agency and make direct grants thereto from the State allocation.

"(b) If the State fails to designate or establish a State commission or if the State commission fails to meet its responsibilities under this title, the Director shall, to the extent possible, assume the responsibilities of such State commission and assure that the functions of the State commission are performed until such time as the State shall designate or establish such State commission or shall comply with such obligations.

"APPROVAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 234. (a) After consultation with the State commission, the Director shall approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, the State's plan for action required under section 211(b)(4): *Provided*, That, in any instance of disapproval, he shall reconsider his decision at any reasonable time that the State commission may wish to present new evidence in support of any disapproved part of its plan or in support of any modifications of such parts. The authority of the Director shall include the authority to disapprove any component program which the State commission has approved and incorporated into its plan. Such disapproval shall be reported to the State commission within thirty days following the determination of the Director, together with the Director's justification therefor.

"(b) In accordance with the approved portions of the State plan for action, the Director shall make grants to qualified community action agencies or contract with qualified substitute agencies for programs authorized under this title.

"(c) Subject to the provisions of part C of this title, the Director shall make grants to any qualified community action agency or contract with any qualified substitute agencies for any program authorized under this title, but not incorporated into the State plan for action, provided that—

"(1) in the case of a qualified community action agency, such agency has included the program in its annual plan and has proposed it for inclusion in the State plan;

"(2) the Director first resubmits the proposal to the State commission for thirty days for review and recommendations; and

"(3) the program is consistent with those criteria, priorities, and policies, if any, included in any State plan previously approved by the Director.

"(d) If the Director has not approved, or has disapproved, the participation of the State because of its failure to (1) designate or establish a State commission, (2) to develop a State plan, or (3) to meet substantially its responsibilities under this title, he may make grants to qualified community action agencies or contract with qualified substitute agencies for programs authorized under this Act. If the Director subsequently approves the participation of the State, in whole or in part, under section 231, he shall not be required to reconsider any grant or contract made under this section during the period in which the State was without such approval.

"DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 235. The Director is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research and demonstration projects to develop and to evaluate programs designed to accomplish the purpose of this title. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated for such year to carry out the purposes of this part. No grant or contract for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of his annual report or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and to the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, indicating the time or period in which such activities were undertaken and to the extent possible the manner in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed with him for review and recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing.

"RESTRICTIONS ON ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 236. (a) For the purposes of chapter 15 of title V of the United States Code, any State commission or community action agency funded under this title shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of that title, any delegate agency or substitute agency funded under this title shall be deemed to be a State or local agency. The Director shall issue such regulations or impose such requirements and restrictions as may be necessary or appropriate to enforce the provisions of this subsection.

"(b) Programs assisted under this title shall not involve the use of program funds, the provision of property or services, or the employment or assignment of personnel which—

"(1) supports or results in the identification of such programs with (A) any partisan or nonpartisan political activity or any activity associated with a candidate, or contending faction or group, in any election for public or party office, or (B) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election, or (C) any voter registration activity, or

"(2) which tends to incite, promote, encourage, coerce or carry on a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of any Federal,

State, or local law; which facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, coercion, or carrying on of any such riot or civil disturbance; or which assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or be involved in such riot or civil disturbance.

The Director shall promulgate and publish rules and regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this subsection. Rules or regulations under this subsection shall provide for enforcement procedures which shall include provision for summary suspension or discharge of individuals, or other action necessary to permit enforcement on an emergency basis. Such regulations or requirements shall not be construed to deprive any person of his right to vote as he may choose and to express, in his private capacity, his opinions on any political subject, public issue, public officials, or candidate for public office.

"(c) Whenever the Director has reason to believe that any of the rules and regulations promulgated or published pursuant to subsection (b) have been violated, he shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the individuals and agencies involved, take corrective action to insure the termination of such violations, which action may include (1) suspension or discharge of any individual involved in such activity or responsible therefor; and (2) the suspension of funds in whole or in part to such agency.

"LOBBYING PROHIBITED

"SEC. 237. The Director shall take such steps as are necessary to insure that the provisions of section 1913, title 18, United States Code, are communicated to all employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and to all employees of any State commission, community action agency, delegate agency, or substitute agency funded in whole or in part under this title or any other title of this Act."

On page 201, line 2, strike "241" and insert in lieu thereof "238"; line 9, strike "222" and insert in lieu thereof "212"; line 11, strike "232" and insert in lieu thereof "235".

On page 203, line 9, strike "242" and insert in lieu thereof "239".

On page 204, line 22, strike "243" and insert in lieu thereof "240".

Page 205, line 14, strike "244" and insert in lieu thereof "241".

On page 207, line 23, strike "245" and insert in lieu thereof "242".

On page 210, after line 22, strike all that follows through line 15 on page 211.

On page 211, strike "247" and insert in lieu thereof "243".

On page 211, after line 21, insert the following new Part E:

"PART E—STATE BONUS COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 241. It is the purpose of this part to further encourage and enable States to act as partners with the Federal Government in carrying out programs under this title.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 242. (a) From the amount allocated to carry out this part for a fiscal year, which shall not be less than $20,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the Director shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount being allotted as the amount allotted such State under section 213 bears to the amount allotted all the States under such section for such fiscal year.

"(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallotment to other States from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix.

"SUPPLEMENTARY STATE PLANS

"SEC. 243. (a) Any State which desires to receive a grant under this part shall submit to the Director a supplement to the State plan for action, which supplement—

"(1) provides for carrying out, or supplementing the financing of, community action programs which are eligible for assistance under other parts of this title, but are not being, or are being inadequately assisted thereunder; or

"(2) provides financial assistance to qualified community action agencies or substitute agencies for other programs, including statewide programs, which conform to the policies and priorities of the approved portions of the State plan for action.

"(b) In the same manner and subject to the same procedures as provided under sections 231, 232, and 233, the Director may approve or disapprove the participation of any State under part E of this title.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 244. The Federal share for each State for programs under part E of this title shall be 50 per centum."

Mr. GOODELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] cannot explain his amendment until the reading thereof has been dispensed with.

Therefore, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I note that the gentleman from Illinois has been complaining about insufficient time for the purposes of debate. I hope that the gentleman will no longer object now that we are extending additional time under the 5-minute rule to the minority.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most significant areas of the bill, the community action program. I respectfully believe that the amendment I have offered is one of the most significant amendments.

Mr. Chairman, true community action implies three essential elements. The action must result from a decision taken democratically by those affected. Its goal is the sharing of mutual benefits impossible or difficult of attainment individually. Finally, it must be undertaken by the people themselves through maximum contribution of their own labor and intellect.

It is important when we are talking about this community action title, that we understand it.

Mr. Chairman, the three essential elements are immutable, although the process has been variously named over the years. It is a tradition which must be understood and reinvigorated. It is the essence of our ingenious American political system.

Time honored and time tested, it grew from initial expression in the classic division of labor between man and woman. Cavemen structured their fledging social organization as its practice began to develop into theory. It is rooted in the long history of social and governmental evolution. It is a primary font of economic development.

It typifies the frontier settlement from Jamestown to Virginia City. Men and women struggling to carve home and fortune from the wilderness organized to survive through community action. No government intervened. Such government as existed resulted from decisions taken by the people in town meetings themselves, a form of community action. Homes, schools, and churches were built for the people with their own labor and resources. Such works were executed by a committee of the people.

So grew the theories which dominated the politics of the colonies. Limitations upon this new-found freedom triggered the Revolution.

Formal expressions of community action became known as the Declaration of Independence.

The unique contribution of the American system is total commitment to the community action concept. The key difference is preservation of the democratic expression of the well of the people in application of its techniques.

Community action throughout the world has served as a substitute for despotism. It made possible the cherished common law system nourished by the English and transplanted to America. Elsewhere in the world a comprehensive code of human behavior often emerged to serve as a vehicle for the forces of oppression.

Only in America today is the ideal of government as the last resort for problem solving still pursued. This philosophy is a product of applied community action.

To some, the issue before this House is a cornerstone of our national heritage.

It is strange indeed that those who insist that people can and should solve their own problems oppose this program. People, and people alone, are the exclusive raw material of human progress. People, and only people, are competent to solve those national problems which are in fact the macroism constituted by millions of individual cases.

Few affluent Americans pass a day untouched by the product of community

action. From the car pool to the country club, Americans outside the ghettos enrich their lives through sophisticated concert of action. The poor stand, in stark contrast, chained in poverty, without the substance to help themselves in the sophisticated society of today.

Mr. Chairman, one of the examples of community action in a society today is the civil rights movement, the NAACP. Negro people are utilizing the same ingenious system that powered this Nation to greatness. Constructive courses must be available. Militant and irresponsible zealots, those exploiting particularly community action must be replaced by responsible advocates. If one looks through our history, Sam Adams, John Hancock, John Brown, Tom Paine, and—yes—Patrick Henry, were zealots. Without Tom Jefferson and some others like them to channel those forces constructively, they could have been just militant protestations going for naught. Tom Jefferson became safe in the 19th and 20th centuries. He was not very safe in the 18th century when he spoke most of the things that we quote today as American gospel.

The problem with community action in too many areas is that the Tom Jeffersons have not involved themselves to give constructive courses to deep frustrations generated in the dark ghettos of America.

My amendment is in the form of a substitute to the first few sections of community action. It would preserve the basic intent of community action, the independence of the community action board. It would insist upon representation of local government, but not dominance by local governments over community action boards. It would reverse the action of our committee to set an arbitrary 51-member ceiling in the community action boards because in many areas of our country this would impose a major hardship. It would reverse the action of our committee to require local government involved in every level right down to your neighborhood organizations with one-third of such members on the neighborhood boards.

Once again, this becomes unworkable in most of our large cities.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues this is a crucial issue. We must preserve the basic genius of community action in this program. This does not mean we are going to present unregulated and undisciplined opportunity for militant exploitation of Americans. Our amendment brings the States into community action under the Director. The Director of the poverty program in Washington can bypass the States as long as the State programs are not being implemented properly. But where the States are willing to come in, and as long as they are administering the programs to the liking of the Director—and I emphasize that—to the liking of the Director, the States can be utilized. But the Director, if he does not like the way the States are administering it, can bypass the State entirely.

Community action boards would be required to have at least one-third representation of the poor. They would be required, if the city or local government wishes to be represented, to have some representation of local government up to a maximum of one-third.

This program, Mr. Chairman, offers us the opportunity to unite on a bipartisan basis.

I say to you, it does not bypass the local government. It reinforces the strength of the local government. It keeps the community action agencies independent as an instrument to work with the local government and all other elements in the community in partnership. But it avoids the trap, which the committee walked into, I am sad to say—it avoids the trap of making the community action boards subservient to and the creatures of city hall.

If that provision prevails which is in the bill, we will lose the potential of community action. We will have the community action boards in our cities turned over to city hall. If you think politics has been involved in this program up to now—when it is turned over to city hall in the form in which it is included in the committee bill, you will see the worst and most egregious kind of abuses.

I call upon all my colleagues to support this amendment on a bipartisan basis. There has never been anything partisan about community action. It has had bipartisan support from the beginning. I rise here to call upon all my colleagues who represent Americans all over this country to give the ghetto area people their opportunity to have a voice and a responsible voice in partnership with their elected officials so that we can go forward and motivate people to help themselves.

That is the key element and I hope it will be preserved in this legislation.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from New York who offered the amendment, if I may have his attention.

Does the gentleman understand who appoints all the members of the citywide CAP program in the largest city in the country today; that is, New York City? Do you know who does that?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, I am aware of that.

Mr. CAREY. Is it the mayor of the city of New York?

Mr. GOODELL. I also know that the mayor of the city of New York has contacted me and you and a great many other Members in opposition to the provisions in the bill. He wants very much to have this restored so that the community action boards can be independent.

Mr. CAREY. And the mayor, of course, is an elected public official and he appoints all the members of the present board, that is correct; is it not? He does not want that for other elected officials but just for the mayor?

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman, he does not appoint all the members of the present board.

Mr. CAREY. I must disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The involvement of the board has been met in New York City not only on community action but it has been made at the neighborhood level throughout the programs in New York.

Mr. CAREY. The record is clear that the mayor appoints all members of the citywide umbrella agency in New York City.

I have one further question. Is it not true under the gentleman's substitute, he does make provision that one-third of the board would be public officials elected or appointed, under your substitute amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Did the gentleman say one-third of the poor?

Mr. CAREY. One-third of the public officials would be elected or appointed.

Mr. GOODELL. The amendment provides that there must be a representation of local government if the local government wishes the representation up to a maximum of one-third.

Mr. CAREY. And they may be public officials elected or appointed?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. They are representative of the local government.

Mr. CAREY. Evidently, when the gentleman puts them in his amendment, they are annointed and deserving and truly diligent and worthy public officials, but when they are in the committee bill, they are low-grade politicians.

Mr. GOODELL. Of course, that is not the distinction, if I may say so.

The gentleman is well aware that the key issue here is not representation on the board. The committee moved to require one-third, one-third, and one-third—from the poor, from the city officials, and from agencies generally in the community.

Ours is somewhat different in that it would require up to one-third, and it would require that they be represented from the local government, if they wish to be. But the key issue here is whether the board that is functioning is going to be independent, whether it is going to have its own voice and set its own priorities, or whether it will be the creature of city hall. The committee bill makes it the creature of city hall.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, many Members in this Chamber have spent perhaps the greater part of their lives connected with governments, whether they be local, county, or municipal, in an effort to serve the people that they were privileged to represent. It goes without saying, and it is an elementary principle, that if we do not have cooperation at the local level of government, whether it is in the city, in the county, or in some rural area, with the local governmental officials, we just are not going to accomplish anything or obtain any results.

We have $1,062,000,000 in community action programs. All of us want to see

every penny of that billion-plus dollars spent wisely and not wasted.

There was evidence before the House Committee on Education and Labor that some funds had been loosely spent. Many are convinced it was because of the lack of involvement of local governments. The record speaks for itself, and I invite you to examine those four volumes of hearings that we have conducted since last June 12.

We must get the local governments more involved in this program if we are going to have a constructive program and if we are going to have a program that is going to endure and survive the next year, the next 5 years, or the next 10 years to serve the people in the ghettos and serve the people in the rural areas. To do so we must get the local governments involved, more so than they have been in the past, or somewhere along the line we are going to have too much trouble in the enactment of this program in the future.

To my way of thinking, every Member in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, can vote against this amendment. Sections 210 and 211 of the committee bill to which the amendment is directed were carefully worked out on a bipartisan basis in committee.

In the language worked out in committee for sections 210 and 211 we simply provide that a community action agency shall be a State, municipality, or a local subdivision of that State. Or they may, if they wish, designate a private, nonprofit agency or some other public agency to serve as the community action agency. But in all instances the poor are represented.

The amendment adopted in the committee provides in each instance for a board, at least one-third of which shall consist of representatives of the poor. Another third shall be elected public officials or their representatives. The remainder shall be civic leaders, business, labor, church groups, patriotic groups in the communities or throughout the area that the community action program covers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down. The provision in the bill is reasonable. I am hopeful not only that we will vote down the amendment but also, when we go to conference, that this provision will remain unaltered in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I desire to join my distinguished friend the gentleman from Kentucky in what he has just said. This is a good and important provision in this bill. A lot of work has gone into it. It is important that this bill not be splintered.

Those who are in favor of moving this bill to a final and successful conclusion will, in my judgment, support the gentleman. I ask my colleagues to defeat the pending amendment.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact, I ask the chairman of the committee, that there was testimony before our committee that in Newark a rump organization took over a community action board, ran away with it, and gave neither the city administration nor the OEO nor anyone else any control over the activities of that community action board?

This amendment, offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, would prevent that kind of runaway activity; is that not a fact?

Mr. PERKINS. That is absolutely correct.

First let me state that in the Newark hearings before the committee there was no evidence that the workers in the so-called poverty program incited the riot. There were some statements on the part of some people that they may have created a certain climate, but there was no evidence that they incited a riot.

The amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon certainly will eliminate this situation, and eliminate it in many other cities of the country where it crept up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentlemen that the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader, has been recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say further that the provision referred to as the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is a part of the bill reported by the committee. It is true that the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon did have a major part in the formulation of this amendment, but it is a provision which was worked out by the committee and it is a part of the bill. It is not a pending amendment; it is a provision in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, we have heard time and time again that the local members of the OEO staff and others and local members of the committee have supported the committee bill, but in this particular case we have a situation in which again and again and again the local people involved in the war on poverty are indeed against the committee bill in this section.

What we are doing with this amendment is just this: We are providing for a balanced committee to operate the war on poverty—a balanced committee between local public officials, private agencies and, most importantly, the poor themselves.

Whereas the statement by the chairman and others indicates that the committee bill will involve the poor, I say it will involve the poor only indeed in an advisory capacity. Under the committee bill the delegation of authority goes directly to the local political subdivisions. Might I note parenthetically, what a strange contrast in philosophy. Whereas the majority leader and the chairman of the committee have on occasion in the past rejected all concepts of local political subdivisions controlling education programs, they are now coming out and saying that we want to give this authority to the local political subdivisions.

Are we not now at the heart of the matter? It is do we or do we not believe that we should have the poor effectively involved in making their own decisions and in having adequate and effective representation in the war on poverty. Or do we intend to give the control back to the bosses in city hall?

Now let us recognize that there have been in some city administrations an effective involving of the poor. Yet the events of the last summer point to the fact that the poor are not adequately represented under the present program. They have been promised things that they have not received and they have not had a voice. I suggest to you that we need a balanced program involving local public officials, private agencies, and especially the poor themselves, not just in an advisory capacity but involved in the decisionmaking. The method to do that is through the Goodell amendment proposed today.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

cisionmaking. The method to do that is

Mr. Chairman, there may be some confusion in the minds of the Members as to what the difference between the provisions in the committee bill known as the Green amendment and the provisions of the Goodell amendment might be and how they conflict. I think very simply put, it is this: The Green amendment provides that the community action agency, the one with the executive authority to make decisions as to what a community action program will be and how it will be carried out, shall be the State or a political subdivision of the State. The Goodell amendment provides for a community action agency with representation from local elected officials to have this executive authority, or the authority to make the decisions. The Green amendment does provide for a board, but it is only an administrative board, a board without decisionmaking power and a board that would be empowered only to carry out the decisions made by the State or the political subdivision of the State which is the community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, the question has often been asked, "Why not involve and bring into community action locally elected officials?"

Mr. Chairman, many of us have complained in the past that the structure of community action bypassed the State and local officials to set up a separate, independent branch of Government so to speak in the local community. It is completely bypassing the locally elected officials. This should be remedied.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will remedy that situation. However, the Goodell amendment does not turn the program around 180° as does the Green amendment which is contained in the bill and referred to as sections 210 and 211.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill in order to make this 180° turn takes the poor and the local businessman out of the decisionmaking process in the community action program.

Further, Mr. Chairman, it is my opin-

ion that we have another problem here that goes beyond sections 210 and 211. Once we say that the State or local municipality is the community action agency, then look at section 212 that defines what a community action agency must be able to do. It says here that—

A Community Action agency—

And this would be the State or local municipality or subdivision of the State—

must have the authority under its charter or applicable law—

I presume that would be the State constitution or the charter of a city—

to receive and administer funds under this title.

That means Federal funds going to the State or local municipality.

Then, Mr. Chairman, later on at page 177 it says that these funds channeled through the State or local community can go to public or private nonprofit agencies acting as grantees, contractors and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this raises a real question as to whether a State or local community has the authority under its constitution or under its charter to receive Federal funds and then channel them to a nonprofit agency or to a private agency to act as the grantee of these funds.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it raises a real question as to whether church-related schools operating Headstart programs could receive these funds through a State or local municipality, or whether the State or local municipality could be designated under the law as a community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion many of the States would be precluded, under their respective constitutions, from having the powers which are set forth in section 212 and meeting these qualifications.

Therefore, the State in many instances would be prohibited from acting as the community action agency.

Mr. Chairman, we have had no testimoney presented before our committee as to how many State constitutions and local charters would allow a community action agency, State or local group, to exercise the functions required under section 212.

It is my further opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the church-state relationship is raised by the wording of this section.

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

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois can clarify for me, as a colleague of his from the great State of Illinois, what the present attitude of Mayor Daley of Chicago would be toward this amendment?

Does the gentleman think he would be for or against it?

Mr. ERLENBORN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] that the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is probably in a better position to answer the gentleman's question, since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has a more direct line to the office of the mayor than does the gentleman who now occupies the well of the House.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have listened very carefully to debate on this amendment. Obviously those who oppose the committee bill have not taken the trouble to read all of its provisions. I do not know where they were when the bill was being discussed in committee. I call the attention of my colleagues to page 171 of the committee bill, which provides in section 210 that a community action agency shall be a State or political subdivision, then, on page 174, we provide in the committee bill that this community action agency shall administer its programs through a community action board. Get that straight. No funds can be spent by a community action agency until the programs have been approved by the community action board and we carefully spell out how that board is to be chosen to assure community participation.

Then on page 175, it clearly states that the Director shall provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title. To suggest that the victims of party will not have a voice in formulating these programs is to depart from the facts.

We say that the taxpayers' money shall go to an agency controlled by the electorate, either a municipal, county, or a State, but none of that money can be spent until a community action board has been set up, and, I repeat, it is spelled out how this board is to be set up and what it is to consist of. Then it provides that the Director shall promulgate regulations which will give that board the say-so on these programs.

So, do not let these people kid you that somehow or other we have eliminated the poor.

If this provision of the bill is defeated in the Committee, I shall ask for a rollcall vote, and I want to spread across the RECORD those Members who do not have confidence in the elected officials of their respective communities, in the mayors, the city councils, county boards, and, yes, in their State Governors—those who do not have confidence in letting elected officials control the taxpayers' money.

We are talking about millions of dollars here. I want the RECORD to identify those who do not have confidence in these elected officials. I want the mayors of these communities to know how their congressmen voted in giving them basic control over the money spent by the poverty program.

I want to show who the Members are who——

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Not at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to show who the Members are who support the establishment, as the gentlelady from Oregon said, of a separate government—a shadow government—that is not elected by the people. Who are the Members of Congress who believe in operating these programs and spending vast sums of the taxpayers' money by people who have no one to account to.

I say to the Members that what we did in the committee bill is to assure that this program goes forward with the full cooperation of the duly elected officials of the community who have the respect and confidence of the electorate, men and women who periodically must go before their electors and account for their stewardship.

Mr. Chairman, I say that defeat of the committee bill, and substitution with the Goodell amendment will put this program right where it is now. We saw this summer the mayor in Aurora, Ill., who witnessed a riot in his city, unable to improve the poverty program to help eliminate the conditions which led to the rioting because the nominating committee of the community action board in his community refused to have any public officials on the board. Can you imagine a community board keeping a mayor of its city off the board. Well it happened in Aurora under the amendment being offered by the gentleman from New York.

The chairman of the committee mentioned a moment ago about the testimony of Newark witnesses. I invite the Members to read that testimony. Do not take my word for it, read it. See how a renegade group of self-styled leaders took over a community action board in Newark and by the testimony of city councilmen and members of the police department who came before this committee, helped set the stage for mass disturbances in that community. When we asked why these troublemakers were not fired we were told no one had any authority to fire them because the board was completely autonomous. Not even the OEO could interfere once a contract was signed. What kind of colossal foolishness is this?

All over this country in the smaller communities of America, public officials are excluded from the program. No wonder they do not want to participate, because they have nothing to say, and they are not willing to take the responsibility for being in this program and not having anything to say about how these moneys are spent.

So I say to you, my friends, look this over carefully, and then reject the Goodell amendment. Stay with the committee if you want to make this poverty program worthwhile.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Not at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members that there are about 1,010 community action programs in this country, and I might say to my colleagues that a vast majority of these are in communities where a Republican local administration is in control. So this is not a partisan matter we are trying to put over on this Congress. I invite you to talk to your own mayors and talk to your own public officials in your communities, and ask them why they are not participating in the

program. They will tell you the reason they are not participating in the program is because they do not have a voice in the program. The committee bill corrects this serious shortcoming in the present law.

So I urge the rejection of the Goodell amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest a moment ago to my colleague on that side of the aisle, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I must say that I was in agreement with a great deal that the gentleman said.

It seems to me we have been reading in the papers of late about a Congress unresponsive to the needs of the poor. It seems to me it is desirable to get the facts straight.

It was the Congress and not the Office of Economic Opportunity which appropriated $1.7 billion last year for the poverty program.

It was the Congress and not the Office of Economic Opportunity which has voted the funds amounting to more than $20 billion for urban and rural development, for social security, for aid to dependent children, for aid to the elderly, for educational funds for disadvantaged children, and so on and so on.

It is the Congress and not the OEO who will be held accountable by the people if these funds do not go to those for whom they were intended and for the purposes for which those funds are intended.

I must say to my colleagues, I am thoroughly tired of the OEO casting itself in the role of the "White Knight in Shining Armor," the champion of the beleaguered poor, and assigning to the Congress the part of the "Ugly Dragon." The facts of the plot are quite different, for it is the so-called dragon that gave the so-called white knight his armor and his mission.

It is ridiculous for the OEO to call "foul" every time they are questioned about whether the mission is being accomplished. It makes just about as much sense as telling someone who makes a donation to a charity that he has no right to know if his donation was spent for the stated purpose.

In this case the American taxpayers are the donors; they have entrusted the Congress with the task of allocating those funds wisely, and it is far past the time that the Office of Economic Opportunity realizes that they are the dispersal agency—nothing more—not the donor—and not the recipient. They owe it to all: the taxpayer, the poor, and the Congress an accurate accounting of how the funds are spent and whether, indeed, the purpose is being accomplished.

I might add as an aside, if the poor are really interested in improving their condition, they should be equally concerned to see that all of the funds are handled properly and that there is fiscal accountability and that the money does go for the purposes for which it was appropriated.

May I say, in addition, this amendment in the committee bill which is being discussed at this time is not the "Green amendment," as our majority leader has so accurately stated. This was an amendment that was worked on by several members of the committee and many hours were spent on it. It was also a bipartisan amendment to the bill by the committee. There were just about as many Republicans who supported this amendment as there were Democrats on the committee. May I also say, that as I sat through the hearings through the last several weeks on this bill and now for the last week on the House floor, I wondered at times whether it was city hall or poverty that was the enemy being attacked with Federal funds. It was impossible not to question whether we were using Federal money to organize or encourage rival and harassing power centers, to the duly elected community authorities.

What a tragedy it would be if the community action against poverty becomes perverted to an attack on local government as though it were the cause or even held the cure for the problem.

For whatever grievances the poor may have—and the list is long—the picket line around the courthouse, the demonstration at the police station, or the angry rally in the core of the ghetto are not places to learn a skill or to find a willing employer. The goal of the Economic Opportunity Act is for every American to have a decent place to live, enough good food on the table, and a chance to walk with his head held high because he makes his own way in the world and his wife, his children, and his neighbors know it.

Mr. Chairman, when I have heard in the last 2 weeks attacks made on State or local officials—on city hall—I must say to you that I take no personal umbrage because I have never had the honor of being the mayor of a city, a member of a city council, or one of the county commissioners. But I do count many very distinguished Members of this House who did serve with distinction at the local level. The honor roll is long. Among Members now serving in this House we have 30 former mayors. Do you mean to tell me that there is some kind of political metamorphosis that takes place when an individual travels from his hometown to Washington, D.C., and that when he was mayor of a city presiding over city hall, he was unresponsive to the needs of the poor, that he did not concern himself about programs that would help them, but when he came to Washington he suddenly was endowed with all wisdom and all compassion and all concern? I cannot believe that. He had the same concern and compassion as mayor that he has as a Member of Congress.

In addition to 30 Members of this House who were former mayors, we also find we have 34 former city councilmen, 33 former city and county judges, and 57 local and State board chairmen, county commissioners, and supervisors. By what divine wisdom does anyone in this House now argue that future Members of this body must not be and, indeed, cannot be entrusted with this program as they serve today at the local level?

As I said the other day, if State or local officials, duly elected to office, charged with the responsibility and required by law to give an accounting of the funds spent—if such State or local politicians are unresponsive to constituency needs, blind to poverty, and deaf to the needs for change, the answer, as I see it, is to be found in throwing them out of office at the next election. But do not place all of this responsibility and money in the hands of a board that is responsible to no one.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been endorsed by the National Association of Counties. It has been endorsed by the National League of Cities, representing 14,300 cities across this country. Why are these people concerned? Why are they anxious that this amendment be retained in the bill?

I think there are several reasons, but let me give you one. I think there comes a time in the hearings when you finally make up your mind that there must be a change in the legislation if you are going to be able to support it. That moment in the hearings came when a gentleman who was a community action representative, or chairman of a community action program in Oregon, testified before the committee. He had said that he wanted more power put into the hands of the local CAP agency. He had been critical of the local school board.

I asked him how the school board was chosen. He said they were elected by all the people in the community. This is the testimony, and allow me to read from the hearings that were held this year, just a couple of months ago. I said to him:

How are the CAP people chosen?

And this is the chairman of the CAP agency in Oregon. If he is chosen this way, they are chosen the same way in countless communities across the country. The chairman of the CAP board in Medford, Oreg., said:

We are very undemocratic in this way. We choose ourselves initially. We went to the county court and we said, will you approve this. This was for the first board.

I said:

A school board that is elected by the people supposedly has the best judgment to run the educational programs. You would like an agency that is self-selected and approved by the judges, or whoever it is, to have superior authority over the duly-elected representatives?

Mr. Day said:

This bothers me. We sit there not responsible to anybody and we are handling something like $400,000 a year of taxpayers' money. Not a one of us is elected by the public generally and I realize that it is a tremendous responsibility, but it is not the school boards that we have difficulties with. It is the administration establishment.

And then I said, in effect, "You said that you would like to see CAP get more power to compel other agencies to work with them"— other agencies that have been elected—and he said, "Yes." I said:

What do you mean by this?

Mr. Day said:

We have several examples. . . . We see the Neighborhood Youth Corps, for instance, being improperly handled.

I wish I had time to quote the entire colloquy because it bears on this amendment. It appears on page 2695 of the hearings. Mr. Day continued:

The schools are running the in-school program, and some outfit with the Labor Department is running the out-of-school program.

He continues:

I would like to see CAPs have the first shot at funding any type of program and let them delegate it to a school, for instance. I would like to see the CAP board have a real meaningful write off authority or veto authority on this type of program in our area.

Mr. Chairman, if this board for one community action agency can be self-selected, not one of them elected by the public generally—and as the chairman of the board said——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And as the chairman of the CAP board said:

We sit there not responsible to anybody, and handling $400,000 of the taxpayers' money.

If this can happen here under the present law, this same thing can happen in any community action agency in the country. Others, we know, have been elected by 1 percent of the poor, quote unquote, 2 percent of the poor, or 6 percent of the poor.

If we are going to provide hundreds of millions of dollars ostensibly to help so many of our people find their way out of "that air-tight cage of poverty," then we ought to make every effort to indeed see that the money goes to the poor.

I would give one example that surely everybody in this House is aware of—the accounting of funds in the Haryou Act of central Harlem. This was one of the reports I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] that I have been trying to get, but have been unable to.

The preliminary audit of that shows that $383,000 in the Haryou program alone has been disallowed by the auditors, though, a postaudit does little to help the poor. The committee bill simply asks that elected people bear the responsibility, that they be held fiscally responsible for all of the funds, and that we stop this nonsense of doling out money from the Federal Government to any agency that wants to qualify.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentlewoman refer to parks in California?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will discuss that if I am allowed to offer an amendment tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I have one other thing and then I will yield to Members.

I do not think the Congress aimed to create autonomous groups to displace decisionmaking processes of State, county, and local governments, or to fund with Federal dollars dissident groups intent on reversing decisions which the duly elected school boards or duly elected county or local governments have made.

As I said the other day, no one challenges the right of dissent, but we do question the wisdom of requiring others to pay taxes to finance it. The committee bill does not intend—nor do any of its provisions provide—that poor people will no longer be able to help shape decisions affecting their lives. The opposite is true, for the bill specifically provides that community action boards shall insure participation of the poor through giving poor people at least one-third of the seats on such boards. But it also provides that those who are helping to pay the bill and who also live in this same community shall have a voice through their elected officials on how their money is to be spent and how programs can be coordinated with other existing programs.

In the committee bill we are defending the right—indeed the responsibility of State and local governments—to make hard decisions on local problems. In fact, the bill demands engagement by local elected politicians so that they cannot avoid tough decisions on the battlelines of the war on poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Goodell amendment will be defeated and that this House will give their support to the committee bill which was worked out on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the issue here on this particular vote is quite simple. The question is, will we involve State and local governments as partners but not as masters? Will we make local governments—again I include both State and local governments—participants but not the dominating participant.

I am not here to speak up for the Office of Economic Opportunity. I believe my record here is clear on my reservations concerning certainly the Washington aspect of the Office of Economic Opportunity. My record is clear in voting for a substantial reduction in the funds in the overall program.

I happen to think that the Headstart ought to be transferred to the Office of Education. I think there ought to be a great many other revisions made in the management of the program and the responsibilities of the Office of Economic Opportunity at the Washington level.

However, I do think that the Goodell amendment in this instance ought to prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I can recall vividly the arguments in the last 3 years when proponents of this community action program spoke in the well of this House. In justifying the community action program they argued that we must break the traditional methods of dealing with poverty and the poor. They argued that it was essential and necessary to encourage the poor to help themselves in the unfortunate cirmumstances in which they were living. They argued that the traditional role of local government was inadequate; it had failed in the past and therefore we had to have a new technique by which the disadvantaged would have the hope of participating and helping themselves with the assistance of Federal funds.

I must confess that I was not sold or persuaded. I did not really believe that this new technique would work. However, I come from a community of 220,000, a county of 385,000, the fourth largest in the State of Michigan, and a substantial industrial county, with our share of the poor, the unfortunate and the disadvantaged. Last week, a week ago today, as a matter of fact, I met with about 150 people who followed the course that was outlined in the bill for community action for the last 3 years. These were people from all walks of life. They were the most affluent and the poorest; people who had made this program work by following the formula that has been in the law up to now. I admitted in their presence that I was wrong—that this new approach to involve the poor was a better one than what we had followed over a long period of years in this country. I was proud to see those who were affluent in our community and those who were the poorest sit down and discuss with me and perhaps to some extent disagree with me about the dollars but sell me that the community action program, where you have a partnership of local government, State government, and the poor, is the best answer. On my right during this 2½ hours of discussion was the mayor of my community, an able nonpartisan local official. He agreed with me that he was apprehensive initially that the program would work with the new technique but he was pleased with the way it was operating. He was not urging me to change the old formula because it had worked. He found that this community of 220,000 by working with this group, the people from the poverty-stricken areas, was doing the job and that this was the best way to get the results we wanted with the dollars we invested at the Federal level.

So I say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle we have traditionally felt and we do today that we want local government to be strengthened and not to be weakened.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this matter.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, based upon my personal observations of a relatively large industrial community, I am sold on the idea that we can get the best return from our Federal contribution, we can get the best return from the contribution made locally, in cash or in kind, by having a partnership between local government and the State government, as recommended in the

Goodell amendment, and by the vigorous participation of responsible people from the poverty-stricken areas. It is my hope and belief that they will no longer be hesitant to come in and participate with the local people in the resolution of the problems, problems which they could not heretofore solve.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say if we really want to make local government work in the solution of these problems, we should join with the poor as partners and not exclude them from participation. We should not turn the program over to the big-city politicians and any others who might use it for purposes not intended in the legislation.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the concern of the distinguished minority leader for the poor and for local government is touching, indeed.

Now, let us examine what can happen under the plan being advocated in the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. Chairman, the paradox is that State governments should be arbiters of specific needs and solutions of the local communities which, of course, are their creation; that they should be the arbiter to be left out of a modern State legislature. It goes squarely against the trend toward increasing home rule.

Mr. Chairman, what does it add to the existing statutory framework of community action? Delay, friction, and confusion. Delay, because the State's review of local proposals and formulation—subject to reconsideration at the Federal level—cannot help but add another 3 or 4 months to the funding process if the State is to take its responsibilities seriously.

There is bound to be friction because a State is not required to contribute any program resources and community residents are bound to resent being told by someone in the State capital that they have not properly conceived their own local problems and needs. Suppose, for example, the community agency proposes to run a legal services program and the State disapproves because the head of the State community action program thinks family planning is more important. It is possible. Confusion is certain, because State governments have little competence to assess grassroots needs and formulate programs to meet them. In other words, the sponsors of this proposal recognize this when they provide that the Director could override any or all of a State agency's planning and could even assume the functions thereof. In other words, the whole idea is hedged. When someone does not have the courage of his convictions, it is time to consider whether they are good convictions or not.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the community action agency can appeal over the head of the State agency to the Federal Government, it still has no certainty about where its program proposals stand until the very end of a long process.

Mr. Chairman, delay, friction, and confusion are only a part of the problem. A State plan could not provide an interlocking and mutually consistent program such as the committee bill proposes to do. Community action is not a single action as envisioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The committee, after a considerable debate, has provided a well-balanced structure relating our existing law, plus some significant changes, to go after this.

I am against the amendment by the gentleman from New York, very strongly, as is the gentlewoman from Oregon who just indicated so in her speech, but I am against it for entirely different reasons than indicated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. Because I not only was present at the Newark, N.J., hearings in the committee, I, as a matter of fact—and the record will so show—asked more questions perhaps than anyone else. And not one iota of evidence was adduced from those three witnesses from the city of Newark to connect one single poverty worker with the disturbance in Newark. And any statement to the contrary is answered flatly by the record.

Mr. Chairman, each of us have a variety of reasons for being for or against an idea. I am against this idea because I am convinced in my own mind that the States do not have the resources, the competence, to handle programs, as are set forth in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, because I know the hour is getting late, but I believe it might be helpful to try and clarify this debate slightly——

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. REID of New York. Yes, I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see a number of Members standing. Are they all seeking recognition on this amendment? And if so, we will not be able to finish by 5:30.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:30 p.m.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] is recognized.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is very clear that there are two provisions in the pending committee bill that are unwise. The first of these is the Green amendment, because very clearly, in my judgment, the thrust of this is to turn out the community action agencies, and turn over direct control of them to governmental entities, such as city hall which with some exceptions—notably New York City—would stifle innovation and flexibility. It could move the community action agencies back into the smoke-filled rooms and into the arena of the political clubhouse. I believe in this respect it is very clearly a mistake.

I would submit the principal purpose of a community action board is to mount a meaningful campaign to assist those living in poverty to obtain a better way of life with lasting jobs. It is not—and I repeat—it is not a proving ground for officials elected to other positions of public trust in other areas of competence. I believe that the Green provision should be amended in the committee bill to insulate the innovative capabilities and capacities of the CAPS from political domination.

The second provision, Mr. Chairman, that is unwise is to place a requirement on local community action boards that they must put up 10 percent or one-half of the local share in cash.

It is very clear I think that many communities and many CAP's could not meet this requirement and that these new cash requirements might have to be met from tax funds and that many localities do not have the tax resources to provide those additional funds.

More tragically, there would no doubt be local officials who would be unwilling to obligate public tax funds to this purpose. The supreme irony is that there might well be communities whose residents most need the help that would be unwilling to take this action.

Clearly this cash requirement is inimical to voluntary support and wide support on the part of a number of philanthropic agencies, religious organizations, YMCA's and church groups.

Mr. Chairman, I think both of these provisions in the bill should be changed.

The Goodell-Quie substitute clearly does several things.

First, it removes the upper limit of 51 as the maximum number on a community action board, which would be very helpful in New York City.

Second, it removes the local share cash requirement.

Third, it says that at least a third of the members should be public officials.

It makes no requirement that a third be public officials and clearly it is the intent of the substitute not to place community action agencies in city hall.

The debate today has touched on what several mayors believe about this, and it is my understanding that Mayor Lindsay of New York believes that the Goodell substitute in respect to its amendments relative to the Green provision is an improvement.

The mayor of New York does, however, have serious reservations with regard to the State plan in the Goodell substitute because he believes this would add another administrative layer, lessening the involvement of the community in community action and making it more difficult for New York City to proceed effectively.

It is my understanding that, on balance, Mayor Lindsay would oppose the Goodell substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to

oppose the substitute and if it is defeated I would urge the adoption of amendments to clarify and improve the deficiencies I have noted in the committee bill.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, last week and again yesterday, I spoke to my colleagues in the House about the importance of retaining the specialized and concentrated focus on the problem of poverty which is provided by the independent Office of Economic Opportunity.

The thrust of my remarks on those two occasions was that poverty is a matter of urgent and special concern, which required urgent and special solutions best provided by an independent Federal agency whose sole responsibility is the war against poverty.

The same argument applies even more strongly to local antipoverty efforts. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now before the House to strike committee revisions of title II, which would require that community action agencies be public agencies, is essential to the effective continuation of these local programs. I heartily support this crucial amendment.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act as it now stands, local programs may be administered by nonprofit, private community action agencies. These agencies have grown in many communities to be important social forces, inspiring both public and private concern and action in behalf of innercity economically deprived residents. Most important is the involvement of the poor themselves in directing and implementing the policies and programs of these agencies. The independent community action agencies afford a unique exercise in democracy for many people who otherwise would have little or no opportunity to direct the course of their neighborhoods and communities.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that if the antipoverty programs on the local level were submerged into the structure of local government organizations, that this involvement of the poor in helping themselves and their neighbors would be lost, as would the flexibility of an independent agency whose sole concern is carrying out a successful antipoverty program in the community.

The case for this amendment could not be better stated than it was 2 weeks ago by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], when he said:

> The goal of Community Action is to help people help themselves, rather than to subject them to welfare-type services. It is a means to allow the poor to act, not simply be acted upon. It is a source of innovation and new approaches to break the shackles of poverty. To have any hope of success, Community Action Boards must have real authority and balanced membership, including the poor themselves. They cannot function effectively as a part of City Hall.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will see the compelling logic of this statement, and that we will preserve independence and citizen-participation in this vital aspect of the poverty program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER].

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodell substitute and urge the Committee to adopt it as a progressive step. It is aimed at maintaining the innovation and creativity of independent community action agencies and furthermore it is aimed at providing the job opportunity board, as proposed in the Goodell substitute, as a means of insuring that there shall be job orientation in meaningful jobs for those to be served through local CAP agencies.

If we do this, we will prevent the regressive and backward step contained in the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am utterly amazed that people who serve in elective office at the Federal level would take the position today that some do and say, "You can trust me as an elected official, but you can't trust anybody else." If you support the Goodell amendment, you have said to every elected official at the State level and every political subdivision below the State level that you represent, "I stand above you. You can trust no one but me." Defeat the amendment. Give the responsibility for community action agencies to responsible elected officials who have a responsibility to their electorates. Remove them from those who have no responsibility to anyone. I trust the elected officials in my district and I believe they trust me. Why do you not do the same?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discovery on the part of the distinguished minority leader that the community action program is working, I would hope that he would support the present statutory framework. I am opposed to "city hall" domination as proposed in the Green amendment. I am equally opposed to "statehouse" domination as proposed in the Goodell amendment. I urge support, when it is offered, for the Hawkins amendment, which will strike from the bill the Green amendment and retain the present language.

The unique feature of the community action program is the direct involvement of the poor in planning for their own needs. The very failure of the traditional approach necessitated new thinking and innovation. Community action has stirred fresh hopes and aspirations which it would be cruel to stifle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

(By unanimous consent Mr. GURNEY yielded his time to Mr. QUIE.)

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, paraphrasing the comments of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the last few days, if we leave the Green amendment in the bill, it will destroy community action as we know it now. What the Green amendment does is to say that the States and the local political subdivisions shall be the community action agencies. The three-legged board consisting of local public officials, the interested agencies, and the poor will not be the governing board in that case. The community action board will strictly be acting in an advisory capacity. The poor need to have a voice in these programs. We do not want city hall to dominate the program. Let them have a voice. City hall ought to have a voice. But they should not dominate the program as they would under the Green amendment. I ask support of the Goodell amendment in order that the work under the community action agency will continue to give hope to the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I believe that local decisionmaking is what we are all for. Officials at the State level have traditionally been disinterested and unconcerned with the problems of the poor; that is why we have a Federal poverty program—most State administrations—with a few notable exceptions—could not have cared less. Hopefully, the States will rapidly mobilize their resources and leadership to meet headon the challenge of urban and rural poverty alike. But until that time arrives, we should defeat this amendment and others like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE].

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, as I believe it is the most meaningful way to carry forth the poverty program.

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

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. It is a misnomer if we say that State participation in the Goodell amendment would give the State control. The Director would permit them to do so only if they devised a plan acceptable to the Commission, and then the money would go directly to the local community action agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, the Goodell amendment would require the involvement of local officials on community action boards. Both the status and the composition of the boards would, in my opinion, be improved. It would increase the involvement of local government without giving it domination, and it would, in addition, perform the very important task of creating a Job Opportunity Board with the features about which Mr. STEIGER spoke.

In addition, it will eliminate the requirement that one-half of the local con-

tribution must be in cash. Without this amendment a great many desirable community programs will be forced to end.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose substituting a State stranglehold over community action programs for municipal. I am opposed to both.

I believe there is a hooker in the Goodell amendment, in that it requires 50-percent contribution from the local community, and therefore would kill community action effectively altogether. Nobody has mentioned that. As I read the amendment, that is in the amendment.

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

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. That is not true. That is a State bonus provision. If the State puts up a dollar the Federal Government will put up a dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, since obviously no one can present an argument in 30 seconds, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

Since so many have been asking me what the end result might be, when we get down to the voting on this bill, I should like to announce if Members are relying on the passage of the Green of Oregon amendment to determine what might be in motions later on, I would be very careful not to assume that if the Green of Oregon amendment should prevail there will be provisions in the motion to recommit to protect their opposition to the bill.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a brief word in support of sections 210 and 211 of the pending bill, the so-called Green amendment.

The House Education and Labor Committee, as we all know, devoted a great deal of attention to this subject of community action agencies. A bipartisan majority of that committee believed that locally elected public officials should have more of a voice in the antipoverty effort in their own communities. I agree.

The basic objective of the language in the committee bill is simply this: to insure that authority over the conduct of community action programs is not divorced from accountability to the people in the community for the honest and efficient operation of those programs.

The pending bill does not do away with participation of the poor—it requires that one-third of community action board members be representatives of the poor.

The bill would not force unwilling communities to include themselves in the community action program of a State or other political subdivision. Section 210 (e) preserves local freedom of choice in this area.

Nor do I fear abuse of this arrangement by local elected officials. Their conduct of local programs is, by definition, reviewable at the polls by local citizens. If mistakes are made, if inefficiency or malfeasance has occurred in the program, I trust the judgment of the voters to make the necessary corrections.

Under the present arrangement, the local electorate is, in many cases, deprived altogether of a voice in these programs. Large sums of money are granted to privately organized agencies which have broad authority to spend in the community but their decisions are not reviewable by that community. Programs that could be part of a coordinated, long-term community development plan are sometimes undertaken independently and, perhaps, without regard to parallel or preexisting plans by the elected leadership of the political subdivision. The committee bill, on the other hand, fosters integrated planning, the increased commitment of local resources, and responsiveness to the expressed wishes of the electorate as a whole.

I might say that I look forward to support for the committee bill on this point by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. He expressed intent to support this type of measure well over a year ago. At the House Education and Labor Committee hearings on March 8, 1966, he said, and I quote:

> Any time you let the poor have a voice, and let the State come in to coordinate a program, I am willing to vote for this (antipoverty) bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's statement describes rather well the intent of sections 210 and 211. Under these sections the voice of the poor is preserved and the States are encouraged to coordinate antipoverty programs. I look forward to the approval of the committee language and to Mr. QUIE's support for it as well.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OLSEN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. CAREY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, the choice before the Committee is now clear.

We have before us a committee bill, supported by a large majority of the majority party and by a substantial number of the minority party when it was discussed in committee.

I might put it this way: If you are looking at two eggs before you, this one has been candled and the other one is scrambled. We know what is inside this amendment but no one knows what went into this minority omelet.

The Green of Oregon amendment, so-called, was constructed by a considerable number of people on the committee, and clearly provides for the participation of the poor. It mandates the participation of the poor. At least one-third of those on the community board must be poor. In fact, more than one-third of those on the community board may be from the poverty sector.

Under the Green of Oregon amendment we do not put politics into the poverty program. We say, "politics out, but public servants in." Public servants in the field of education, public servants in the field of health, public servants in the field of elected office. We provide ways in which they can bring their considerable talents to bear on the problems of the needy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT and Mr. PERKINS yielded their time to Mr. CAREY).

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], observed, there are hangnails in this amendment, and hidden pockets.

The so-called bonus for the State really is the beginning of a State-matching plan. Some States can do this and some not. It will bring about a disorderly redirection of the program. It will probably penalize the poorer States.

This was not well considered. It was not an amendment tested in the committee. We have not had adequate discussion of it in the Committee of the Whole. It comes late in the day.

If the Members will consider carefully, what we really want to do in community action is to carry on phase 2 of community action. The first phase was to get a total awareness of problems of the poor. We have that.

Now we move into the phase where we bring to bear on the problems of the poor all the talents of society.

That means bringing into the community to help the poor all those who can do a constructive job—as provided for in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Goodell amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] to close debate.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, there is only one issue here and that is whether we are going to adopt something which is clearly thrown together at the last minute like the last Xeroxed amendment we had up here or whether or not we are going to stick by the firm bipartisan approach we had in the committee.

The Green of Oregon amendment—that is, the principal amendment under discussion here—was put together by a bipartisan group in the House Committee on Education and Labor. Let us not tear it apart here at the last minute, because if you want to build responsibility in this program, you will vote for the Green of Oregon amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GOODELL and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 205.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POVERTY HAS BECOME BIG BUSINESS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, every right-thinking person is opposed to poverty. In this battle we are not dealing with attitude, but rather with the weapons that are employed.

It has become increasingly evident that overemphasis has been placed on questionable methods, and little or no credit given to the proven approaches. This gives rise to confusion. Enlightened people are made to wonder if we are not using 2-ton trucks, in many instances, to do the work of a pickup. Let us keep this problem and its treatment in proper perspective.

In the first place, from the excessive publicity that has been given to the so-called war on poverty, one might conclude that except for this legislation little if anything is being done in this country in behalf of the unfortunate who receive low incomes. The truth is that the so-called war on poverty crusade represents a relatively minor factor in support of the overall upward trend of low incomes. After all, the chief weapon is to keep the doors of opportunity open.

WAR ON POVERTY IS NOTHING NEW

In fact, at the time—3 years ago—that amid ballyhoo and arm twisting the war on poverty was put on the books, the Congress had already that year provided in excess of $30 billion for Federal antipoverty purposes.

As the gross national product has increased and as industrial development has advanced, low income earnings have steadily moved upward and the number in that category has steadily decreased. This war on poverty has been going on ever since the Republic was established. It has been waged—with gratifying success—in the home, in the churches, in local communities, in job opportunities provided by business and industry, in the field of education, and on scores of other fronts.

Mr. Chairman, if one should judge by the reams of publicity concerning the war on poverty in recent years he would conclude that masses of our people are living in hopeless squalor. The "poverty cult" has estimated that from 20 to 80 million Americans are hopelessly trapped in poverty. Few have bothered to examine the validity of these figures and claims.

IS EXTENT OF POVERTY OVERDONE?

There appeared in the U.S. News & World Report on September 4, 1967, a most significant article written by John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois. He meticulously developed the facts and concluded that the poverty claims are terribly overrated. Here, in brief, are some of his findings:

Ninety-six percent of all American families have an adequate minimum daily intake of nutrients. In 1920 only 50 percent were so fortunate.

Automatic cooking equipment is found in 99 percent of U.S. households.

About 99 percent of all American families have purchased electric or gas refrigerators.

Television is found in 92 percent of our homes.

Today nearly 92 percent of all U.S. households have telephones. Only 35 percent had them in 1920.

In 1910 only one of 10 families had access to hospitals for childbirth. Today 98 percent are born in hospitals. The number was 97 percent in 1960.

Professor Parrish exposes as a myth the assumption that all who make less than $3,000 a year are poverty stricken. This is described as a numbers game.

He points out that many college couples with an income as low as $1,500 manage to get along. A retired couple with a $2,000 income, who own their home, can live very well. They may sport a housetrailer, as thousands do, and live modestly as they see the national parks. The average family in that category may have some savings to draw upon if need be.

Moreover, it is pointed out that the poverty cult statisticians base their assumptions—that $3,000 is the magic figure—upon national consumer price indexes, not realistic as applied to the good shoppers and bargain hunters. There are always food items which sell for less but are wholesome.

There is the school lunch program, with low-cost noon meals for nearly 20 million children.

One million take advantage of the food stamp privilege, where the Government pays a part of the cost of purchases.

The total number of low-income persons reached by various food-subsidy programs came to nearly 30 million in 1966.

These advantages are not taken into account by the statisticians who say all who make less than $3,000 a year are "trapped in poverty."

Thus, the dire picture painted by the politicians and the poverty cult seems very exaggerated.

As an indicator of how well we were doing before the new war on poverty began, the number of American families which made less than $5,000 a year was reduced by 27 percent between 1947 and 1963—a 16-year period.

It must be kept in mind that except for birth control, jobs constitute the only real answer to poverty. Providing jobs is essentially the role of private industry and the business community. The Government does provide generously in the fields of job training and education. The Federal Government has more than 79 separate training and education programs, administered by 15 different agencies and bureaus.

There are at least four major different federally financed job training projects going on. Although very expensive, perhaps this program does some good. There are, however, many recent reports of job training being conducted even more successfully by private industry and in local communities without any Federal aid.

In Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., the Job Development Corp. was formed by a group of community businessmen, without Federal, State, or local financial assistance. They found permanent jobs for 550 individuals, and they are currently training 300 prospects.

Similar job training programs, financed locally, have recently made remarkable records in Rochester, Los Angeles, and elsewhere. It is said they work out much more satisfactorily than do the government-operated training programs.

WELFARE BEGETS WELFARE

There is mounting evidence that excessive fanfare and publicity over welfare programs, particularly the so-called war on poverty, tends to encourage more people to turn to the government as a primary source of livelihood.

In 1950 about a billion dollars was spent on relief; that figure is now approaching $8 billion a year.

In 1960 there were 7 million people on relief. There are now 8½ million—and the number is increasing each year.

All this talk about poverty and its rewards has inspired the so-called poor to organize in order to put pressure on Congress to give them more—not more job training or education, but bigger relief checks. The National Welfare Rights Organization held its first convention in August, with delegates from 26 States.

Only recently Dr. George A. Willey, director of this organization, was quoted as saying:

> Not much of the public has grasped the potential of this movement. It could have much greater power than the civil rights movement. There are 8½ million welfare recipients with a very strong common interest. Welfare is a right.

An August 2, 1967, article in the Philadelphia Post-Dispatch reported that Prof. Richard A. Cloward of the School of Social Work at Columbia University, was spearheading a drive to organize the 8 million now on welfare rolls in order to get higher welfare payments.

Later, on February 26, in Washington, the professor was quoted as saying, regarding more funds for welfare:

> Congress will have to act. It's acting badly now because not enough pressure has been built up.

Those people are not interested in jobs. Their announced objectives do not mention jobs. They are interested in welfare, and more of it. They are organized for a massive raid on the Federal Treasury.

This does not relate to the unfortunate who cannot help themselves. Nor to the self-reliant who strive to make the most of their talents and opportunities. I am speaking of the lazy and trifling, many of whom are organizing to obtain higher rewards from society for being professional beggars. Stripped of personal pride and self-respect, they prefer a handout to a job.

Mr. Chairman, why not absolutely prohibit welfare checks to any able-bodied person when there is a job available, of any kind, that person can do? And there are unfilled jobs of some kind in nearly every community. Look

at the want ads. Call the local employment office.

Abraham Lincoln once said that you cannot permanently help a man by doing for him that which he can and should do for himself. Devices employed in the war on poverty violate that admonition every day.

When the good Lord turned Adam out of the Garden of Eden, He said: "By the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread."

DISTURBING SOCIAL PROBLEMS ARISE

Along with all this is the serious social problems that are being created. Not long ago the National Capital Housing Authority, wanting to help in the war on poverty, offered to pay $1.40 an hour for up to 16 hours a week to teenage children of public housing residents for part-time jobs. Although 154 jobs were offered, there were only 98 takers. This prompted William Raspberry, a Negro writer, to report in the Washington Post:

> Right now there are jobs going begging—jobs that the underprivileged poor could have for the asking.
>
> The embarrassing truth is that some youngsters from poor families simply don't want to work.

ILLEGITIMACY

A multitude of Federal-State programs seem to have generated an explosion of illegitimacy. The reason is obvious: The more children welfare recipients have, the bigger the welfare checks.

Seventeen percent of those receiving help under aid for dependent children—ADC—are born out of wedlock. A Chicago study of the problem there revealed that 53 percent of ADC children are illegitimate.

Today one out of 12 born in this country each year is out of wedlock. One out of every four Negro births is illegitimate. And it is most disturbing that at the present increase rate, every 10th child born in America in the 1970's will be out of wedlock.

In October of 1966 Dr. R. Frank Jones, medical director of Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D.C., reported that 75 percent of girls in one of OEO's Neighborhood Youth Corps projects got pregnant.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Along with this is the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency, the rate of which has doubled in the last 10 years. While all of this is not due to poverty and the craze for welfare, they figure in the upsurge.

While general employment has increased, unemployment among youngsters under 20 has steadily risen: slightly for whites and sharply for nonwhites.

These new social problems are being dumped into the laps of the schools and police. But discipline is different to achieve in the schools, and without discipline education is next to impossible. And compulsory racial integration is creating new antagonisms and problems.

Mr. Chairman, just as excessive and provocative civil rights agitation in this decade has given rise to demonstrations, violence and rioting, so it is that too much welfare and poverty talk have added to our social ills. Too many of our young people are being powerfully molded in a Federal pattern, with less and less chance to know the virtues and rewards of self-reliance.

We are today faced with the problem of keeping children from being infected with a life on public assistance. Welfare recipients, it so often happens, seem to discount standards of achievement and integrity because come what may—illiteracy, drunkenness, illegitimacy, crime—there is always a welfare check.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. Chairman, what does the new approach—the war on poverty—offer as a solution? I have already pointed out that under this program relief rolls have increased. Let us examine its usefulness.

The pending bill would authorize an additional $2 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity to use, superimposed on many other antipoverty programs, in the so-called war on poverty.

This fits in with the philosophy of those who believe that you can cure any problem on the face of the earth if enough Federal money is spent.

When this particular program was begun 3 years ago the Congress did a most unusual thing. In its haste it practically gave the executive branch a blank check to spend billions to finance almost any conceivable scheme designed to improve the lot of the poor.

Consequently, under the guise of helping the poor, hundreds of projects have been activated throughout the land—by no means confined to the areas containing the "pockets of poverty." In a sense it has been a massive scatteration of Federal money. Ingenious schemes have been initiated. In many of these the poverty angle has been purely incidential.

GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME

Only 2 weeks ago, it was announced that $620,000 in antipoverty money was set aside by OEO for an experiment in Government-guaranteed minimum income for those in low-income brackets—whether they work or not. The idea is to lift the annual income of all American families to a $3,000 level. It is being tried out on 800 New Jersey families, with the annual income of each to be supplemented by Government checks in amounts sufficient, when added to what any recipient earns, to total $3,000 a year.

The New Jersey experiment is to be but the beginning. It is to break the ice for a nationwide new and revolutionary venture in State welfarism. The plan would reward the drones and would naturally discourage incentive to work and get ahead. Because the recipients would know that, whether they work or not, they would still get that $3,000 a year.

The Congress has never specifically approved this scheme. It is a glaring example of how a Government agency can spend the taxpayers' money under the blank-check authority granted by the Congress in the war-on-poverty legislation. The approval of the pending bill would, therefore, approve the concept of a guaranteed annual income for all American families—whether they choose to work or not.

OTHER EXAMPLES

Mr. Chairman, the news media have carried hundreds of reports on how the antipoverty program has functioned. It is recognized that there are explanations for many of these accounts, that remedial actions were taken in some cases; but they serve to point up the abuses in the administration of the war on poverty throughout the land. An examination of some of these reports should be revealing and throw light on how the program is working and how recklessly the taxpayers' money is being spent.

In the February 28, 1966, issue of the New York Daily News it was stated that the OEO paid for keeping 37 poor people in the Hotel Astor—plus $9 a day per person for meals. The excuse was that the weather was cold and the favored people lacked adequate heat in their homes.

LEGAL AID FOR POOR

A U.S. Senator reported that under antipoverty's legal aid, Eldorado, Ill., with a population of 3,573, including four lawyers, was allotted $59,589. And in the town of Karnak, Ill., with a population of 677 and no local lawyers, there was an allocation of $65,805 to pay for legal aid to the poor.

There has been much criticism of OEO for hiring lawyers to represent antipoverty workers or enrollees who were accused of crime. In New York an antipoverty group is reported to have provided OEO funds to defend 10 peaceniks who interrupted religious services in St. Patrick's Cathedral in order to protest our involvement in Vietnam.

While there is something to be said for Government aid to help the poor when they need legal aid, in proper cases, any such program by the Federal Government should, of course, be administered by the Department of Justice.

Out in Cleveland, OEO's Community Action for Youth—CAY—was granted $700,000 for 1966. Neither the money nor the equipment was cared for very well. The press said that one Ellen McCulloch was paid $1,632.50 ostensibly to do some confidential research. But it turned out no person by that name could be found. She was evidently a fictitious name used to pad the payroll. Local OEO officials seemed unconcerned.

It was also reported that from CAY's offices in Cleveland between $13,000 and $20,000 worth of business machines and typewriters were stolen. The place was not burglarized. The machines just disappeared. An alert newspaper reporter happened to uncover these infractions.

WILLOW VILLAGE, MICH.

The town of Willow Village, a community in southeast Michigan, according to news stories, received an OEO award of $188,252 to finance a program of self-help for 4,500 residents. The township supervisor said the poverty report was absolutely false. There was not a home in the town, they insisted, over 10 years old, and the homes had an average value of $12,000. It was said no one could be found who was unemployed.

A New York City poverty consultant was hired at $500 a week. Two other consultants were put on the rolls at $60 and $65 per day, and a program director drew $22,500 per year.

A Houston policeman, Lt. M. L. Singleton, chief of Houston's police intelligence

division, testified before a Senate committee that Negro militants on the payroll of the Houston antipoverty program repeatedly tried to stir up riots and other disorders last summer.

ANTIPOVERTY SUBVERSIVES

In Berkeley, Howard Harawitz, a member of the antipoverty board there, admitted that he was a former member of the notorious pro-Communist W. E. B. DuBois Club.

The New York Daily News charged that more than 37 employees of Mobilization for Youth, sponsored by OEO, had subversive backgrounds. Wholesale penetration of MFY by the Communists was charged.

OEO recently granted $400,000 to Southwest Alabama Farmer's Cooperative, of Selma—over the protest of the entire Alabama delegation, local officials of OEO and a report to OEO that the project was not economically feasible. Two of the project's leaders were Shirley Mesher and John Zippert.

Shirley, the coordinator, was in Alabama in early 1965 to join in the Selma-Montgomery march, and is said to be a close associate of Dian Bevel who recently went to Hanoi and is the wife of Black Panther advocate James Bevel of Chicago.

John Zippert, former president of the student body of City College in New York and a fieldworker for CORE, was an agitator against the U.S. war effort in Vietnam. He was a member of the American Youth Festival Committee and aided in promoting the Ninth Communist Youth Festival in Algiers.

In New York one Robert Schrank has been director of work experience programs under OEO's Neighborhood Youth Corps. He has a long record of Communist activity.

A year ago in New York the Black Arts Repertory Theater in Harlem was raided. It was funded by OEO's community action program and reported to have received $115,000 in Federal money. The raid netted an arsenal of deadly weapons, a pipe bomb, sharpened meathooks, pistols, knives, clubs, and a cache of ammunition.

MORE ANTIPOVERTY TROUBLEMAKERS

The mayor and three other Newark officials said antipoverty workers there made significant contributions to the city's riots. A leftwing group known as Students for a Democratic Society is said to control two of that city's eight war-on-poverty efforts. Another new left group, Newark Community Union project, also controls an antipoverty program and holds that the United States is a "warmongering, racist society."

A Newark antipoverty liaison, Jesse Allen, was reported to have gone to Puerto Rico last spring to take part in Communist-led agitation for Puerto Rican independence. The trip was financed by the Communists.

NASHVILLE'S "LIBERATION SCHOOL"

From Nashville the story of a "liberation school" which was subsidized by OEO. It was run by an official of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC. Operated by one Fred Brooks, a black power advocate and chairman of Nashville's SNCC, the school preached hatred for whites. One instructor was George W. Ware, who accompanied Stokely Carmichael to Cuba. He praised the Detroit riots.

Nashville officials cited a "flyer" advertising the school which said it would train people in "activist civil disobedience" and take action "by any means necessary."

AGITATORS AND STRIKES

In Buffalo seven of nine city councilmen, according to the press, wanted "all Federal antipoverty activity removed from Buffalo because of the agitation and disruptive action on the part of the antipoverty workers in local affairs."

In Perth Amboy, N.J., last summer the mayor was reported to have accused a local antipoverty leader of "seeking to foment and incite unrest, agitation, and disorder." And a similar charge was said to have been made by the city manager of Rochester.

A Washington newspaper reported that neighborhood poverty workers from the Near Northeast Neighborhood Development Center went on a 5-hour strike to protest impending budget cuts in the city's antipoverty program. The story continued:

> The strikers decided yesterday afternoon to return to work and submit a citywide poverty workers' strike plan to the Underground organization at a strategy meeting Monday.

On May 10, last, the General Accounting Office reported it had found "extensive evidence that Federal antipoverty funds were used in efforts to unionize farmworkers in Florida last year." That was revealed in the Washington Post, May 30.

In Fresno, Calif., 50 pickets appeared at four entrances to a store, carrying signs which read: "Black Power says, 'Strike, Baby, Strike.'" It was revealed that 16 of the pickets had come up from an OEO training center in Watts and joined with union members as a part of their official war-on-poverty training.

Mr. Chairman, is this kind of misuse of taxpayers' money going to help poor people? What is the connection? How absurd can they get? There are a lot of hard-working people in my district who do not want to pay taxes to support this sort of irresponsible waste and extravagance.

The case of Mr. and Mrs. William S. Clark has been cited during debate. It was found that both were on two poverty war payrolls at the same time. They drew a total of $5,178 plus expenses during 12 weeks of 1965. Clark was director of the Headstart program and at the same time served as supervisor of a Neighborhood Youth Corps project. Mrs. Clark was listed as overall supervisor of the NYC program and was on the Headstart payroll as an instructor.

In the Bronx a preacher was found serving three churches and at the same time was a civil defense inspector. He got on the OEO payroll and was soon charged with stealing $9,000 of antipoverty money.

Beryl Bracewell of Kennedy, Minn., wrote his Congressman complaining about an OEO project hiring one of his employees whom he had trained as an apprentice in plumbing and heating for 2 years, conforming with the wage and hour law. In his letter he concluded.

> Now we have my former employee around town trying to look employed, and I am short on help . . . This makes me feel real good about paying my income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, this experience can be repeated all over the Nation, a thousand times. A mayor in my district recently told me of a Negro janitor who was making nearly $300 a month and was happy and contented until an OEO project was developed. The janitor understandably resigned to take over a local antipoverty job at $800 a month.

Is it any wonder that so many of our people—the taxpayers who are footing the bill—are bewildered by the way they see their money wasted right before their eyes, in broad open daylight? Earlier this year I sent questionnaires to the registered voters in the district I represent. The interest was refreshing and the rate of returns was high. One question was: "Do you feel the war on poverty has been worth the money?" The answers: 87.5 percent said "No," and 6 percent said "Yes."

SEARCHING FOR NEEDY

The Houston Post on August 30, 1967, said Francis Williams, executive director of Harris County Community Action Association got OEO and Labor to grant $900,000 for a manpower program for Houston and added:

> The Neighborhood Centers Association will be paid $177,000 (out of the $4.9 million) to pay workers to conduct a door-to-door search for those in need of help for the new program.

From this it would appear that the poverty people are going from door to door, searching for business. While this procedure may be desirable in an extraordinary situation, its general practice is very reprehensible. A good many people who are working may, after such contacts, decide they can make more by boarding the poverty bandwagon.

Another Houston poverty story—Houston Tribune, September 7, 1967—refers to a new theater being financed by OEO. This subsidy enables the theater to pay rent, lights, sets, costumes, and salaries. This nationalized theater will compete with three or four others in Houston. Due to the antipoverty subsidy the Pilot Theatre charges $1.75, while the competitors are hard pressed to stay in business by charging $5 per seat.

The question follows: Is this helping the poor people in Houston to increase their incomes? Is this a proper function of the war on poverty?

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Scores of instances have been reported involving VISTA volunteers and others on the OEO payroll, who have engaged in voter registration drives and other political activities. Documented cases to this effect have come from Omaha, Nebr.; Gary, Ind.; Atlanta, Ga.; Durham, N.C.; Des Moines, Iowa; Santa Clara County, Calif.; and Arlington, Va., to mention but a few.

Mr. Chairman, is this any way to run a poverty program, to advance the in-

come of those in low-income levels? Is this a responsible way to handle the taxpayers' money?

Here is another indicator of how money is being wasted: During debate on this bill it has been disclosed that OEO put up the money for a $376,000 program through the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to establish a student exchange program. Instead of getting 150 participants, as planned, only 15 were placed—costing $25,066 per enrollee for a one-semester project.

The Detroit News of September 15, 1966, revealed that that city's antipoverty program had been paying $500 a month since the preceding March for a youth center which at the time of the report had not even been opened.

OTHER MISUSES OF FUNDS

OEO has financed distribution of books and booklets, supposedly for the reeducation of the unfortunate and underprivileged. One of them, entitled "Negro Self-Concept," says:

> Much of the aggression of the Negro is a very healthy thing . . . Sit-ins, freedom rides, and other demonstrations are indicative of a mood of aggressiveness—significantly led by young Negroes—that in turn speaks of a more positive racial image.

An OEO outfit in Houston ordered seven telescopic rifle sights, saying they were for conversion to microscopes to be used in manpower programs, in case they should be needed. The explanation did not make sense, and the purchase was blocked by people outside of OEO.

THE JOB CORPS

The financing of OEO's Job Corps has been scandalously expensive. Designed for a year of training of school dropouts between ages of 16 and 21, the annual cost per student has averaged $8,000.

It has been revealed that, by Internal Revenue figures, two out of three American wage earners make less money than it costs to put one boy or girl through a year of Job Corps training.

A General Accounting Office investigation revealed that from January 20, 1965, to December 31, 1966, the average cost per enrollee at the Parks Job Corps Center in California, was $11,000 per year. OEO did not deny this but said this amount was later cut down to $6,500.

It must be assumed that out of this vast expenditure some good must have been accomplished. But many reports indicate the opposite.

The Omaha World-Herald carried a story in September 1967 saying that of the 1,506 trainees who went through the Lincoln, Nebr., Job Corps Center this year, the whereabouts of more than one-half are unknown, and that only 338 are known to be employed.

A report from Kansas City, Mo., dated July 23, told of Mrs. Grace Phillips, director of a Women's Job Corps Center at Excelsior Springs, being served with a warrant charging her with maintaining a public nuisance.

The complaint was signed by 20 residents of the area. They complained that girls at the center were loud, profane, sometimes drunk, and often on the town's once-quiet streets after curfew. They said the girls were promiscuous, sometimes in the yards of residents.

A San Antonio Evening News story reported that Roger Flores who operates a beer and wine lounge posted this notice: "Notice. Sorry—No Job Corps Allowed."

He told the press:

> I'm doing it in self defense. Those boys are roughnecks . . . uncontrolled and uncivilized. They bust up my place every time they come in.

The troublemakers were from the Gary Job Corps Center.

There have, of course, been scores of other complaints about the Job Corps. While the results are, at the best, not impressive, the exorbitant cost of the operation cannot be justified.

Perhaps the Headstart program has more to show for the money that has been expended. If it is desirable to have the Federal Government continue to help finance kindergarten schools, then it would seem logical that it be administered by the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, there is no point in belaboring this matter. I believe that from my meager files on the subject I could cite perhaps 50 more instances comparable to those I have mentioned. Now I know what the explanation is: that corrective actions are undertaken when appropriate, and besides the number of people involved in infractions represent but a limited percentage of the overall total of those engaged in the war on poverty. One is made to wonder how many equally indefensible instances of waste have gone undetected and unrecorded.

But as I see it these many intolerable developments cannot be dismissed as isolated instances. There are simply too many of them for that. I recognize the difficulty in running herd on such a massive, disjointed program. It presents an administrative nightmare. Someone said the poverty crusade has come apart at the seams. Certainly if it is continued it is in need of some major surgery.

MORE BIRTH CONTROL NEEDED

The one thing that stands out as a bright spot in this entire picture is OEO's allotments for family planning and birth control. Its awareness of the relationship of poverty control and birth control is commendable. OEO's commitments in this area have been limited and should have been much more. But it helps.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, birth control is the only real and meaningful answer to this problem, so far as a substantial number in the low-income category is concerned. I am referring in particular to those who have neither the capacity nor the motivation to train, work, and get ahead. Therein we find the hard core of poverty. An antipoverty program, regardless of cost, whose major interest and effort is devoted to family planning would have my wholehearted support.

But as the program is now set up, one must engage in some painfully wishful thinking to expect any long range and significant help in reducing the number of people on relief and in elevating the earning power of those in the lower brackets. If real progress in this area is forthcoming, it will come through the old time-tested methods which have been so successful in the past.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, the debate in this House on the economic opportunity legislation—and particularly on the community action program which is at the heart of its success as well as its controversy—has developed a very interesting pattern.

My colleagues who oppose the program, whether their method is to break it into fragments, amend it to death, or abolish it entirely, practically always manage to avoid addressing themselves to the hard facts of what the community action program is doing in the communities. They snipe at isolated mistakes and temporary reversals, but they are wise to shun discussion of the amazingly constructive impact that community action has made in specific slums, on specific poor people. If they got into that kind of discussion, Mr. Chairman, they would have no way to conceal the weakness of their negative case.

I am for community action, Mr. Chairman, because it works. There is impressive testimony from all parts of the Nation of how well it works, but let me dwell for a moment on a city where I have seen it work at firsthand and gather strength and effectiveness over a considerable period of time.

In Providence, the keystones of community action are education and manpower programs, striking directly at the root causes of poverty.

Eight community schools, administered by Progress for Providence, the community action agency, and the Providence School Department in eight marginal income neighborhoods, run afternoon and evening courses for youngsters and adults. Some 4,000 are enrolled. They get remedial assistance. They receive individual attention. They receive psychological and social guidance. They get hope and a stake in their neighborhood. If community action is gutted, some, most, or maybe all of them will be thrown back on the scrap heap.

Progress for Providence has a flourishing manpower program. In the quarter ending September 30, in just 3 months, this program placed 160 people in full-time jobs with good wages, 40 in on-the-job-training programs and 76 in various other training programs. What happens to them, and people who come after them, if community action is gutted? Forget them? They will be back on the streets and on the dole.

The legal services program, which gives the poor not only vitally needed legal assistance but also, respect for the orderly process of law, handled 851 cases and advised 128 more poor people—again, in a period of just 3 months. A credit union has 782 poor members who are learning to shop, save, and plan wisely. Community workers have in the last quarter referred well over 1,000 poor people desperately in need of various kinds of help and totally ignorant about where they could get it to the appropriate agencies. More than 500 children are enrolled in school department Headstart programs.

And so it goes, Mr. Chairman, and so to my mind it must continue to go. I have just touched on the high points of the Providence community action program, but sufficiently, I hope, to demonstrate

how it is tied together, how it is reaching people who have never been reached before, and how essential it is to the life of this particular city.

I might add that over 60 percent of the employees of Progress for Providence, nearly 800 people, are nonprofessional aides who give vital support to the work of the professionals. We hear a lot from those who would wreck the program, Mr. Chairman, about the so-called poverty bureaucracy. Here is the bulk of that bureaucracy: Poor people, recruited from the slums at minimal wages to help their neighbors and to be trained to help themselves. If community action is gutted, we can forget about them, too.

We may also have to forget about what these people can contribute to the maintenance of law and order in the innercity. Without them last summer, Mr. Chairman, Providence would have had a riot. As it was, there was only a minor incident. These nonprofessional aides of Progress for Providence, these poor people from the slums, formed an impromptu "soul patrol," and to put it succinctly, Mr. Chairman, they "cooled" it. My good friend and the distinguished mayor of Providence, Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., said at the time:

As far as I'm concerned, if it wasn't for the poverty workers, there is no telling how bad the situation might have been.

I am not willing to wait and see how bad the situation may be next summer in our cities. The war on poverty may be considered to be in an embattled state in the House today, but it will be the cities and urban areas of our country who will be in a state of seige if this program is gutted by the House.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I have been a consistent supporter of the war on poverty because I believe that through this program—through a partnership of Federal, State, and local resources—we can help the disadvantaged help themselves and make taxpayers out of taxeaters. This massive program of human renewal merits the support of every thinking, compassionate citizen.

I recently received a report on activities in the village of Freeport, N.Y., a truly cosmopolitan community located in the heart of my congressional district on Long Island's south shore. The village of Freeport, which last month celebrated its 75th anniversary of incorporation, is a suburban community with a population of more than 40,000.

The religious leaders of all faiths have been cooperating on a community program which could stand as a model for others.

The Freeport Methodist Church has been in the forefront of efforts to strengthen the war on poverty and I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from its distinguished ministers and a report on community relations and employment programs of the Freeport Economic Opportunity Commission which they forwarded to me:

THE FREEPORT METHODIST CHURCH,
Freeport, N.Y., November 10, 1967.

Hon. HERBERT TENZER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We are concerned along with a great many other persons about the anti-poverty legislation currently being proposed and debated. It seems clear to us that the bill, as currently designed, will have negative effects on the problems of alleviating poverty, if it is adopted.

It is apparent to us that the effect of adoption of the present anti-poverty legislation will be to reduce, perhaps undermine, the effectiveness of moderate Negro leadership in this and other communities. In the vacuum of leadership that would follow such reduced leadership capacity, it would be likely that the Black Power ideology could take firmer root than has been possible to this time. Thus, it seems curious and ironical that our government could, by its own voice and vote, foster the growth of social unrest, not to say anarchy. If our governmental structures cannot deal imaginatively with this most urgent problem, then it seems clear that in the long run there will be hardly any course left to the poor and those who work with them but to establish paragovernmental structures, or indeed, to work in opposition to established government. It is not difficult to imagine that such time may come if the anti-poverty program is made ineffective now.

Attached is a document detailing some of the work of the Freeport OEO program. We can attest that hopeful signs were coming visible in this place by their good work. We dare not have them fail now.

We know that you are concerned and that you intend to stand for the kind of legislation which will allow the anti-poverty program to function effectively. Be assured of our support of your stand and our keen interest in the coming vote.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER E. HODGSON.
MICHAEL MCINTYRE.

DETAILS OF FREEPORT, N.Y., OEO PROGRAMS

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Ad-hoc committee on urban renewal

This committee was established to open the channels of communication between the Urban Renewal Authorities and the citizens of the Bennington Park (initial Urban Renewal site) section of Freeport. It is composed of fifteen (15) elected members representing all of the families residing in the target area. The neighborhood aide assigned was most effective in organizing this group. The Legal Service Committee of Nassau County will act in an advisory capacity.

Freeport Housing Council

A tenants' association was organized by a neighborhood aide as the outgrowth of the many complaints received from tenants living in the public housing facilities provided by the Village of Freeport. Initially many tenants were slow to join due to fear of reprisals. At present there are more than forty (40) families involved of the total occupancy of one hundred (100) families. The goals are:

a. Management will recognize the tenants as a bargaining force

b. Vandalism can be reduced

c. Council will initiate a self policing policy placing responsibility on tenants.

Youth Council

The need for reaching out to the youth of Freeport is very much in evidence. The Southeast area (Bennington Park) has received some assistance from the Family Service Association of Nassau County. However, most areas are without facilities or guidance. It is obvious a youth center is of paramount importance. Meetings are presently being held between this office, Village Officials, and members of the Freeport School System, to make a year round youth program and adequate youth center a reality. There are at the present time about one hundred fifty (150) young people involved in this effort.

In conjunction there are twenty five (25) youth meeting three nights each week in our Child Day Care Center rehearsing. In hope of presenting musical and dramatic plays, this group also participates in career clinics and provides a volunteer service to the community.

Boy Scout troop has been formed in partnership with the Freeport Methodist Church. We feel this is an excellent opportunity for our youth to participate in a well supervised program and come into close contact with boys of varied cultural backgrounds. During the summer more than forty (40) boys were sent to camp, for some this was the first such experience. We are working closely with the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Nassau in presenting two hour tutorial service each Saturday for school youngsters who may require additional assistance in such subjects as Reading, Math, History and Languages. There are presently more than seventy five (75) school children enrolled in three (3) schools. Ages range from 7–14 years. This tutoring will last for four months.

FREEPORT E.O.C. EMPLOYMENT SECTION
MARCH 1967 TO OCTOBER 1967

The Employment Section of the Freeport E.O.C. has directly affected over five hundred (500) Freeport families. Two hundred seventeen (217) applicants have been employed or placed in training classes. All other applicants have problems which are keeping them from being employable at the present time. These are active cases shared between the employment section and the Family Service Section. Our focus is on the unemployed and underemployed. We work very closely with the Domestic Worker finding that 30% are high school graduate who have never applied for employment other than Domestic. We have taken them directly from the train station with their belongings, secured lodging, immediate funds and on-the-job training for them. This action initiated the idea for a Domestic League in Freeport. The Domestic League is not for employment and training advice alone—It will include:

A. Recreational Pursuits

B. Advice on job opportunities and Training Programs

C. Consumer Education

D. Discussion on legal rights, pay scales, working conditions, etc.

E. Assistance in planning for future growth

F. Intervention where necessary with employees and employment agencies.

Since opening, we have come in contact with most of the in school and out of school youth from below the poverty line. We find them uninformed about career opportunities available to them. Therefore, the employment aide is assigned to the youth group and is present at all meeting not only to inform them concerning employment but also to direct other activities.

Emphasis is on finding employment that will utilize existing skills to their best advantage and upgrading of those individuals who are working below capacity. We have contacted by mail, telephone, and personal interviews all of the business establishments in Freeport and surrounding areas. As a result of this campaign, we have not only compiled an extensive file on job opportunities but have established very fine working relationship with the business community. We share job informaiton with other C.A.P. agencies in an effort to obtain maximum exposure for our clients.

On the job training programs have been established in the Freeport Community. Employers and employees are very receptive to this Federally subsidized program.

A late opening of the Multi-Service Center made it impossible for us to be effective in obtaining summer jobs for "in school" applicants. Because of this experience last summer, the Employment Section has already mailed out over fifty (50) applications for summer work with government agencies. (Federal, State, and County) with the help of our youth organization, we are presently

working on a flyer to be distributed to the home owners of Freeport to list household and handyman jobs that our youth can perform (babysitting, shopping, errands, lawn care, painting, cleaning garages and attics, etc.). We shall also list summer jobs from local business men.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress faces a challenge in our debate on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967—a challenge posed by those who would strike at the heart of the war on poverty by cutting back on the vitally needed resources to continue the struggle on behalf of the disadvantaged.

I urge my colleagues to heed the warnings expressed by those who have been involved in war on poverty efforts at the local level—to heed the cry for justice from the disadvantaged who want and deserve an opportunity to help themselves—and to heed the nonpartisan appeal for support from religious and civic groups across the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the Minneapolis Tribune has editorially given strong support to the war on poverty and to the $2.06 billion antipoverty authorization bill that is now before this body.

The Tribune feels that Congress has been ignoring the major issue before it, mainly poverty itself. While OEO has had problems in its short existence, it had achieved tremendous gains in the overall effort to help the poor. Perhaps OEO's greatest problem is that it has been given too little money and support in relation to the massive needs.

Any cut in funds for the program will cause incalculable loss to the poor. Headstart, neighborhood centers, legal aid programs, VISTA projects, health centers, Upward Bound, and foster grandparents programs and a number of other efforts ought to be expanded, not reduced.

A more serious effect of fund reductions would be to deprive the poor of hope itself. I do not know how the poor, or anyone, can believe that we in the Congress are truly serious about alleviating poverty when this body is inclined to slash funds from such a vital program.

We must, at least, provide OEO with the $2.06 billion authorization. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that all of us are serious about giving our Nation's poor the help and the hope that they so desperately need. Yet, as the Tribune article concludes:

If Congress does slash the OEO funds, it will indicate that a majority of its Members are not very serious about trying to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment and related human troubles.

Mr. Chairman, with unanimous consent I include the full text of the Tribune editorial at this point in the RECORD:

DOES CONGRESS CARE ABOUT POVERTY?

The Nation's antipoverty program is in serious danger of going on the rocks in a storm of controversy over its political, administrative and fiscal complications. What Congress seems to be largely ignoring is poverty itself.

The economic opportunity program has had many growing pains in its short life. It can profit by some revisions. But it also represents a major effort to solve America's greatest social problem—to help its people who, by reason of race, meager education, lack of opportunities and qualifications, are poor and deprived. Its greatest weakness so far is that it has done too little, measured against the massive needs.

Yet the House has passed a resolution to cut the 1968 funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity from $1.6 billion to $1.2 billion. Funds for some existing programs already have been cut off. Such future projects as the Pilot City program for the Minneapolis North Side may never get launched. A more realistic federal budget for OEO would be the $2-billion figure which is getting slim support in Washington.

A catalogue of what would be lost with the big slash includes much of the promising Head Start program for children; cuts in the citizens community centers and legal aid services, and complete loss of the summer job program for young people. It would affect OEO activities in rural areas and on Indian reservations as well as in cities.

In the larger view, the cut in funds would mean a rebuff where hope has been built among the nation's poor. It would mean a weakening of basic efforts to ease racial problems. It would mean losing experienced staff people and undermining the momentum of strong community organizations which have brought together low-income residents and civic leaders.

If Congress does slash the OEO funds, it will indicate that a majority of its members are not very serious about trying to solve the problems of poverty and unemployment and related human troubles. To be realistic, constructive and fair, it seems to us, Congress should approve appropriations for the war on poverty at the $2-billion level.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to section 103?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the poverty bill, S. 2388.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 2.

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

There was no objection.

WHERE DO WE STAND IN SPACE?—AN ASSESSMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday America thrilled to the spectacle of the giant Saturn V rocket lifting into space on a successful test flight. This accomplishment was extremely gratifying for several reasons. First, there is always a doubt about the outcome of such enormously challenging and complex technological projects, especially where there is no prior record of experience.

In combination with this, America was deeply aware of the recent revelations concerning mismanagement in the space program which led to serious conditions of faulty workmanship and lack of quality control; conditions which surrounded the January Apollo disaster. Recent public statements by NASA concerning in-house efforts to improve management and control procedures could do little to dispel the doubts in light of NASA's history of lack of candor about program status and managerial difficulties. Surely the entire Nation, as well as NASA itself, was holding its breath as the historic moment approached.

I do not for a moment believe that all of the serious problems of the Space Agency—which in a few years grew so fast that it was not able properly to organize itself—are under control. It would be most dangerous for recent history to be forgotten in the flush of excitement at the new success.

This in no way diminishes my appreciation of the brilliant performance witnessed last week. However, it is essential to maintain our perspective at this moment. Generous credit is due to the agency; yet at the same time we must refuse to relax our vigilance about measures that are necessary to improve this program. We must continue to ask hard questions and make sure that further efforts do not get out of hand either in terms of management control or in such items as the severe cost-overruns which were encountered in the development of the very Saturn rocket whose success we hail.

There is, of course, another aspect to this picture of which the press in America and other nations is much aware and took the occasion to make considerable comment. This is the question of the so-called space race between the two major powers. Most of the press hailed the Saturn V shot as an achievement that put the United States ahead in the international competition.

Although I, as an American, was very much cheered by this thought, it was also clear that in these difficult times there is an accompanying responsibility for farsightedness on the part of this Nation. Accordingly, I sent a letter to President Johnson last Friday morning suggesting that this was the time for America to display its self-confidence and wisdom by

abandoning this race which has outlived its usefulness and now works to distort our own plans in space and on earth by causing us to react and make decisions based on the whims, decisions, and timetable of another nation whose system, problems, and values are different than our own. I also suggested that this was the time to initiate a serious effort to achieve international cooperation in space in order to limit costs and increase the benefits of space programs which are otherwise wasteful in their extreme duplication of energies and results.

In regard to the question of a space race, we need only remember that its undue pressure was perhaps one of the major reasons that NASA was forced to grow in uncontrolled fashion and produced the breakdown of authority and administrative chaos that were surrounding circumstances to the Apollo fire. It is unthinkable that we should allow such pressure to continue to injure our space program.

We need also only mention that our Federal budget is quite finite, as is being sharply brought home to Congress this year. At a time when financial pressures are enormous and contradictory it is simply not possible to promise the moon and the planets and the stars—whatever the cost—without any sense that pressing national priorities may work to counter our ambitions and enthusiasms in space at least so far as to modify the pace at which we pursue them. Can we afford to allow Russia—or any other nation—to determine our national priorities for us and influence, perhaps to our detriment, the intelligent allocation of our resources and the progress we make in meeting our urgent problems here on earth?

The press has been divided in its view of the space race. Some have accepted it as a necessity as well as a useful means of raising funds for the space program—others have decried it as harmful. The interesting thing to note is that recently both of these factions seem to agree that the space race, as we have known it, is no longer valid under present conditions. Two of these differing views were seen in editorial columns of the New York Times of November 10 and the Christian Science Monitor of November 13. I commend both of the following articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1967]

THE SUCCESS OF SATURN 5

A dictionary of superlatives is required adequately to describe the spectacularly successful performance of the Saturn 5 rocket yesterday.

The vehicle launched at Cape Kennedy at 7 o'clock in the morning was undoubtedly the most complicated single integrated machine men have ever built and successfully operated. As far as we know, the Saturn 5 was not only the most powerful rocket ever launched, but the 140 tons it put into orbit was the heaviest man-made load ever to travel in space. These and other features of the test have done much to restore the luster of this country's space program, tarnished by the Apollo tragedy early this year.

Even in this moment of triumph it is worth recalling the needless sacrifice of three astronauts in the beginning of 1967. The inquiries sparked by that disaster revealed a shocking situation in which mismanagement, shoddy workmanship and a willingness to take excessive risks were evident. It can hardly be doubted that yesterday's triumph was in part made possible by the new caution, the tightened quality control and the heightened awareness of the cost of negligence which resulted from last January's fire.

Politically and propagandistically, the Saturn 5 achievement is the United States' counter to recent major Soviet space triumphs. It is now clear from the public statements of at least two distinguished and important Soviet scientists that there are influential persons in the Soviet power elite who would like to end the space competition and replace it by Soviet-American space cooperation and division of labor. The United States' capabilities demonstrated so impressively yesterday must reinforce these arguments in Moscow.

Now it is time for Congress to give more serious attention to long-term space policy than it has yet done. This newspaper has repeatedly protested against a needlessly rapid manned-space program with an artificial time goal for putting a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. We reiterate our belief that there were better ways to expend here on earth some of the excessive funds spent on this forced-draft program. At the same time, having made so huge an investment in space hardware, the nation must now give the most careful thought as to how best to use it and how to keep intact the production and research organizations that are at the heart of American prowess in space.

Solving these problems within the limits of the Government's resources is more important than insuring that an American gets to the moon by 1970.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 13, 1967]

TWO STEPS TO THE MOON

Apollo-Saturn 5 and Surveyor 6 have carried the United States closer to the moon.

The one shows that the design for the country's mightiest rocket works well and that the moonship can withstand the hottest reentry yet attempted for manned craft. The other shows that American engineers have perfected a lunar-soft-landing system.

We heartily congratulate the engineering teams involved, especially that of Dr. Wernher von Braun whose rocket engineers have had such consistent success.

Yet we can't join some other commentators in concluding that all of this gives the United States an edge over the Russians in the moon race—if indeed the Russians are racing us to our natural satellite at all.

The American and Russian space programs travel different roads. Progress can be judged only by distance traveled along these individual roads. And, since no available information enables us to know just what the Soviets' course may be or how far they have traveled along it, to ask who's out front is meaningless.

In terms of its own program, the United States now has taken two giant strides forward. It still has a strong chance of getting to the moon in 1969, as planned now, barring any more major failures.

However, this gives no ground for complacency. The United States has cut its space budget substantially. It has no firm program for manned flight beyond the lunar landings. It has no planetary exploration program beyond for the 1970's at all.

The Russians, on the other hand, give every indication of a strong ongoing effort both in manned flight and in planetary exploration. The latter, they say, lays the foundation for manned planetary flights in the indefinite future.

The Soviets, as far as we can find out from our Moscow correspondent, still spend heavily on space. They spend more than did the United States even when its space budget ran over five billion dollars a year.

We share the glow of success that Americans feel after last Thursday's successes. But we realize that the American space program today gives no assurance of being able to beat the Soviets to any goal that the Soviets really want to win.

JUDGE TAKES A NEW APPROACH TO JUVENILE PROBLEM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in this era of do-gooders, who have been encouraged by a Supreme Court which seems to be more interested in protecting the "rights" of the criminal, and have evidenced little interest in protecting the innocent and the law-abiding citizens, I am happy to report that a welcome change is being experienced and enjoyed by folks down in southeast Missouri where a young circuit judge, the Honorable William H. Billings, is not following the trend, but is courageously implementing a new policy in making available to the public through all news media the law violations of the so-called juvenile offender.

I am hopeful that other judges may have the courage to interpret the law in a way that will help reduce crime, other than to encourage youngsters to embark on a career of law violation, secure in the knowledge that they will be protected from the light of publicity and notoriety which is one of the greatest deterrents.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to set forth a recent article, distributed by the AP and which appeared in many southeast Missouri newspapers, and then to include also an editorial from the Dexter Statesman, published in Stoddard County, one of the two counties included in the 35th Judicial Circuit, the other county being Dunklin, my home county, in which Judge Billings was born and reared.

In closing these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have a very keen personal interest in this jurist, who as one of his first jobs was employed on the Dunklin Democrat, a newspaper published by my father, my brother, and myself. He demonstrated great natural ability, and would have made a great newspaperman, had he not chosen to follow in the footsteps of his father, who at that time was judge of the 35th Circuit, which is now presided over by his son.

First, the AP article, and then the editorial from the Dexter Statesman, written by the editor and publisher, Barney Miller, who publishes two of the finest weekly newspapers in southeast Missouri:

BILLINGS BELIEVED TO BE ONLY JUDGE IN STATE WHO HAS THROWN COURT COMPLETELY OPEN

CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO.—Juvenile lawbreakers are no longer granted the grace of anonymity in Stoddard or Dunklin counties when they

appear before Circuit Judge William H. Billings.

Judge Billings, of the 35th circuit, comprising the two counties in Southeast Missouri, came to the bench last November as an appointee of Gov. Warren E. Hearnes to succeed the late Judge Arthur U. Goodman.

Juvenile hearings in Missouri—since the adoption of the state's juvenile code—have generally been secret affairs, held in a conference room and attended only by the delinquent suspect, his parents, the judge, the juvenile officer and the court clerk.

Not so in Judge Billings' court. He has instituted some sweeping changes in the handling of juveniles—youngsters under 17—from that instituted under the juvenile code.

For example, the secrecy is out. Cases are heard in open court; they can be fully reported and the records are on file for public inspection.

"The secrecy has always smacked too much of star-chamber proceedings," Judge Billings said.

He said through publicizing of juvenile crime and court action, he hopes to deter others from misdeeds and to educate the public generally on the juvenile problem.

So far, the judge believes he is making some progress.

"I've been amazed and pleased as to the letters I've had," Judge Billings said. He added that "school people say they have sensed a change in attitude on the part of the kids."

Generally speaking, reaction to Judge Billings' policy on publicity has been favorable, even among parents of children who appear in Juvenile Court.

Of about 250 cases handled over the past nine months, the judge said only two parents have asked him not to disclose the name of their child.

About the only negative reaction has come from the juveniles themselves.

"The kids don't like it," Judge Billings said. "They don't want to see their names in the paper. It used to be if a boy had his driver's license suspended, the only ones who knew it were the youth, his parents and maybe his girl friend and best friend."

Lifting of driver's licenses is one of Judge Billings' favorite ways of dealing with juveniles coming before him. He has other, possibly less orthodox penalties, such as requiring youths to keep their hair cut, to stay in school, to attend church, to avoid certain companions and to write 1,000-word essays on appropriate subjects.

Concerning the assignment of essays as punishment for the youthful offender, Judge Billings says, "You know how kids hate to write."

The judge reads the essays the juveniles write and said some are quite good.

Judge Billings believes he is the only juvenile judge in Missouri who has thrown juvenile court and its records completely open.

He also may be alone in the way he conducts court when a juvenile is in such serious trouble that he might be sent to the state training school.

Judge Billings is concerned over the constitutional rights of the youngsters, particularly those whose liberty is in jeopardy.

"Any time there is a chance a child may be heading for one of the training schools, we take particular pains to see that adequate notice of the charges is given to the child and his parents," the judge said.

He also insists that the youth be represented by counsel, and that more proof of guilty than the juvenile's own statement be produced. Witnesses may be called and cross-examined.

The judge said he feels there is much to be done in the way of juvenile code reform, though he has no quarrel with what the framers of Missouri's code had in mind.

"The intent of the juvenile code was good, making the state a sort of 'super parent' and preventing the stigma of a child having committed a crime."

"That's all well and good. In theory it sounds beautiful; in practice it is very different," he said.

A Refreshing Change

A refreshing change has swept through Stoddard and Dunklin counties in the past few months—a change in the handling of juvenile cases in Circuit Court.

The change is due entirely to one man, who has brought about this change that many concerned parents, educators and others have thought to be long overdue. That man is Circuit Judge William Billings.

Judge Billings has swept aside many of the long-standing policies as regard the handling of juvenile cases. In the first place, he is handling them now in open court. He is releasing the names of the young offenders. He is handing down sentences that are constructive in themselves and which fit the offense that has been committed.

This is not to say that Judge Billings is a hard-nosed uncompromising tough judge. Neither is he a man who has no feeling for the young offender, or the juvenile in trouble.

He is concerned, and he does have feelings for the youngsters involved, and that is the reason, and the only reason, that he has adopted these new policies for the two-county area which he serves.

The Missouri juvenile code, in the opinion of a growing number of persons, was over-protective, and did not serve the cause for which it was written. A law that is over-protective of any element of society, young or old, is soon scoffed at by the very people it was written to protect. Such was the case with many features of the so-called "juvenile code". It placed a protective arm around the shoulders of the young offender, gave him a pat on the back and said, in effect, "Don't worry, we'll protect you, no matter what you do, or how many times you do it".

The young offenders, and young people in general had no respect for such a code.

They have respect for the rules now adopted for Stoddard and Dunklin counties. They have a renewed respect for the court, for the law, and for their own responsibilities as citizens. Judge Billings has made it so.

Many of his sentences have been most appropriate, we feel. Youngsters, brought into court on charges involving the improper and unsafe use of an automobile, have been required to write essays concerning safe driving and the responsibility of the man or woman behind the wheel. Licenses have been suspended for varying periods. In other words, the youngsters have been "grounded", as well as required to give some thoughtful attention to the matter of traffic safety. Other sentences for other offenses have been equally appropriate, we feel.

In all, it has brought about a refreshing change in the courtrooms of Bloomfield and Kennett. Judge Billings is a young man, a family man . . . a man who understands young people, who has sympathy for the problems.

But he demands that they learn, and learn well, the responsibilities of citizenship.

We're sure that he will be criticized in some quarters for his new approach to the juvenile problems. He already has been. But we are also confident that the overwhelming majority of responsible citizens, youths and adults alike, will declare that this has been a change long overdue.

And we feel that Judge Billings is due a large measure of praise for his courage, his ability to make a drastic change in an important system of our courts of justice, and for his new approach that promises to help society—and, in the end, help the young people, themselves.

A GRATEFUL PRESIDENT SALUTES THE U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this Veterans Day a grateful President traveled 5,000 miles across our land to pay his respects to America's fighting men and women.

Again and again, he expressed the Nation's thanks to the 6 million Americans who make up the Armed Forces of the United States.

At McConnell Air Force Base in Kansas, the President paid particular and deserved tribute to the men in blue of the U.S. Air Force.

He traced their history as liberators and "pathfinders to peace," over many of the troubled spots of the world: Berlin, Japan, Korea, and today in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

He told them they held in their hands the power to destroy any adversary on earth, yet they fought with "restraint, with skill, with judgment, and—with compassion."

President Johnson pledged that:

> Together we will persevere in making the skies over Vietnam an arena which history will honor as the place where freedom found new life and peace finally won.

President Johnson's tribute to the U.S. Force was never more justly earned.

Whether in the missile defense of the continental United States of America, or in the fighters and bombers over hostile territory in Vietnam; or in the air round the clock with the Strategic Air Command and in the Tactical Air Command; whether in missions of mercy of the helicopter air rescue teams—the Air Force is in the front line of our fight for freedom.

I am honored to insert in the RECORD the remarks of President Johnson at McConnell Air Force Base in Wichita, Kans., during this year, the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Air Force.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, WICHITA, KANS.

Thank you, General McConnell, Governor Docking, Secretary McNamara, Congressman Pickle, Col. Cardenas, Mayor Vollmer, Major Baird, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen:

I come here today as the President to speak for 200 million Americans on this Veterans Day. This is a message from their hearts and from mine.

I give you the deep gratitude and pride this Nation feels in all of you.

That is the single reason that I have journeyed across America this week end—to bring this country's recognition, praise and pride to the men and women of America's Armed Forces.

It is a splendid reason. And I am glad to be here on this splendid day to give it voice.

This day belongs to you.

It belongs to the 6 million men and women who serve on active duty and in the Reserves. They are the guardians of our peace today.

It also belongs to our 26 million veterans

who live throughout this Nation. They were guardians of another day.

Those who wear the uniform today—and those who wore the uniform yesterday—these are the millions to whom we owe a debt we can never repay. They are the ones I come here to thank today as the gallant defenders of freedom in this dangerous world in which we live.

This is the second splendid day for me. Yesterday and last night I brought this message of our Nation's heart to the Army at Fort Benning; to the Marines at El Toro and Camp Pendleton; to the Navy aboard the U.S.S. *Enterprise*.

But for all my travels, I am uplifted. I can tell you today, proudly, that this Nation is not complacent. It is refreshed each hour of each day by the courage and the conviction of its fighting men, of which you there in that row are a splendid example.

That—and only that—is what I have come here to say, at this vital center of America's air power.

It is enough, for this Nation knows you well.

We know you and your kind as the liberators of Europe.

We know you as the pathfinders to peace over Berlin, over Japan, over the Philippines, Korea, and a thousand Pacific islands. We were slow to react there. We almost waited too long. But I believe we have profited from that mistake.

And the men who fought communism and totalitarianism then—and those who fight it today in Southeast Asia—are the same breed and they have the same purpose.

For all that long flight of courage—of sacrifice—of unbreakable faith—I come here to thank you.

Today, you hold in your hands the power to destroy any adversary on this earth. And yet you are fighting a limited war with restraint, with skill, and with judgment, and, I think, with compassion.

You show your skill—and your compassion—by the most precise pinpoint bombing.

Your ratio of planes lost is the lowest in the history of air warfare.

Your restraint in avoiding population centers is the greatest in the history of air warfare.

That kind of a record does you and does your Nation honor.

Together we will persevere in making the skies over Vietnam an arena which history will honor as the place where freedom found new life and peace was finally won.

And so I have come here today to thank you, and to share with you the vision of a brighter future which beckons us on.

One more stop for the Coast Guard this evening and I will have completed my visit on Marine Day and Armed Services Day with the leaders of the protectors of freedom in the world—the Army at Benning, the Marines at Pendleton, the Navy at the *Enterprise*, the airmen at McConnell, and the Coast Guard in Virginia a little later on.

I could not conclude that tour without saying to you that I believe the civilian leaders of you men—Secretary McNamara, the Secretary of Air, Army, and Navy, the Commandant of the Marines and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the Army and the Navy—are as fine leaders as this Nation has ever produced and they, in turn, by precept and example, have inculcated in you men the finest ideals of this Nation.

As General Westmoreland said just a few days ago, you have sent to him in all of those services the best trained, the best equipped men to ever wear the uniform. And I believe he is right. I think in time every adversary that faces you will know that he is right.

As I conclude this trip today here in the presence of you men who have gone, who have seen, and who have returned, I join you in joining those who wear the little white flower in prayers that others will be spared and that the good Lord will permit them to come back with us some day.

To Secretary McNamara, especially, who has given such vision and such dedication, who is a much abused man, I want to say to him, his Secretaries and his Chiefs of Staff, that all America and all those who love freedom everywhere will remember their names and will remember their service as we all remember yours.

Thank you very much.

NEW NAVY WEAPON, POSEIDON, PROVIDES INSURANCE FOR AMERICA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, an article in a recent issue of the Washington Daily News discussed a new naval weapon which is regarded by many people as one of the most significant in the world—the Poseidon.

The article, written by award-winning Scripps-Howard war correspondent Jim G. Lucas, is based on an interview with Rear Adm. Levering Smith, the Navy's able Director of Special Projects.

The Poseidon represents what may be an ultimate weapon, since it incorporates the devastating accuracy of the Polaris and carries up to 16 nuclear warheads. Its size is secret, but it will probably be twice the size of present operational Polaris missiles.

I insert the following article, entitled "Poseidon—'Insurance,'" which appeared in the November 13, 1967, issue of the Washington Daily News, in the RECORD:

DEADLY GAMESMANSHIP: POSEIDON—"INSURANCE"

(By Jim G. Lucas)

Rear Adm. Levering Smith sees himself as a combination insurance man and chess player.

At 57, Adm. Smith is the Navy's third director of its Special Projects. This gives him command and responsibility for all phases of the Fleet Ballistics Weapons System, including the Polaris missile, fired from nuclear-powered submarines, and the missile which eventually will replace it, the Poseidon.

It's the Poseidon—still 18 months to two years off—he considers his insurance.

"The terrible problem," he said in an interview, weighing his words carefully, "is we didn't know—we still don't know—how far the Russians intend to go with their antiballistic missiles system. Not knowing, we've got to take out insurance. We are pushing ahead with advanced programs to increase our penetration factor—in other words, get past any defense our or their best brains can conceive. It's like playing chess."

Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Nitze told the Senate Military Applications Subcommittee recently, that Russian ICBMs still could knock out only 10 per cent of this country's retaliatory capability. He said our remaining 900 Minuteman, Polaris and Poseidon (when they are ready) missiles and strategic bombers could strike back and drop more than 2000 bombs on the Soviet Union.

MULTIPLE WARHEADS

Mr. Nitze said Poseidon will be armed with multiple nuclear warheads, as many as 16 on one missile.

Adm. Smith concurs.

"When Poseidon is operational," he said, "we will want the Russians to know all there is to know about it. We will want them to understand it is every bit as good as we say it is.

"But that time isn't now. If we tell them what we intend to do before it is done, they will perfect a defense against it. And your spiral starts all over again."

Adm. Smith said Poseidon is essentially an older member of the Polaris family. And many believe Polaris alone has kept the peace in the years since World War II; that without it, man already would have destroyed himself. Among them was the late President John F. Kennedy.

"It is still incredible to me," he wrote one week before his assassination, "that a missile can be succesfully and accurately fired from beneath the sea. Once one has seen a Polaris fired (he had just witnessed a firing) the efficacy of this weapons system as a deterrent is no longer debatable."

"Polaris has preserved the peace," says Dr. Richard Kerschner of the Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, "and insofar as it is possible in so vast a program, Levering Smith is the man who fathered Polaris."

Adm. Smith was technical director under Vice Adm. Charles "Red" Raborn, who usually is called the father of the Polaris.

Adm. Raborn's contribution was in selecting Levering Smith as his technical director and giving him his head, Dr. Kerschner believes.

TWICE AS BIG

On the record, Adm. Smith carefully limits himself to what the President and the Secretary of Defense have said publicly about his new missile. This boils down to the fact it will be twice as big, carry twice or more the nuclear payload, and be longer and bulkier than the most advanced Polaris, the A-3.

Eventually, 31 Fleet ballistic submarines will be armed with Poseidons, and 10 will carry the A-3.

Adm. Smith expects to fire a land-based Poseidon from Cape Kennedy next summer, and follow this with a firing at sea in the fall. It will be at least 18 months before he installs them on the nuclear subs.

Dr. Kerschner says Adm. Smith is the kind of man "who makes things happen."

IF WASHINGTON REALLY KNEW

Mr. ST GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, too often in the heat of debate we become engulfed in a blaze of statistics and politics and forget that people are our main concern, and it is to their welfare that we must address ourselves.

It appears that in our present consideration of the poverty program we have allowed politics and statistics to cloud the issue at hand: will the poor people of our land continue to be given a voice and a helping hand?

We have failed, I think, to realize just what this program means to the people to whom it is directed.

A very provoking article appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin which serves to manifest the true meaning of the poverty program. It is aptly entitled "If Washington Really Knew," and I

commend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

IF WASHINGTON REALLY KNEW

(By Harold Kirby)

"If they close up this place I don't know what I'll do." Speaking was John Fay, 78, of Prospect Hill, Lincoln, who spends many hours each day, five days a week, at the Senior Citizens Center on Commerce Street, Pawtucket.

It is one of the first centers of its kind to be established in this state by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the people who operate it as well as those who drop in daily are worried about the future. Worried because they have been told there is a shortage of money for this and the whole so-called poverty program—a term they dislike.

"If only those people in Washington really knew what this means to me and many more like me, I think they'd give us enough money to keep it up, maybe expand a bit too," says Mr. Fay. He is a bachelor and has lived alone since the death of his brother. An electrician most of his adult life, he had to retire when he was about 60 because of illness. He comes by bus to the center, mingles with his new-found friends, plays cards, reads the newspapers and magazines, keeps busy.

He isn't the only one. Between 30 and 40 men and women—contrary to the general average the men outnumber the women, first three to one, now three to two—visit the center daily. Some remain for hours, seeking companionship, amusement and instruction in arts and crafts; others use the center as a meeting point, drink a cup of coffee and move on to other places.

One indomitable staffer is Mrs. Maude Crabbs. Her maiden name was Streeter, and she comes from a long line of patriots and pioneers, some of whom were companions of Roger Williams. She attended the School of Design, the Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, N.Y. and taught art in schools in New Jersey, Fall River and Providence. She moved on to Toledo, Ohio, where she married Frank Crabbs of that city, and became identified with the Toledo Art Museum. When her husband died, she returned to her family. For the past 11 years Mrs. Crabbs has been demonstrating weaving and spinning at the Old Slater Mill Museum in Pawtucket. She now teaches an arts and crafts class at the center, spending about 10 hours a week there.

Other staff members are Mrs. Marjorie Spellman, Mrs. Rose Tracy, George McCoart and Mrs. Mary Jackson. All are well over 60 and three over 70. They keep the center going under the direction of their executive, Thomas F. Markey, doing the housekeeping, serving coffee, chatting with visitors, making appointments for Mr. Markey when he is absent, handling correspondence and attending to a variety of other duties.

"If we had a few volunteers to help, we could keep the center open Thursday nights, as we used to, and even on Saturdays," said Mr. Markey, who was formerly a civil service social worker with a strong and increasing interest in older people.

Mr. Markey is a native of Taunton, a graduate of Bryant College where he received a degree in business administration, and worked for a number of manufacturers before entering the field of social work. He lives on Maynard Street, Pawtucket, with his wife and 12-year-old daughter.

He is responsible for all activities at the center and spends a good deal of time counselling those who seek his advice, who have domestic or health or financial problems. When necessary, he refers them to other agencies, public or private, where help is available.

There are other OEO centers in the state, in Riverside and Warwick, for example. Some have "structured" programs, but in Pawtucket, everything is informal, relaxed and low key. There are no fixed rules, either concerning dress or behavior. In spite of this there have been few problems, none of them serious. A few set the standards and soon everybody else conforms.

Although the staff receives compensation for 10 hours each week, all of them work far beyond this limit, some spending twice and even three times the time required. "They are not only good workers; they are dedicated to the older people who, like themselves, need this center," Mr. Markey observed.

The center has been in existence less than a year and occupies rented quarters in Pawtucket's downtown: an office, lavatories, a kitchen and one large gathering room, where all activities are concentrated. This has one disadvantage: it leaves little privacy for such activities as the arts and crafts class. "It isn't easy to conduct such a class when things are going on all around you," said Mrs. Crabbs. She is hopeful that a room adjacent to the center can be rented sometime for activities such as this, but the prospect of getting money enough appears dim this year.

The city provides a share of the expense, usually in services or equipment. For example, a movie projector has been provided by the school department. And occasionally an individual, observing some need, will make a contribution: the television set now used is the unsolicited gift of a business man, who had two in his home and needed only one.

But by and large the center must depend on public funds, federal and local. Everybody there is aware of the precarious position OEO is in at the moment, with some prospect of a substantial cut in federal appropriations, a cut possibly deep enough to curtail services, even put an end to some centers. There will probably be nothing for expansion.

For Mr. Markey and his staff there is one encouraging development: attendance, starting small, has grown steadily. Use of the facilities and counselling at the center continues to expand, and pressure is increasing among older citizens here and elsewhere not only for what they have now but for more space, more programs, more activity. The impact of all this may yet be felt, even as far away as Washington.

DONALD A. WILLIAMS RECEIVES DESERVED RECOGNITION

Mr. WHITTEN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, for the high honor to him, just announced: the Rockefeller Public Service Award for Administration.

This annual award, administered by Princeton University, is not given lightly.

May I say, and I base this on more than 14 years' close association with him, that no recipient was ever more worthy of this award than Don Williams.

I beg your indulgence for a bit of personal history.

Fifteen years ago, in 1952, I went to the Democratic National Convention carrying with me a plank for the party platform pledging a small watershed program for the Nation.

The plank was adopted, and even though something happened to us on the way to that election, the small watershed program became a reality, thanks to bipartisan understanding of the need for it and the public benefits that would accrue from it.

As a second step, it was my pleasure, along with the subcommittee chairman, to insert an item for $5 million in the 1953 Agricultural Appropriations Act to start a pilot watershed program. This was done, in some 58 selected small watersheds across the land.

The success of this experiment led to drafting legislation that became Public Law 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, which became law in August of 1954.

In November of 1953, in the middle of these historic developments, a man who had risen through the ranks in a public service career that began in 1935, became Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service. This man, Don Williams, we soon learned, was the man we needed to put this program into action.

His advice and counsel on the legislation and its many broadening amendments that we have since enacted; his vision of this program as a new benchmark in a cooperative venture among the local people, the State, and the Federal Government; his technical skills developed through long years in the field as a conservation engineer working mainly in the water field; his ability to project his ideas and enthusiasm to the people at the community level; his great administrative skills in selecting the right men for the right jobs and melding them into an efficient and effective technical force; his managerial efficiency in effecting economies and making the Federal dollar stretch to its utmost—all these accomplishments and talents, I would say, are reflected in the Rockefeller Award he will shortly receive.

Under Don Williams' perceptive and skillful leadership, the small watershed program has grown in stature until it today ranks as perhaps the most significent and worthwhile addition ever made to our national resource development arsenal.

The program itself is sound, and it would have moved forward even under the direction of a lesser leader.

But, make no mistake, the results today under Don Williams and what they would have been under less skillful administration are as different, as Mark Twain said, as the difference between lightning and a lightning bug.

I have seen this work in the field and I know its meaning and its value. Don Williams has come before my committee for the past 14 years to make some of the most effective and orderly budget presentation that it has ever been my privilege to hear. Thus I do not speak from hearsay; I speak from personal knowledge of, and long close association with, Don Williams the man and Don Williams the career Administrator.

His leadership in soil and water conservation across the board—the economy and efficiency of technical services to conservation districts and the acceleration of this work; the splendid

new approaches to the total job such as the Great Plains conservation program and resource and conservation development projects—all these and other advances made by a strong and vigorous agency that is contributing to a better America, attest to the overall measurement of the man.

As the problem of getting over to an urban society the fact that a protected and developed land is the basis of our present well-being and the base for the future, a man like Don Williams and the fine job he does become absolutely necessary.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS SOUND

Mr. BOLAND. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when misleading and alarming statements are published about the social security system, they cause grave concern to the millions who are members of that system. It is imperative that false charges against the system be answered. The October issue of Reader's Digest carried such charges. They were emphatically and effectively answered by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman MILLS. His statement was backed up by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen. This response appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1967, page 27026.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniel J. Murphy, Jr., the district manager in Springfield, Mass., social security office, has also challenged the attacks on the system. In two letters to the editor of the Springfield Union, Mr. Murphy persuasively establishes the soundness of the program. I commend him for this action. He speaks as a recognized authority on social security. I know that his statements will greatly help in lifting the anxiety of those who contribute to, and benefit from, the program.

I include Mr. Murphy's letters with my remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Springfield, Mass., October 4, 1967.

The EDITOR,
Springfield Union,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The Springfield Union on September 28 carried a story on an article in Reader's Digest written by Mr. Charles Stevenson for the October issue. The article on "How Secure is Your Social Security?" is misleading and creates anxiety and fear about the financing of the social security system that are groundless.

The article implies that Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and the ranking minority member, Representative John W. Byrnes, of the House Committee on Ways and Means are profoundly alarmed about the basic design and fiscal integrity of the social program and about the course the program is taking. The facts, however, are that as recently as five weeks ago these men jointly supported legislation in the House of Representatives, the Social Security Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 12080), which builds upon the present social security program. In addition on September 27 Representative Mills, speaking in the House stated ". . . I have read the article very carefully and find that it contains a number of half-truths that lead to misleading conclusions. . . . The program is actuarially and financially sound." "Because of the importance of rebutting the erroneous implications" Representative Mills inserted in the Congressional Record a statement by the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen replying to the article.

Space does not permit taking up each misleading point in the article and quoted in your release; however in fairness to Springfield residents, the following should be brought to their attention:

1. The soundness of the program has been examined a number of times by groups of independent, nongovernmental representatives of business, insurance, labor, and the public. These advisory councils, made up of outstanding experts in the field have examined thoroughly all of the issues connected with the "security" of social security. They have consistently concluded that the program is soundly financed and that its income—out into the long range future—will be sufficient to meet its obligations.

The councils have taken note of such charges as those made in the article to the effect that social security taxes are used for purposes other than social security, that the trust funds contain only IOU's and that the system is "in the red" by hundreds of billions of dollars. The councils have found these charges to be without foundation.

2. The article says that the program puts a "squeeze on the young." This is not so. The fact is that even without taking into account that benefits have been and will continue to be increased from time to time as changes occur in the wage levels and cost of living, young workers as a group will get social security protection worth 20 to 25 percent more than they will pay in social security contributions.

Young workers could not buy comparable insurance protection from private insurance companies at anywhere near the amount they pay for their social security protection.

In deciding whether younger people get their money's worth it must be kept in mind that the program provides not only retirement protection but also survivors and disability protection. The importance of this protection can be illustrated by an example: the value of the social security survivors protection provided under the House-passed bill in the case of the worker whose earnings are about the median earnings of regularly employed men ($550 per month) who dies at age 35 leaving a wife aged 32 and two small children is about $56,000. Were this worker to become disabled at age 35, the value of the disability insurance protection to him and his family would be about $59,000.

In Mr. Cohen's words, "Mr. Stevenson has not clarified any fundamental issues. He has not pointed out the great unmet social needs. What he has done has been a great disservice to the millions of social security beneficiaries and the millions who are counting on social security benefits in the future. He has obfuscated and confused the major policy issues in social security. A critical and constructive review of social security would be welcome. A glib and superficial attack on a program so important to millions of Americans is not a contribution to the American people."

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. MURPHY,
District Manager, Social Security Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Springfield, Mass., October 12, 1967.

The EDITOR,
Springfield Daily News,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR SIR: An article by Don G. Campbell that appeared in your paper on October 4 is typical of the misinformation being circulated about the social security program.

Mr. Campbell states that the social security trust funds have a deficit of $400 billion because they do not constitute a full reserve required of private insurance companies. The fact is that it would not only be unnecessary but also unwise to build up such a huge reserve. The Advisory Council on Social Security, an independent group of non-governmental experts stated in its most recent report, ". . . A compulsory social insurance program is correctly considered soundly financed if, on the basis of actuarial estimates, current assets plus future income are expected to be sufficient to cover all the obligations of the program; the present system meets this test . . ."

As in his comments about the program being "in the red," Mr. Campbell's comments about social security being a "bad buy" for the young worker, and his idea that the system should be on a voluntary basis are equally shallow and fallacious. I am sure that his statement, "political maneuvering results in unwarranted increases in benefits," would find little support among the 52,000 social security beneficiaries living in the Springfield area.

I regret that such a brief reply must answer a misleading article that was spread across one-third of one of your pages. What concerns me more, however, is the needless alarm and frightening anxiety that such irresponsible sensationalism causes so many of our fellow residents.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. MURPHY, Jr.,
District Manager, Social Security Administration.

CIVILIAN NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the body of the RECORD a response of the president of the United Mine Workers of America, W. A. Boyle, to Senator JOHN O. PASTORE's comments recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16, 1967, on page 28884:

OCTOBER 18, 1967.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: It has been noted with interest that you took the occasion on October 16 to engage in a personal attack on me in the United States Senate because of the position of the United Mine Workers of America and the undersigned on questions relating to the grave dangers of the civilian nuclear power program.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of the September 15 issue of our official publication, *The United Mine Workers Journal*, which contains the complete text of my remarks on Labor Day concerning this subject. There are also other pertinent matters in this issue of the Journal that I should like to call to your attention. Also enclosed

are subsequent issues of the Journal with further material on the serious hazards of such atomic energy plants.

These documents are being sent to you because it is obvious that neither you nor your speech writers have read my speech. I assume the speech writers are employees of the Joint Committee and/or the Atomic Energy Commission working on government time at taxpayers' expense to enable you to "defend" what you fallaciously call the "private nuclear power" industry.

I resent your attacks on me and my integrity for personal reasons. I resent, as a taxpayer, you wasting the time of the United States Senate and the space of the Congressional Record to launch a personal diatribe against a private citizen.

My concern in this matter is simple. I am concerned for human life. As an official of the United Mine Workers of America for most of my adult life, my first concern always has been for the welfare of human beings.

I cannot, among other things, permit you to go unchallenged with your implication that I am in any way attacking the military nuclear program. I am on record on this matter in all of my public statements on atomic energy. And I quote from my Labor Day speech as a recent example.

"It has been said that we have more nuclear weapons right now than we will ever need. If we need atomic bombs, so be it.

"And I say this because I do not intend to argue with the military about defense policy. I pray to God that they will never be used. But I am not talking about national defense. I am talking about the unnecessary building of dangerous, poisonous radioactive civilian atomic power plants. I am talking about an industry that is being built on the tortured bodies of the men who for more than 20 years have dug this poisonous uranium from the ground.

"I am talking about pollutants that come from these atomic power plants and poisonous waste material that is being dumped around the country in out-of-the-way places where the 'experts' hope it won't be seen. I am talking about the Hanford Atomic plant polluting the waters of the Columbia River. I am talking about the power company executives who are so greedy for government subsidies that they would endanger the lives of millions of Americans in our big cities by building atomic power plants in or near the heart of these cities."

I charged in that speech and I repeat now that the dangerous civilian atomic power program is being subsidized—or paid for, if you wish to be more specific—with government funds. This, as you well know, can be documented despite the deceptive bookkeeping methods of the Atomic Energy Commission.

You admit in your attack on me that up to 1963 the government was subsidizing the civilian atomic industry. How the books have been manipulated since then I can not be sure, but I would be glad to have you open the books for public examination to determine the facts.

Your callous statement that no members of the public have been hurt by the civilian nuclear program attempts to ignore the fact that a citizen of your own state of Rhode Island, Robert Peabody, died a horrible death in 1964 from radiation exposure. The authoritative *New England Journal of Medicine* published the gruesome clinical details on the case and the authoritative magazine, *Scientific American*, followed up with a further article about the Peabody case. I am sure there is a case history on the matter in your files or that it may be obtained from the Atomic Energy Commission files. Under your restrictive definition I suppose the late Mr. Peabody is not to be regarded as a part of the general public. To me, however, he was a human being.

And we have reason to believe that approximately 6,000 uranium miners in the Western States are presently ill with forms of radiation poisoning and will probably die. However, these mine workers, under your definition, are not members of the general public. To me they are human beings. I am concerned for them. As a United States Senator and elected representative of the people of your state you should also be concerned for them and other potential victims.

You charge that the United Mine Workers of America is in a campaign to "undercut the nuclear power industry." We are, to be more precise, actually engaged in a campaign to wipe out the construction of dangerous civilian nuclear power plants across the length and breadth of America. We are in a campaign to put the government-financed and government-sponsored civilian nuclear power industry out of business, to turn it over to private enterprise and see if it can stand on its own feet.

We are sick and tired of the double talk of the Atomic Energy Commission on this matter. We are sick and tired of the falsehoods concerning the real and potential dangers of this program to all Americans.

We are engaged, most importantly, in a campaign to warn the American people of the terrifying dangers of this civilian program. We are, as you charge, engaged in a campaign to "inflame and alarm the public." We admit this. It is time that someone opposed you and your committee, the Atomic Energy Commission and the giant corporations that constitute the civilian atomic establishment. It is time that someone "inflamed and alarmed" the public. We can not expect you or your powerful Joint Committee to tell us the truth or the facts.

Incidentally, I am delighted to read that you state publicly that you do not know "whether actual operating experience with these reactors will verify the economic estimates on which their purchase was based." I seem to recall constant statements by the atomic power spokesmen, bolstered by detailed AEC public relations advisory documents, to the effect that these reactors are economically feasible. If such reactors are neither economically feasible nor safe the whole problem should be sent back to the laboratory where it can not endanger the general public about whom you show at least some concern. If such reactors are economically feasible they are still, in my considered opinion, dangerous and this nation should not be proceeding with the building of such plants at this time.

The public does not know, as I am sure you do, of the leaking nuclear tanks at Hanford, of the air pollution from atomic wastes, of the water and ground pollution from radioactive materials. They do not know—but they shall if I have my say—that they can not buy insurance to protect themselves against atomic accidents.

I am therefore glad to see you admit that there are "uninsurable potential liabilities arising from the use of the atom to generate electricity." I am glad to see you admit that damages "could conceivably arise from a nuclear disaster." That is what I have been saying. But unlike you I am not willing to sit back and wait until such a nuclear disaster occurs.

My concern is for human beings. My concern is for the truth. My concern is for facts. I intend to do everything at my command to "inflame and alarm" the American people over this terrible menace.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

NEW YORK TIMES TELLS HOW SERIES OF 1-MINUTE SPEECHES IN THE HOUSE WILL SAVE NATION $10 TO $25 MILLION A YEAR

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is of interest to every Member of the House, and certainly it is reflective of the national influence and usefulness of speeches made in this Chamber, especially those that are voiced during the 1-minute period, that the vocal revelations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], made in repeated 1-minute speeches, will result in an annual saving of from $10 to $25 million in future defense purchases.

I am extending my remarks to include two articles from the respected New York Times of October 30, 1967, the first a dispatch from Washington by William Beecher, stating that a top official in the Defense Department estimated at between $10 and $25 million the future annual savings resulting from one colleague's exposure, the second a political profile of Congressman PIKE.

The first article follows:

ARTICLE BY WILLIAM BEECHER

WASHINGTON, October 29.—Insistent assertions that the Government had been overcharged more than $34,000 on small purchases have led to a tightening of the Defense Department's procurement program.

A top official says that the move may eventually save $10-million to $25-million a year.

In a series of Congressional statements and press releases last summer, Representative Otis G. Pike, Democrat of Suffolk County, insisted that the military had paid tens of thousands of dollars for spare parts worth a small fraction of that amount.

CHANGES ORDERED

Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, conceded in an interview that an extensive investigation had substantiated Mr. Pike's charges and uncovered several other instances of overcharging.

As a result, he said, the Pentagon has ordered a series of changes in its procedures aimed at eliminating similar overpayments and turning up millions of dollars in savings.

"But the savings, though meaningful, are less important than insuring the integrity of the procurement system," Mr. Morris said.

"We can't knowingly tolerate abuses of the kind Congressman Pike has pointed out."

HEARINGS MAY BE HELD

The whole matter may be taken up soon in hearings before the House Armed Services Subcommittee for Special Investigations, headed by Representative Porter Hardy Jr., Democrat of Virginia.

Mr. Morris said that the problem was centered on the so-called "small purchases" category of military procurement, accounting for eight million individual purchases averaging about $230 an order.

"Even if we were 99 per cent perfect in handling these small purchases," he said, "we would still make 80,000 mistakes a year. Mr. Pike, with the assistance of the Government

Accounting Office, uncovered 18 mistakes. But we cannot allow these flagrant overcharges to take place."

Twelve of the 18 cases cited by Mr. Pike—amounting to $34,059 of the $34,329 total—involved purchases from Designatories, Inc., of Mineola, L.I., which is in Nassau County, or its Sterling Instruments Division, Mr. Morris said. Government auditors have gone over 50,000 of the company's invoices and come up with other allegedly excessive charges, he said.

Mr. Morris said that this material has been turned over to the Department of Justice for possible legal action. In the meantime, the company has been blacklisted from doing business with the Defense Department until the matter is cleared up, he said.

Among the examples cited by Mr. Pike were the sale by the company of nine spur gears for $194.30 apiece on which the catalogue price was $3.43 apiece, and 30 high-voltage couplings at $67.50 apiece, on which the catalogue price was $2.75.

In an effort to tighten procedures, Mr. Morris said that the Pentagon would insist that senior procurement officials devote more time reviewing the 20 to 30 daily decisions of each young buyer involved in small-purchase orders.

These less experienced men will be given additional training and be required to show what evidence they used to determine the reasonableness of each purchase price.

When a new item of equipment is brought into the inventory, Mr. Morris said, a major effort will be made to get a list from the manufacturer or subcontractors who made each component so that spare parts in the future can be bought at the lowest cost, without going through a middleman.

Specifically because of Mr. Pike's disclosures, Mr. Morris said that the Government in search of "irrational pricing patterns," would step up its scrutiny of companies specializing in providing spare parts to the military.

But while granting that by oversight the Defense Department had not plugged all the loopholes in its procurement program, Mr. Morris estimated that it would take more than 10,000 new employes, costing $60-million to $70-million a year, to eliminate all errors.

That would be a lot more than could possibly be saved by eliminating mistakes in buying, he said.

He also observed that small purchases had been overlooked in the last several years because of the relatively small dollar amount involved, representing about 4 per cent of the total defense procurement.

What may be easily overlooked, he said, are the billions of dollars defense officials believe they have saved since 1961 by such actions as markedly increasing the number of large contracts awarded competitively, rather than through negotiation, and in making purchases on a cheaper multiyear basis rather than on a year-by-year basis.

INDEFATIGABLE POLITICIAN

The second article, with the headline "Indefatigable Politician," follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 30, 1967]

INDEFATIGABLE POLITICIAN: OTIS GREY PIKE

Representative Otis Grey Pike got interested in politics and the Democratic party when he was 14 years old and they have been his consuming passion almost without interruption ever since. The tall gray-haired Suffolk County Congressman, whose disclosures of excessive payments by the military establishment have been confirmed by the Pentagon, recalled in a recent interview his first glimmers of political awakening.

"It began when I was 14," he said. "It was on a Sunday during the Depression. My sister, Betty, who is 10 years older than I am, came home from her job with the Suffolk County Welfare Department and told us about a family she had just visited.

"They had a big farm—around 150 acres, as I remember—and she said that all they had for Sunday dinner was boiled potatoes.

"I was surprised that in a great country like America, such a thing could happen. All my family had always been Republicans, but that kind of thing, and what Franklin Roosevelt tried to do about it, turned me into a Democrat."

It did not, however, turn him into a particularly orthodox Democrat. As one party official on Long Island has commented, Mr. Pike "runs for office as a Democrat, is elected by Republicans, has liberal leanings and a conservative approach."

The formula has worked admirably for Mr. Pike, who is now serving his fourth term as the Congressman from Suffolk County, an area once considered solidly Republican.

Mr. Pike was born in Riverhead, L.I., on Aug. 31, 1921, the son of Otis Grey Pike and the former Belle Lupton. Both his parents died when he was a boy but left enough to provide him with a reasonably comfortable childhood and a good education.

He was graduated from Princeton in 1943 and, after four years as a Marine combat pilot in World War II, from the Columbia University Law School in 1948.

Mr. Pike's first bid for elective office was faltering.

In 1949, the year he was admitted to the bar and set up his law practice in Riverhead, he ran for justice of the peace and was defeated. Six years later, he ran again. This years later, he ran again. This time he won and his political career was started.

In 1958, Mr. Pike took on Representative Stuyvesant Wainwright, the Republican incumbent, in the race for the House seat from Suffolk. The open-faced Democrat with the bow tie lost the contest, but he wasted no time beginning his campaign for the same seat in the 1960 election. Then to the surprise of most political observers, he beat Mr. Wainwright by 2,700 votes.

In his subsequent campaigns, which he has won handilly, Mr. Pike has displayed not only an indefatigability that tends to overwhelm his opponents but also a wit that sometimes perplexes them.

For example, during campaigns, he sends Long Island newspapers a "Blast Pike Kit," which informs them of his weaknesses and vulnerabilities so that reporters will not have to invest the time and effort to study his record.

Like most members of the House, Mr. Pike campaigns constantly.

He normally spends the work week in Washington, where he has a remarkably low absentee rate in Congress, and his weekends on Long Island attending a steady round of dinners, meetings, cocktail parties, dances and civic gatherings.

They have three children—Lois Adele, a 19-year-old sophomore at Radcliffe; Douglas Arthur, 18, a freshman at Princeton, and Robert Dudley, 14, a freshman at Riverhead High School.

Mr. Pike recently betrayed the deep faith he places in the craft of politics when a reporter asked to spend some time with the Congressman watching him work and campaign.

Mr. Pike was immediately receptive to the proposal.

"The more people know about politics," he said, "the better off we'll all be."

Then his blue eyes brightened and a smile crossed his handsome face as he added, "I'm clean."

THE PRESTIGE OF CONGRESS

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been written and said about the prestige of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as about individual Members of Congress. I am proud to number among my West Virginia constituents J. Allen Overton, Jr., executive vice president of the American Mining Congress, who delivered today a most remarkable address which reveals a rare understanding of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Overton addressed the safety awards luncheon of the Portland Cement Association annual meeting in Chicago, Ill. this noon. His address carries the title "How Safe is America?" As a West Virginian, trained in the law, and associated with the legislative processes of State and Federal Government for more than 25 years, he speaks from long and practical experience. He concludes:

The Congress of the United States is the last, best hope of free men and free government.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Overton is one of the most distinguished citizens in my congressional district. He was born in the fine and thriving city of Parkersburg, W. Va., the second largest city in the Fourth Congressional District. He served in the West Virginia House of Delegates from 1948 to 1950, being elected as a Republican. He has always proven to be a vigorous and fair exponent of the Republican faith, and an active participant in political and civic affairs. During the period 1949 through 1954, Mr. Overton was a member of the law firm of Handlan, Overton & Early in Parkersburg, W. Va.

During the years from 1955 to 1959, Mr. Overton served in the Department of Commerce, first as special assistant to the general counsel and later as deputy general counsel. President Eisenhower nominated him in 1959 to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission, where he served with great distinction until June of 1962. On several occasions when I testified before the Tariff Commission, I was deeply impressed with Commissioner Overton's grasp of the complexities of the schedules and policies over which he had jurisdiction. In January 1963, Mr. Overton was named to his present position as executive secretary of the American Mining Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest I know that all Members will have in Mr. Overton's address, particularly the last portion thereof, under unanimous consent I am including the complete text of that address with my remarks:

HOW SAFE IS AMERICA?

(An address by J. Allen Overton, Jr., executive vice president, American Mining Congress, at the safety awards luncheon of the Portland Cement Association annual meeting, Chicago, Ill., November 14, 1967)

The American Mining Congress is honored by your invitation to share in that portion of the program for this Portland Cement

Association convention which involves your Safety Awards and Honors for several very significant reasons.

First, I am especially honored with the privilege of speaking here today before the chief officers of the companies who operate in every one of the 50 States of our Nation and who service every city, town and hamlet in the Nation. Seldom is a person accorded the privilege of visiting with such a distinguished and important element of our Nation's business leadership.

Secondly, I am honored by your invitation to address this Safety Awards Luncheon because the American Mining Congress has for a great many years placed an emphasis on safety which is second to no other undertaking in the mining industry, and by which effort the American Mining Congress became one of the pioneers in the safety efforts of industrial activities.

My third reason for being honored by having the opportunity to speak to you today—and the last one I will specifically state, although there are many others—is because of the long, friendly and close working association which the American Mining Congress has had with the cement industry through a very active and comprehensive membership of your companies. This association has given us a rare insight into your industry's problems and accomplishments. We are abundantly concerned with your problems and we share your pleasure in surveying your many accomplishments.

So we speak the same language, you and I. And we have many, many concerns in common.

You have heard much at these sessions about planning for safety, about accident prevention and the techniques which can bring your goals closer to the reach of every employee and every employer. Surrounded, as I am here today, by some of this Nation's most accomplished experts in these areas, I will not presume on your time by any discussion of the technical aspects in these fields which you know so well.

Your deliberations have involved you, too, in matters related to pollution abatement, an area of prime concern not alone to cement, but also to every other segment of mining, to all enlightened industry—and indeed to every man, woman and child in America. Again, I would not presume to engage in any technical discussion of this subject—except to point out the appropriateness of your consideration in a single session of these two subjects which are in the van of our industry's interest and also occupy a major portion of government considerations today.

Day by day, we in the private enterprise sector of our economy are becoming aware of increasing involvement of government in our affairs. This is true of the subject of pollution controls and of the safety features of industrial activities. No longer are safety in the working place, control of stack emissions, quality of plant water discharges, noises from industrial operations, odors from some types of processing endeavors, and a host of other factors inherent in industrial operations treated as separate items of consideration. They all are bulked together now in Washington in a single designation—"Quality of Our Environment". The development of governmental interest in these fields is not limited to our working hours alone. In a recent report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a special study group advocated that Federalism take over the direction and control of all aspects of human life during every waking and sleeping moment.

Such a broad concept of the government's appropriate role in the "new civics"—called "creative Federalism"—may cause additional concern and activity during our every waking moment and perhaps may even eat into a little of our sleep!

So, as we gather here to award Safety Honors, we are active in but a small segment of the total concern of our companies' involvement in a broad field of industry-government relationships.

I have apparently digressed from what might be expected for the topic of a talk at a Safety Awards luncheon. You may by now well wonder what in the world I intend to talk about. Since I have indicated that Safety is now involved in a much broader field than prevention of a cut or bruise in our daily work-a-day world and more comprehensive than any regional application of controls or regulations, I want to devote our attention to the real field of safety in which we are involved today—I wish to discuss with you for a few moments our first safety question—"How safe is America?"

Well, I'm from West Virginia.

In that garden spot of America, we're noted neither for our reticence nor for shortness of breath.

Therefore, true to the traditions of my forebears, when I find myself facing a gracious audience and confronting a live microphone I take advantage of a kindly situation.

I referred a moment ago to the many concerns we have in common. My business, as you know, keeps me pretty much in Washington, D.C. I have been there for many years, deeply involved in the processes of government—and keenly concerned about the growing impact of the governmental processes on virtually all of the business decisions which are made every hour of every day by many millions of Americans.

It is about the legislative process in Washington, with which I have been intimately associated for some 25 years—and more particularly about the dedicated men and women who make it work—that I want to visit with you today.

We are, all of us, much involved, on a personal, a company, an industry basis in virtually every action taken—every decision made—by the Senate of the United States and the United States House of Representatives. We see ourselves affected by legislative proposals in such diverse fields as taxation, foreign policy, military affairs, tariff and trade, appropriations—and the hardy perennials which command the very special attention of our industry, such as mine safety, pollution abatement, and the other items in the long litany.

But I want you to look with me beyond the specifics of these pressing legislative concerns. I want you to assess with me a condition which could well hold within itself the seeds of a development far more important to this Nation than the safety requirements of our daily occupation, more important than the very legislation on which the Congress acts.

I am concerned—very concerned—about the decline in Congressional prestige.

I am concerned—very concerned—that each and every one of us face up to his civic duty to do something about correcting this decline.

I am persuaded beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Congress of the United States is the last best hope of free men and free government. In saying this, I demean no other branch, no other arm, no other facet of our governmental structure. As I indicated a moment ago, I served in State government. Also, it was my great privilege to serve for several years (beginning in the middle 1950s) in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in Washington. One of my most treasured keepsakes of that service is the framed Commission of Office, indicating appointment by the President and, equally important, confirmation by the Senate. As a lawyer who began his adult working life in the private practice of law, and whose only son is now engaged in the study of law, my respect for our Judicial system is ingrained and deep.

Yet, of all the great branches of our government, the Congress of the United States, as I see it, stands closest to the people, instinctively responsive to their wishes, steadily reflecting their hopes and aspirations.

The Senate of the United States has well been called the world's greatest deliberative body; the House of Representatives aptly labeled the Forge of Democracy. The impact of the Congress, and through it the impact of the people, on the other great branches of government is both obvious and pervasive. Graduates of the House and the Senate have served with high honor and great distinction at all levels of the Judiciary since the earliest days of this Republic. The White House too has been graced by those who first served on the national scene in the Congress of the United States. Indeed, three of the last four Presidents served first in the Congress. So, too, did the last five men who have served as Vice President of the United States.

Despite all these obvious considerations, we have witnessed throughout most of our adult lifetimes—interrupted only now and then, subsiding only occasionally—a persistent, a relentless effort by the advocates of strong central government to downgrade the prestige of Congress, to tarnish its image before the public. For more years than most of us care to remember, we have seen this steady campaign, listened to the incessant drumfire of its single theme—that we ought somehow to regard Congress (the institution, and all too often the individuals who comprise it) as an assortment of buffoons, and worse.

This is a slander of low degree. It is totally unjustified. And we—every one of us—can and should start doing something about it, and now. This is our safety problem. This is the safety problem of the Republic.

From my many years of close personal association with the legislative process in Washington, I am a complete, a total believer in the skill, the dedication, the reliability of the men and women who serve in the House and the Senate. I don't always agree with what they do, and maybe that's as it should be. But they do reflect the attitudes of the folks at home, and I don't know of a single one among them who isn't ready and willing always to account to the folks at home for his actions and his votes.

But what's happening? What impression is the most prevalent impression about the Congress in the minds of the American voters? Buffoons, and worse, as I said a moment ago.

Now, why is this happening? Congress, unlike the Presidency, is not a highly personalized institution. Congress is impersonal, in great part because of its very size. This unwieldy, impersonal quality makes it easy for advocates of bigger and stronger central government to point an accusing finger at Congress, to lay the blame on Congress for a wide range of shortcomings which are properly chargeable to somebody else. The composite and grossly inaccurate result, after all these years, is that Congress is characterized before the public as dull, insensitive, an essentially selfish group serving only some narrow "special" interests and caring not a whit for the welfare of the people.

Add to that the few in Congress—and they are very, very few indeed—who have abused the power of their Congressional offices, or used their official positions for personal gain. The vocal critics of this very great institution need only one such case every decade—even the suggestion of a case will do—to reinforce the campaign of slander, abuse and ridicule. And Congress, again because it is so unwieldy and as an institution so impersonal, does not and cannot adequately defend itself.

In all this, who is the loser? Who loses when public confidence in the Congress is slowly eroded and finally undermined?

Everybody loses. Literally everybody. The Congress itself, the public generally, you and I—we all lose. The cause of good government is set back immeasurably.

And if we're going to turn this thing around—we'd better tackle it at the point where we have some likelihood of success.

You—yes, you—you'd better tackle it in the person of your own Congressman. Whether you like his politics, or whether you don't, get better acquainted with him. If you don't like the Congressman you have, maybe you can get another one next year. But you'd better get together now with the one you do have. Let him know your respect for the institution in which he serves. Let him know you don't put him or the Congress in this "buffoons, or worse" category.

The process must begin somewhere if we are ever to let Congress know there are people who understand and appreciate its role and its efforts. Your one Congressman and your two Senators add up to only three of the more than 500 Members in both Houses of Congress. Only three. but they're *your* three. This is a good place for you to start. Take these three as an assignment for yourself. Invite them to your meetings where you can. Go meet with them were you can. Maybe you can generate some local recognition—newspaper editorials, civic club activities, and the like—as your contribution to the start of a campaign to upgrade the Congress in the public's esteem, to restore it to its rightful position in terms of prestige, public understanding and appreciation of its very great significance.

You can do your part in all this without endorsing the reelection of a Congressman or Senator of whom you don't approve. Get behind your own candidate with all the steam you can generate. If you elect him, you'll obviously feel that much better. Don't apologize for opposing the reelection of an incumbent. Don't apologize for being a hard-working supporter of your own Party and your own candidate. The real genius of our system remains its basic two-Party character.

So, if you generate some public recognition for a Member or a candidate whom you do support, all the better in your view. If you feel that you're saddled with one you cannot support publicly, then let him know quietly and privately that you are not one who thinks Congress is sinking to the low estate its critics ascribe to it.

This will not be an idle gesture on your part. This is a civic obligation that squarely faces every one of us. And, if you're inclined to look for some return beyond your duty to improve the body politic—then I would only add that a prime rule of human behavior tells you that you'll achieve with that Member of Congress a better relationship, a better appreciation of your problems—if you make this effort, regardless of whether you and he agree politically, ideologically, or on a specific issue of the moment.

The time for this is now. Never before in these many years of my exposure to the workings of Congress have Members of the House and Senate seemed more sensitive to their unfortunate—and unfair—public image. Never before in these years have they seemed so much to need, and to welcome, the understanding of their constituents. And I would add that never before in these years have I felt that the Congress—collectively and individually—was as badly maligned and slandered as it is today.

We have many problems in Washington, you and I.

Industry's concerns with the processes of government add up to a big job, a many-sided job. That you know this is obvious. Your presence here, and the enthusiasm and purpose with which you participated in these very constructive sessions in Chicago give ample testimony of your awarenes of that fact.

Yes—this activity we like to call Governmental Affairs is indeed a big job, a many-sided job. And I'm convinced that we single out the most important part of the whole undertaking when we say—

It's time to Speak Up.

It's time to Stem the Slanders.

It's time to let the House and the Senate know there are some who Salute its Integrity—who would Restore its Prestige—who would Proclaim Again free government's essential dependence on the Congress of the United States—who realize this is the *first* Safety Program of our industry—and who realize that America is only as safe as its Congress is strong and respected.

THE TYRANNY OF BUREAUCRACY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two letters.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the tyranny of bureaucracy has been further demonstrated by John Doar, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, in his most recent action, which is reflected in the exchange of correspondence I direct to the attention of the Members of this body.

The situation has now developed where more is at stake than a mere legitimate request by me to the Department of Justice for information, which has been denied me. This has become secondary.

Mr. Doar now thumbs his nose at individual Members of Congress and makes the determination that he alone decides what information a Member of Congress is given and what information is denied him.

His latest interpretation of the Freedom of Information Act, which specifically says that Congress shall not be denied the availability of records, is that Members have no rights as individuals, and information will be given only to Congress itself or to a congressional committee.

Now every Member of this body is a party of interest in this dangerous attitude of Mr. Doar and the Department of Justice.

In other words, his latest communication to me says that a Member of Congress cannot have information if Mr. Doar decides the Member should not have it. I believe you will agree with me that this position and attitude is one which strikes at the very foundation of the right of a member of Congress to know and to have available to him information which he desires.

I repeat that my own individual request has been submerged. At stake now is the right of each individual Member of this body, who in the future may make a request to the Department of Justice and have that request denied.

In Mr. Doar's opinion, a Member of Congress has no more right to access of information than a policeman directing traffic in the street.

This is tyranny in its ugliest form. I submit the exchange of correspondence, which supplements my remarks of November 6, so you can see for yourself the reply of Mr. Doar in this matter and my response to him:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, November 8, 1967.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HÉBERT: This will respond to your letter dated November 3, 1967 which repeats your earlier request for the names of individuals assigned as election observers under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Your letter questions the applicability of the Freedom of Information Act to a request for information made by a Member of Congress, and suggests that in connection with such a request only the President may decline to furnish the information.

My understanding of the doctrine of Executive privilege as asserted by the President with respect to Congress is based upon the enclosed copies of President Kennedy's letter of March 7, 1962, as amplified by Mr. Sorenson's letter of March 30, 1962, President Johnson's letter of April 2, 1965, and a letter of May 5, 1965 by then Deputy Attorney General Clark. These letters reflect that the question of Executive privilege, as to which the President is to make a personal decision, arises only in situations where a request for information is made by Congress or its committees, as distinguished from a request made by an individual Member of Congress. Accordingly, my earlier letter did not rely on any claim of Executive privilege.

Your letter questioned the applicability of the Freedom of Information Act to your request because the Act contains a specific provision that "this section is not authority to withhold information from Congress." 5 U.S.C. 552(c). The legislative history concerning this provision, however, shows that this provision makes the same distinction noted above between requests from Congress or its committees and requests by individual Members of Congress. House Report No. 1497, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess. (concerning section 3(f) of Public Law 89-487, which became 5 U.S.C. 552(c)) contains the following statement at pages 11-12:

"Subsection (f).—The purpose of this subsection is to make clear beyond doubt that all the materials of Government are to be available to the public unless specifically exempt from disclosure by the provisions of subsection (e) or limitations spelled out in earlier subsections. And subsection (f) restates the fact that a law controlling public access to Government information has absolutely no effect upon congressional access to information. Members of the Congress have all of the rights of access guaranteed to 'any person' by S. 1160, and the Congress has additional rights of access to all Government information which it deems necessary to carry out its functions." (footnote omitted).

I hope that the above explanation will clarify the basis for the position taken in my previous letter.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOAR,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1967.

Mr. JOHN DOAR,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOAR: I am surprised at your cavalier treatment of a Member of Congress, contending that a government official elected

by the voters will not be taken into the confidence of the government, itself. I cannot agree with your statement that language in the Freedom of Information Law applying to the Congress gives Members of that official body no more right of access to government information than a member of the public.

Regardless of the Congressional right of access to government information, I believe I have the right to know the facts requested. The section of the law which you cite as authority for withholding the names of individuals assigned as "volunteer" observers at the polls in Louisiana on November 4, 1967 certainly is not authority for withholding.

I do not see how the identification of "volunteer" poll observers can qualify as "investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes"—which are exempt from disclosure under the law. Identification of investigators is by no means an "investigatory file."

Finally, your letter of November 3, 1967 states that "*advance* disclosure of the names of agents" might disrupt the investigative function. The election has passed. There is no possibility of "advance" disclosure.

For these reasons, I repeat my request for the names of individuals who "volunteered" to serve as observers at the pools on election day, November 4, 1967, in Louisiana.

I would appreciate a prompt reply in order that I may plan whatever future action is necessary.

Sincerely yours,

F. EDW. HÉBERT.

KEY WEST'S DESALTING PLANT: MODEL FOR WORLD

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply interested for many years in the enormous potential for social and economic progress represented in the development of efficient facilities for the conversion of sea water into pure, fresh water.

I have been concerned, first, because the Key West area in the congressional district which I represent for years has been facing the threat of a severe water shortage. There is very little natural fresh water available in the Keys. In the past water has been brought into the area by a Navy aqueduct. But this approach obviously would fail to meet our future needs, and it would be inordinately expensive.

Second, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been acutely aware that effective desalting techniques could contribute greatly to our goal of improving the quality of life for millions of people in arid regions around the world—with all this means for political and social stability. So I was very pleased to have sponsored the legislation which led to the International Conference on Water for Peace which was held in our Nation's Capital this year.

Today, I would like to call the attention of the House to a development which has great significance for Key West—and, by example, to many other arid regions in this country and abroad. This development is the completion and successful operation in Key West of the world's largest and most efficient single-unit water desalting plant built to date.

A great deal of credit is due to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission for its leadership and initiative in sponsoring and financing this project. The plant, designed and built and operated by Westinghouse, is now providing more than 2,600,000 gallons of highest quality fresh water per day—water taken from the ocean. This supply meets the entire community's water needs. Key West thus becomes the first American city to obtain all of its water from the Atlantic Ocean.

Performance tests have recently been completed and the plant has met or bettered all performance requirements with flying colors. At the conclusion of these remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. John M. Koenig, chairman of the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission, and several newspaper articles which attest to the satisfaction of the community with the quality and cost of the plant's performance.

Incidentally, as principal sponsor of the legislation which created the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I am pleased that HUD provided a loan guarantee to the commission which helped to make this pioneering effort financially feasible.

But the meaning of the success of the Key West plant extends far beyond my own State. This project demonstrates the advanced technological capacity of American industry—working on its own—to design, construct, and operate desalting plants which provide water of excellent quality at economical costs. In addition to the benefits this will bring to the American economy, designs similar to the proved plant at Key West offer early opportunities for other areas of the world which have been depressed for centuries by a lack of water.

The Key West plant is a landmark which can help arid developing countries meet their own needs in the most economical way—employing techniques and design features that have met the hard test of practical experience and success.

Already, our Key West plant has become a world showplace, attracting prominent visitors from foreign countries as well as Members of Congress and others in the United States who are interested in this advanced technology.

I congratulate the people of Monroe County and Key West, who are justly proud of this great project and all it means to their progress, and the progress of other peoples around the world.

The material mentioned above follows:

FLORIDA KEYS AQUEDUCT COMMISSION,
Key West, Fla., November 13, 1967.

Representative DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FASCELL: In response to your recent request for information relative to the Key West desalting plant, I am pleased to offer the following on behalf of the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission:

The Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission's 2,620,000 gallon per day ocean water desalting plant, which was designed and built by Westinghouse, is in full operation providing our entire community water needs. Performance tests have been recently completed. The results of these tests clearly indicate that our desalting plant has met or bettered all of the contract-required guarantees and warranties. Operation of the plant by Westinghouse has also given us added assurance of smooth, continuous and dependable plant performance. While we do not as yet have enough specific data accrued relative to the cost of plant product water cost, there is every indication from the recent performance tests to indicate that the cost of water will be well within the predicted 85 cents per thousand gallons.

Speaking for the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission, we are very pleased with the fine spirit of cooperation that we have experienced with the prime contractor, Westinghouse. The Key West desalting plant design and construction is of the highest quality, consistent with long life and dependability, common to utility type production facilities.

As might be expected, because the Key West desalting plant is the largest, most advanced desalting production facility in operation to date, many visitors have come to Key West to inspect it. To date we have had visits from the Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District, the Prime Minister of Malta, the United States Ambassador to Malta, representatives from the Bahamas, from Italy and Kuwait, as well as many of our distinguished members of Congress who have a legislative interest in the desalting field; and, of course, our highest honor was recorded when the Honorable Hubert Horatio Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, dedicated our plant on July 20, 1967.

To summarize, our desalting plant is in full operation and is performing better than levels as guaranteed by Westinghouse, both in capacity and efficiency. We believe we have an exemplary desalting plant and welcome the opportunity to show it to any and all visitors that might be considering such a plant.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. KOENIG,
Chairman.

MALTA OFFICIAL VIEWS DESAL PLANT OPERATION

Malta's dapper 56-year-old Prime Minister Dr. G. Borg Olivier came to Key West yesterday shopping for a desalination plant to meet the needs of his bustling Mediterranean island.

Northeast's giant Yellowbird jet winged the prime minister over the Westinghouse-built plant on Stock Island precisely at noon before landing at nearby Key West International Airport.

It was at the exact moment the huge commercial liner flew over that the plant successfully completed a 30-day sustained performance test.

A few minutes later a motorcade carrying the prime minister, U.S. Ambassador designate to Malta Hugh Smythe, Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission members, Westinghouse officials and others arrived at the location of the world's largest single unit desal plant.

Olivier stepped briskly out of a Lincoln auto, wearing a sporty blue suit and sharp-toed black slippers.

Roy Gaunt, head of Westinghouse's Water Province Department, escorted the prime minister into the plant's control room where he explained the instruments then measuring a product water output of 2.7 million gallons per day.

The plant had ended its 30-day test just moments before and now was beginning a four-day test to measure the consumption rate of consumables—like fuel, electricity and sulphuric acid.

Olivier signed the guest book which Gaunt pointed out had been first signed by Vice

President Hubert Humphrey when he was here in July to dedicate the plant.

The party moved outside where Gaunt continued to review the plant's operation with Olivier, Ambassador Smythe and the prime minister's private secretary, G. W. Borg.

There was no doubt Olivier was impressed with the plant.

Westinghouse has submitted bids to build two one-million-gallon per day desal units on Malta which now only has a one million gpd unit.

The prime minister said the island's 320,000 population is growing and eventually Malta will need a seven million gallon per day output.

When the party moved to the rear of the plant, the prime minister called his 18-year-old son Peter over to look at a school of needle gar swimming in Safe Harbor Channel. The teenager is enrolled in Iona Prep School at New Rochelle, N.Y.

The party spent about one hour at the plant and then left for the Holiday Inn where Westinghouse hosted a luncheon.

Olivier, accompanied by his Secretary to the Ministry of Commonwealth and Foreign Affairs, F. E. Amato-Gauci, arrived in the United States as official guests of the President October 1. He had private talks with the President on Wednesday and Friday he spoke before the United Nations General Assembly.

The Maltese delegation will return home Tuesday.

Those in the party from Washington included Ambassador Smythe's wife, Senator Claude Pepper's aide, Art Roberts, and State Department representative Joe Newman.

Locals in the group: Florida FKAC chairman John Koenig, commission members Walter Trandel, Claude Thompson, Hunter Lyon, and Blackie Valdez, The Citizen's editor-publisher, Norman Artman, Sheriff Reace Thompson, Captain Franklin Hernandez and escort deputies Peter Gomez and Buddy Mora.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 20, 1967]

KEY WEST, FLA., GETTING FRESH WATER FROM OCEAN

(By Harry Wilensky)

KEY WEST, FLA., August 19.—Life suddenly has become much more pleasant for the 47,000 people of this city. The water shortage that was a problem year in and year out has been solved—permanently—thanks to a desalination plant that makes Key West the first American city to get its fresh water from the sea.

Now people here can take a bath instead of a shower, plant flowers, turn on lawn sprinklers without worrying about rainfall, cisterns and pipelines. They no longer need pumps to get water up to the second floor, and when they turn on a faucet they do not have to keep their fingers crossed and hope there will be enough pressure.

For an island city with the Atlantic ocean on one side and the Gulf of Mexico on the other, Key West has been an extremely dry place. It was surrounded by billions of gallons of water, but it was salt water altogether unsuitable for washing cars, watering grass and flowers or taking a drink.

Key West once got its water from wells dug in the 1820s by Commodore David Porter, who came in to rid the island of pirates. But the wells could not supply all needs, and in time they became polluted. Then the people had to depend on rainwater, which was sluiced into a series of municipal and private cisterns.

In the early 1900s water was brought to this southernmost city by tank barges and by tank cars operating over the extension of the Florida East Coast Railway. The Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission, with five members appointed by the Governor, was established in the 1930s to wrestle with the problem of supplying water to those living on the coral reefs off the southern coast.

In 1942 the United States Navy, which has a base at Key West, built an 18-inch pipeline to bring water down from Florida City, on the mainland 130 miles to the north. The pipeline, which followed the overseas highway connecting the chain of islands, brought 6,000,000 gallons a day, but is wasn't enough to meet the needs of both the Navy and a growing civilian population.

The Navy has been using about 2,000,000 gallons a day and selling the remainder to the Aqueduct Commission, which stores it in tanks for distribution through the keys. The tanks have a storage capacity of 17,500,000 gallons, but Florida's prolonged drought reduced the amount in reserve to about 2,000,000 gallons. The Navy had to ration water at its base last spring, and the people of Key West adopted conservation measures.

In 1965 the commission, seeking a new source of water, decided to turn to desalination. Converting sea water into fresh water is an expensive process, but through 15 years of research the Federal Office of Saline Water has developed progressively cheaper and more efficient methods, reducing the cost of producing 1000 gallons of fresh water from $5 to less than $1.

Obtaining a federal loan of $4,440,000, the commission employed *Westinghouse Electric Corp.* to design, equip and construct a desalting plant with capacity to produce 2,620,000 gallons of fresh water a day. Under a $3,369,400 contract *Westinghouse* not only designed and built the plant but is operating it for a year to "get all the bugs out."

Stock Island, a neighboring islet 3 feet above sea level, was selected as the plant site, and by fill the land was extended and the elevation was raised to 7 feet, which is considered sufficient protection, the waters of the Atlantic ocean having never risen higher at this point.

There are several methods of desalting sea water. The one used in the Key West plant is multistage flash evaporation, a process in which ocean water is heated by steam from a boiler and is forced through a series of chambers of lower pressure and temperature. The differences in temperature and pressure cause part of the heated salt water to vaporize into steam, which in turn condenses into fresh water.

From three wells dug into the coral rock of Stock Island the plant draws water from the Atlantic at about 5500 gallons a minute. The water is heated to about 250 degrees and is pumped through a series of 48 chambers, each of which evaporates and condenses an additional portion of water.

The plant, which went into operation July 20, produces one gallon of fresh water for every three gallons of ocean water. The desalted water is stored in three 5,000,000-gallon tanks until it is needed by consumers in the lower Keys. Fuel oil to fire the plant boilers is shipped by barge from Fort Lauderdale.

Desalination costs about 85 cents for 1000 gallons of fresh water. The Aqueduct Commission has been paying the Navy 75 cents per 1000 gallons, but considers it well worth an additional 10 cents to insure availability of supply. Water service from the Navy pipeline was erratic and subject to disruption, particularly by storms. When Hurricane Donna struck in 1960, the pipeline was ruptured in half a dozen places.

Householders had been paying $1.52 per 1000 gallons for water from the pipeline, and the price for water from the desalting plant remains the same (as compared with 37 cents charged customers of St. Louis County Water Co. and a little less than 22 cents charged by the City of St. Louis).

Water from the desalting plant apparently tastes no different from pipeline water, but is much softer. "I use only half as much soap for my washing now," one housewife reported.

The water has fewer impurities. The U.S. Public Health Service recommends that drinking water contain no more than 500 impurity particles per million parts of water. The count with water from the pipeline ran up to 120. Impurities in water from the desalting plant average 10 parts per million, a very low level.

One of the best things about the new water supply is the increased pressure.

"There were times when I tried to take a shower and got only a trickle of water from the pipe," one man said. "It's sure different now. If I turn it all the way up, the shower will knock me against the wall."

The commission still buys some water from the Navy to supplement its supply. Now that people no longer have to skimp, water consumption has increased from 2,000,000 gallons a day to more than 2,300,000. Key West and the lower Keys are growing fast, and a study indicates that capacity of the present water supply will be taxed in a few years so that a new shortage may develop in the 1970s.

In view of this, the commission already is considering the advisability of building a second desalting plant.

Although it is described as the largest single-unit desalination plant in the world, the facility on Stock Island is not a huge plant. It is quite compact with almost 400 miles of pipe coiled into a small area, and is so designed that its control center could operate two plants. All the important flows, pressures and temperatures are automatically controlled for continuous operation with a minimum of manpower. Only two men are needed at any one time to operate the plant, and the entire staff numbers only 13. There are standby facilities for quick replacement of key equipment in an emergency.

Water shortages in various parts of the world are becoming more acute, leading to a rapid increase in number of desalination plants. Salt water is being converted into fresh water in Israel, Kuwait, Cyprus, Malta, Sicily, Tunisia, Mexico, Hong Kong, the Canary Islands and many of the islands in the Caribbean. Twenty-nine new plants are planned, most of them of the flash distillation type; three are dual-purpose plants that will make use of nuclear energy, and five are solar distillation plants.

Water shortages are not confined to underdeveloped countries. Parts of the United States are feeling the pinch. The average American family uses fresh water at the rate of 150 gallons a day. It takes 110,000 gallons of water to make a ton of steel; 184,000 gallons to produce a ton of paper; 660,000 gallons for a ton of synthetic rubber. A jet airliner needs 1000 gallons to take off.

The United States has a daily supply of natural fresh water estimated at 515 billion gallons. American industries, farms and homes use up 350 billion gallons. With consumption increasing by 25,000 gallons per day, by 1985 our daily demands for fresh water may be 600 billion gallons—50 billion more than is now available.

The Office of Saline Water is developing improvements in the technology of removing salt from seawater and brackish inland water, so that desalination is becoming increasingly attractive to dry places throughout the world.

Where desalination can be combined with generation of electric power, cost of producing fresh water can be greatly reduced. St. Thomas, in the Virgin Islands, was paying more than $2.25 per 1000 gallons for its water, most of which was brought in by barges from Puerto Rico. Now a plant that produces 7500 kilowatts of electricity and 1,000,000 gallons of fresh water daily has reduced the island's cost of fresh water to about $1.10 per 1000 gallons.

A desalination plant planned for Los Angeles will have a daily capacity of 150,000,-

000 gallons of water and 1800 megawatts of power. With federal aid, capital cost of the dual-purpose project will be $444,000,000, and the cost of desalinated water will be 21.9 cents per 1000 gallons.

Engineers predict that big nuclear desalters will be developed in the next 25 years to produce power at cost of 1 mill per kilowatt and fresh water for as little as 8 cents per 1000 gallons.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 9, 1967]

KEY WEST THIRST EASED BY NEW DESALTING PLANT—OLD PROBLEM SOLVED BY WORLD'S BIGGEST UNIT, FORERUNNER OF SOUTHLAND INSTALLATION

KEY WEST, FLA.—In the third month of a searing drought, old Key West faced a crisis. Water reserves were dangerously low and 56,000 residents were on severe rations. The city was tense, because a fire could mean catastrophe.

Then from the sea that surrounds it millions of gallons of purest water gushed into the city's mains. And suddenly long years of shortages brought by drought and hurricane were gone forever.

Thirsty Key West had turned to the sea, mightiest of reservoirs, to solve a problem that has plagued peoples of many lands through all of recorded history.

STAGGERING DEMANDS

The biggest single-unit seawater desalting plant in the world had just gone into operation. It sucks up 5 to 6 million gallons of briny fluid a day and sends it coursing in a boiling flood through a maze of superheated pipes and chambers. Then out one end pours 2.62 million gallons of water so pure it must be cascaded over a bed of lime to give it body and taste. From the other end, mineral-laden residue flows back to the sea.

The plant is the biggest so far put into use as the world looks to the seas to meet staggering demands of the future for fresh water.

But it is only a small sample of what is to come. Last May 19, President Johnson signed a bill authorizing a $444 million nuclear-powered plant off the Southern California coast. It will produce 150 million gallons of fresh water a day, while generating 1.8 million kilowatts of power.

This huge installation, the President said, "will not suddenly make the deserts bloom. But more than anything we have yet done, it points to the day when lands now dry and empty will sustain life and feed the people of the world."

Water covers seven-tenths of the earth, but civilizations have fallen for lack of it. Wars have been fought over it. And today millions of people cannot get enough that is fit to drink.

Lack of rainfall cannot be blamed entirely for this paradox. In many regions richly endowed with water, man has so recklessly polluted his precious rivers and lakes that their foul contents are useless to him.

Key West, sitting astride a coral island at the end of the chain of Florida Keys, has no fresh water streams. From the time it was a haven for pirates of the Spanish Main until 1941 it relied on rainwater caught in cisterns.

Then the U.S. Navy built a 130-mile pipeline to carry 6 million gallons of water a day from the mainland to its Key West base. It needed only half of the flow. The rest was sold to the domestic population and for years this satisfied all requirements.

Occasionally, a hurricane slashing through the Keys broke the line, cutting off the water for days at a time, and Key Westers went on rations. Then, as the population grew and the Navy base was enlarged after the Cuban crisis of 1962, there wasn't enough water to go around.

WORST DROUGHT

In the search for relief, the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission found that a second pipeline would cost $40 million, a conversion plant only $3.37 million. It became the first community in the United States to fill its needs by desalting seawater.

The plant poured out its first fresh water April 21, at the height of the worst drought in a quarter of a century. Three hundred years before the birth of Christ, the Greeks were trying to find a way to make sea water usable. But not until 1952, when the Office of Saline Water was established in the U.S. Department of Interior was the problem attacked on a broad front.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. had begun purifying brakish water for electric power plants in the early 1930s and its evaporators were in common use by utilities and industrial plants.

In 1948, Westinghouse began research that was to lead to construction of what was claimed to be the first large-scale plant for distilling ocean water. It was in the oil-rich but water-poor sheikdom of Kuwait on the Persian Gulf.

Today the company has plants in operation around the world producing more than 28 million gallons a day for communities and industries. And it is being challenged in this exciting field by several other U.S. firms.

EXPECTED TO RISE

World production now is 50 million gallons a day and it is expected to rise to more than 2 billion gallons a day—or 9 trillion gallons a year—by 1975.

Water use has expanded so tremendously that even the United States views its future supplies with anxiety. In 1900, Americans used 40 billion gallons a day. Today, the figure is 350 billion gallons.

By 1980, the Interior Department says, the need will be 600 billion gallons, 85 billion more than is currently available. Because of these immense demands, several areas of the nation are faced with a choice of finding new supplies or restricting population growth and economic development.

The OSW shares its technology with other nations and interest has been so great that when an international conference on water met this year in Washington, 98 countries sent representatives.

Numerous desalting plants are in operation in Africa, some in Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America and a few in Europe.

There can be far greater application of the new purifying techniques than just desalting seawater. They can be used on contaminated river water, swamp water, or water poisoned by mine acids.

If, as forecast, daily fresh water production reaches 9 trillion gallons in 1975, that much water would yield $250 million in salt, $230 million in potash, $43 million in magnesia, $29 million in bromine, $29 million in boron, and $10 million in other minerals, including $510,000 in gold.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object to coming in at 11 o'clock a.m.—but I have been in session until Christmas Eve in this House, and I hope we do not have to do that again.

The only suggestion I would make, Mr. Speaker—and I appreciate the fact that the 1-minute rule is a very valuable and useful thing for the Members, but when we have important legislation pending like the bill before the House at this time, and many other bills that ought to be considered this week, I really believe that the Members should refrain from requests for 1-minute speeches. Of course, anyone can object tomorrow, and I would hesitate doing that, although I will cross that bridge when I get to it, but if they want to extend their remarks in the RECORD, that is available to them, but I do believe we could come in early without the first hour being consumed by 1-minute speeches that could just as well be put in the RECORD. I believe that would satisfy everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

DON'T BLAME THE MERCHANT

Mr. RUPPE. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we here in America are faced with a very peculiar situation. While the food costs in the grocery stores are going up, the cost of the food paid to the farmer is going down. Many farm prices are as low today as they were in the deepest valley of the depression of the early thirties.

However, while the grocery bill for the American family is climbing, the percentage of salary paid for food is dropping. In 1947, 25.7 percent of personal income was spent for food while today only 17.6 percent of the income is so used.

These figures were very graphically presented in a recent editorial appearing in the Pierz, Minn., Journal, edited by my good friend, Jim Wermerskirchen, a copy of which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

DON'T BLAME THE MERCHANT

Food prices are rising again, but it should be remembered that the total bill at the checkout stand of a grocery store is a poor gauge of food prices. The reason for this when it is reported that one tenth of housewives' total bill is used for nonfood items . . . shampoo, magazines, aspirin, kitchenware, and many others . . . her 'food' bill is bigger because she's buying more nonfood items at the grocery store. . . .

Moreover, despite rising food prices, the long-term trend in the percentage of family income that goes for the purchase of food has been declining markedly for more than 20 years. According to an exhaustive study of food costs by U.S. News & World Report, feeding the family took 25.7 per cent of personal income after taxes in 1947. In 1967, it is taking 17.6 per cent. Another thing that it is important for all of us to remember is that profit margins of the grocery stores have been squeezed thinner and thinner—from 1.2 cents on each dollar of sales in 1957 down to an estimate .8 of a cent in 1967.

The cost of food, like the cost of everything else, is directly related to the spending and fiscal policies of government. The long term decline in the value of the dollar, which pushes up wages and all costs, also pushes up the price of food. As long as the prevailing philosophy of government is spend and spend regardless of debt, and voters sanction it, prices will go up and up, as the hardships of inflation multiply.

OUR OBSOLETE WELFARE STATE

Mr. RUPPE. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, George Champion, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, has called for an overhaul of what he terms the Nation's "hopelessly obsolete" welfare system through the adoption of an "incentive welfare" approach based on motivation, training, and job opportunity.

Speaking at a Grinnell College convocation last month, Mr. Champion said that the present "impersonal mass approach" to welfare fails to take into account the "potential ambition and economic vigor of the average individual."

The New York banker added that this procedure "writes off" the individual as being "indolent, incompetent, or unworthy of development." Or, it seeks to "enclose the problem of the poor in brick and steel," rather than concerning itself with the "nature and goals" of the individual.

He said:

> We need new imaginative, result-oriented approaches to welfare, approaches designed to take full advantage of the strengths of private business and to give every individual a stake in our society. We must concentrate on the development of his fullest capabilities as an independent being, rather than as a ward of the Federal Government.

Mr. Champion underscores what he considers to be the failures of many of the governmental approaches to the poverty problem, and outlines his "incentive welfare" program which combines individual motivation, education and training, and job opportunity. These three ingredients are necessary, he argues, if a successful assault on poverty is to be made. And Mr. Champion emphasizes, such a solution depends on the active involvement of business and industry.

At a time when the Nation is desperately groping for a response to the needs of the poor, Mr. Champion's remarks are challenging and provocative. The full text of his Grinnell College address follows:

OUR OBSOLETE WELFARE STATE

In the course of this remarkable Convocation, you have heard from distinguished men of science and letters, and from leaders prominent in the nation's political, social and cultural activities.

Since I myself claim no expertise in these areas, I can only assume that President Leggett included me on the program to provide a dash of local color.

I stand before you as a fugitive from the neighboring state of Illinois. In fact, if you were offering a prize for the speaker who had come the shortest distance from his birthplace, I, as a native of Normal, Illinois, would be very much in the running.

For those of you who are not familiar with the great American landmarks, Normal is situated half-way between Heyworth and Minonk!

It's about twice the size of Hubert Humphrey's birthplace, Wallace, South Dakota, and roughly as big as Johnson City, Texas, before the President turned up all those new kinfolks!

I was born in Illinois, went to high school in California, to college in New Hampshire, to work in Louisiana and New York, and to live in Connecticut. Now this may not seem an impressive traveling record to someone like your vigilant Iowa Congressman, H. R. Gross, who is always checking up on his junketing colleagues in Washington!

But I can tell you it has certainly kept the bank examiners in a quandry and the sheriff at bay!

In my frequent visits to this great Midwest heartland of our country, I've noted many far-reaching changes over the years. But I'm happy to say one thing that has not changed since my boyhood is the people's preference for plain talk. Today, I'd like to take advantage of this refreshing spirit of candor to discuss a subject that is of growing significance in the wake of this past summer's violence in our cities—the subject of "Our Obsolete Welfare State."

An ironic and baffling aspect of the recent riots is that many of the cities hardest hit had the most active anti-poverty programs. They had received larger-than-average shares of the billions of dollars dispensed each year by the Federal Government to aid the underprivileged:

Detroit has been allotted $100 million in Federal funds for urban renewal since 1960, and is spending $30 million this year alone on its poverty programs.

Newark has received more than $25 million in Federal anti-poverty funds in the past three years, and is spending about a half million dollars a month on welfare programs.

New Haven has been granted Federal urban-renewal funds amounting to about $800 for every man, woman and child—a figure almost twenty times greater than New York City's.

How did it happen, then, that some of the worst riots occurred in cities where the most money had been spent?

"Because," reply some theorists, "not *enough* money was spent."

They seem to be saying that if huge doses of a medicine fail, we should try more of the same and maybe the patient will eventually recover.

Considering the history of our Welfare State, though, one is inclined to doubt that it would be wise to count on stimulating the lagging heartbeat of our cities with still further massive transfusions of Federal money. I am strongly persuaded that money alone is not the answer.

To help the poor at home, Americans are now putting up $15 billion a year in Federal taxes. To help the poorer nations of the world, they are putting up another $5 billion. And this, of course, is wholly apart from the money spent on waging the war in Vietnam and maintaining U.S. troops in Europe and elsewhere. The net result is that this year we face a budget deficit approaching $30 billion—a deficit unprecedented except for the years of World War II.

Even as prosperous a nation as ours cannot do everything at once. We must inevitably make choices. The riots this past summer underscored the fact that a reappraisal of national priorities is long overdue. Our Welfare State, based largely on the priorities of thirty years ago, is hopelessly obsolete. We need new imaginative, result-oriented approaches to welfare—approaches designed to take full advantage of the strengths of private business and to give every individual a stake in our society. The eminent Negro psychologist, Dr. Kenneth Clark, expressed it well when he said: "People who have something to lose don't riot."

Let's look for a moment at some of the changes that have taken place since the Welfare State's priorities were first established. None is more significant than the enormous upward shift in family income. Thirty years ago, scarcely 20 per cent of U.S. families had annual incomes of $6,000 or more. Ten years ago, this figure has risen to 40 per cent. Today, well over half our families are above $6,000, and by 1975 more than two-thirds will be in this category.

Yet many government programs are still geared to an earlier era when incomes were lower and needs were greatly different. Public funds are being used to subsidize private endeavors where the majority of participants now have average or above-average incomes. For example, urban renewal programs have chiefly aided Americans in the middle-income ranges.

The farm program is a prime case in point. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the more successful a farmer becomes, the more he stands to receive from the government. Over the years, the Agriculture Department has increased its costs, its personnel and its services—but it has done little about trying progressively to lower price supports and reduce controls so as to promote the kind of freer competition that would be most beneficial to the farmer himself, the consumer and the nation at large. If we assume depression as a normal condition—as the farm program does—then the farmer will always need help and so will almost everybody else.

Regrettably, very little thought has been given to whether existing programs for farmers and others might be modified, reduced or eliminated to make way for new ones that rate higher today on the national priority scale. It has been well said that if a monument were erected in Washington to every government program that has been discontinued in the past three decades, the landscape of the nation's capital would not be perceptibly altered!

This phenomenon moved The Washington Post to comment recently that "Obsolete Federal programs, like old soldiers, never seem to die."

Yet the significant economies in government are likely to come, not from turning off the lights in the East Room, but from intelligent review of goals and the programs designed to meet them. This is the essence of the "Programming-Planning-Budgeting" system which is frequently talked about in Washington these days and which many private corporations have been following for some time. Surely no area is more urgently in need of review than public welfare.

To the authors of our Constitution who designed the matrix of democracy, promoting the "general welfare" was an inspiring ideal. Today, "welfare" has become a dirty word. The average citizen never expects to rely on welfare and does not have much respect for those who do. The sprawling Federal welfare empire and the layers of local and state relief operations are regarded as the "enemy" by many of the very people they have been trying to help. Welfare recipients have organized into unions to press their "rights," and have even staged protest demonstrations against the system.

Many of the programs, techniques and theories of our present approach to welfare have turned out to have exactly the opposite effect from what was intended. This has often been the case with the attempt to abolish poverty through building new apartment houses for the poor. Unfortunately, it has proved much easier to rehabilitate housing than to change people. New high-rise apartment developments may go up in an area, yet, after several years, the neighborhood will have reverted to the old slum conditions.

What has happened is that we have tried to enclose the problem of the poor in brick and steel, rather than working from the inside out and concerning ourselves primarily with the nature and goals of the individual. Ad-

mission to low-rent housing projects has been determined by income—the lowest income. As a result, families with the greatest potential for fighting their way clear of poverty have been denied entrance to the new apartments. With their homes torn down, they have been forced to live elsewhere. The neighborhood thus levels out economically at its lowest common denominator and becomes a permanent slum.

The same lack of consideration for the individual exist at many levels of our present welfare system. Family patterns among the poor have been crumbling as a result of the rule that only fatherless families can qualify for the Aid to Dependent Children program. The program thus has encouraged fathers to leave home because the government will pay a fatherless family more money than the fathers could earn at their unskilled jobs.

In New York City, more than three-fourths of the 700,000 people on welfare are mothers and their dependent children. A pattern of community-supported illegitimacy has resulted from a situation in which fathers have found it economically beneficial to desert their families. Three out of four children born onto the relief rolls are illegitimate. Last year in New York, 63 unwed mothers had their tenth, eleventh or twelfth child on relief.

Our present impersonal mass approach to welfare fails to take into account the potential ambition and economic vigor of the average individual. Instead, it "writes off" the individual as being indolent, incompetent or unworthy of development.

Personally, I believe we cannot afford to write off anybody. I am deeply convinced that if we are to make significant strides in the war on poverty, we must gear our efforts to realize the great potential of the individual. We must concentrate on the development of his fullest capabilities as an independent being, rather than a ward of the Federal Government. Above all, we must emphasize private participation, as opposed to total government participation, with private entities such as the business community shouldering the major burden of helping individuals to help themselves.

The approach I'm suggesting might be called "incentive welfare," and involves three primary elements: motivation, training and job opportunity.

The "incentive" approach to welfare puts great stock in those old-fashioned—but today largely neglected—ideas of individual responsibility, personal character, and the belief that every man is, in fact, his "brother's keeper." This basic philosophy is well expressed, I think, in former President Eisenhower's description of how he and his brothers worked their way off a Kansas farm to careers of achievement.

The former chief executive writes in his new book, "At Ease":

All the younger brothers sent Edgar funds on occasion, but he worked at the University of Michigan and essentially financed his own education. My appointment to West Point assured an education for me with no drain on household finances. Ed, remembering the help he received, financed Earl's education at the University of Washington. Milton, by writing for magazines, correcting English papers, and playing in a dance band, was able to pay his costs at Kansas State University. . . . This willingness of brothers to aid each other was one consequence of the guidance we received as youngsters.

Most of those trapped in our city slums lack the elements that were present in the Eisenhower success equation as well as the vital, family stability that provided the foundation for their success. However, the fact that these things are lacking does not mean they cannot be supplied. It does not mean that those in the private sector cannot do something, well beyond what the bureaucratic state has been able to accomplish, toward filling out this formula for improving the lot of our underprivileged groups.

As I see it, motivation is the indispensable first step.

Not long ago, a European newspaper correspondent, interviewing residents of a Chicago slum, asked one teen-age girl what she wanted to do when she grew up.

"To draw," she replied.

The newsman, pleasantly surprised to find artistic interests in such unlikely surroundings, pursued his inquiry: "What kind of pictures do you like to draw?"

"Not pictures," replied the girl. "Drawing welfare like mother does."

To break this mold of chronic dependency, private business must reach out imaginatively to the inexperienced teen-ager and the unemployed adult, and persuade them that it can offer a path to a better life. It must give them an incentive to leave the "security" of their isolated but familiar neighborhood for the gains that will follow upon fitting themselves into society at large.

This may mean setting up mobile employment offices within walking distance of disadvantaged areas. It may mean providing extensive counseling services to ease the difficulties of entering the working world. Whatever it means, business must be willing to make contact with members of minority groups and encourage them to acquire marketable skills.

This is the second step in "incentive welfare"—education and training. And it is inextricably linked up with the third—job opportunity. We have to look upon training and jobs as two aspects of the same problem.

The thing ghetto people want most is a job.

Mayor Lindsay found this in Harlem. Mayor Yorty found it in Watts. Mayor Cavanagh found it in Detroit.

And there are jobs going begging today.

Of the 10,000 job openings listed each month by the New York State Labor Department, six out of ten go unfilled.

Across the nation, there are more than one million job openings—at the very time when almost three million people are unemployed.

This highlights our predicament: no skills for available jobs, and no jobs for available skills.

To qualify for existing jobs and those that will become available in the future, the unemployed need training. The answer does not lie with the nation's public schools although their improvement is greatly needed.

The answer, in my judgment, lies with business and industry.

This area of training is one where business is uniquely equipped to make an effective contribution. More than that, it is one where business cannot afford *not* to contribute. For beyond the social needs so obvious in today's atmosphere of tension are the economic imperatives of providing a continuous and growing supply of trained manpower and womanpower to meet the requirements of the future.

Business is already doing a great deal. In Philadelphia, some 600 companies are working with the Reverend Leon Sullivan's Opportunities Industrialization Center which, in the past three years, has trained more than 3,500 disadvantaged young men and women for responsible jobs. In St. Louis, the McDonnell Douglas Corporation has demonstrated that in just four months, people with no high school diploma or special skills can be prepared for work in a production system that demands high accuracy and precise workmanship. In our own bank, we have well over fifty separate training programs, including one for high school students from high "dropout" areas which provides part-time jobs as long as they continue their studies and then permanent employment if they make the grade.

Effective as these individual programs are, I believe that the ultimate promise of vocational training can be realized only from an overall approach. Groups of businessmen in New York and Chicago and Des Moines and elsewhere should combine their resources and take the initiative in citywide cooperative ventures in basic education.

In its initial stage, such a program would aim at bringing job applicants up to required levels of "employability" by improving their reading, spelling and calculating skills and their work habits.

In its next stage, this program would provide even more on-the-job training than is being done now so that all workers would have greater opportunity to advance to higher positions.

Finally, this program would include a continuing research effort to devise means of using more effectively in vocational training the programmed learning techniques, teaching machines and audio-visual aids that are being developed mainly for elementary and secondary schools.

Such a blueprint, responsibly and creatively carried out, would have the great advantage of linking the varied elements of vocational training in a planned program of growth.

Training is an essential part of any job-creation program, but it is futile if there are no jobs at the end of the line. And in each of the next ten years, we must find jobs for some 1½ million persons who will enter the labor force—an increase of 50 per cent in the rate over the past decade. How these jobs must be created is no secret. Under our free-opportunity system, jobs come into being because somebody sees an opportunity to earn a profit and is willing to make a capital investment. They are not free. They cost between $15,000 and $20,000 apiece in capital investment.

Our ability to provide more jobs in the years ahead will depend decisively on our capacity as a nation to form capital—both human and material capital. Any society can add to its stock of capital only through savings. Thus, to satisfy the mounting demand for jobs, we must provide adequate incentives to savers and see to it that the government does not drain off savings in the form of wasteful Federal spending and taxes so high they smother incentive.

The trends in this decade of the Sixties are illuminating. While the population of the United States has grown 10%, the Federal civilian bureaucracy has increased 25%, overall Federal spending 83%, and non-defense expenditures almost 100%.

Among these non-defense items are several that certainly don't strike the layman as essential. For example, I am thinking about the use of Federal grants to beautify Berkeley, California with a municipal putting green; to landscape the city hall at Overland Park, Kansas; to construct a two-acre lagoon at El Centro, California. I am thinking about tax funds appropriated in the name of poor children in such high-income communities as Grosse Point, Michigan, and Beverly Hills, California.

As a banker, I'm very much concerned that unless we bring government expenditures under control through an intelligent ordering of national priorities, we face a continuing budget crisis with periodic tax increases and persistent inflation. We cannot solve our fiscal problems by preaching economy and practicing extravagance. Instead of trying to prod Congress into action on raising taxes and continuing heavy spending, the Administration should be proposing new formulas for reducing non-essential expenditures that will bring the budget—and the economy—under some semblance of control.

There are many areas where reductions and postponements could be made. Medical research, a recent investigation disclosed, is wasting a vast amount and as a result is an especially inviting target for a cutback. So is the space program with its expenditures of over $5 billion. So, too, is the broad range of government subsidies, both direct and indirect. At a time when the nation is so heavily committed abroad and at home, there is no conceivable justification for the kind of wasteful spending associated with the business-as-usual approach. Yet, all too often, this is what we get from our obsolete Welfare State, dedicated as it is to the proposition that the nation, particularly the cities, can be run from Washington if Congress will only authorize bigger and bigger appropriations.

Perhaps the disadvantaged of a half century ago were more fortunate than those of today. On our own Illinois farm, we did not have any bureaucrats telling us that the government was going to take care of all our needs. We realized that we had to make it pretty much on our own, so we did the best we could and things seemed to work out all right.

There is more than a casual connection, I suspect, between the lack of individual incentive characteristic of our present welfare approach and the tottering superstructure of our welfare system. The relationship underscores one of the fundamental questions of our times: Whether the individual will be able to maintain his identity and purpose in an age which, through rapid technological progress, has created awesomely large and impersonal institutions in all areas of society?

It is essential to our way of life that the individual not only survive but strengthen his control over his own destiny. Even as technology has seemed at times to overwhelm him, it is also offering opportunities for human progress eclipsing those of any other time. At the same time, it has raised the level of personal aspirations—and this is no less important.

For the strength of a nation is a compound of the aspirations, abilities, energies and character of its people. Any program of foreign or domestic economic aid, or rehabilitation, or stimulation or whatever one chooses to call it, that does not take this into account must be considered obsolete. It cannot help but prove more of a burden than a benefit to the people it is intended to serve.

That's why I suggest that the "incentive welfare" approach—concentrating on motivation, training and jobs—offers our best hope for helping people to realize their opportunities more vividly and to pursue them more consciously. Through this approach, I believe we *can* deal more effectively with the problems of our cities. For the sake of our nation, I am convinced that we *must* do so.

SCS ADMINISTRATOR WINS PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and South Dakota's 70 local soil and water conservation districts has brought about tremendous achievements in better protection and use of our soil and water resources. Their effective teamwork is visibly reflected in more beautiful countryside; in better quality farm crops; in thousands of new acres of water; in improved economic opportunities throughout the State; and in many other ways.

I am very pleased that the man who in the last decade and a half has made the Soil Conservation Service an increasingly valuable and efficient member of this resource team has received singular national recognition.

Dr. Donald A. Williams, a fellow South Dakotan, is the recipient of the 1967 Rockefeller Public Service Award in the field of administration. The award for $10,000 was presented through a trust fund set up by John D. Rockefeller III and administered by Princeton University.

Dr. Williams richly deserves the honor. As administrator of the Soil Conservation Service since 1953 he is at the helm of a large and complex organization, one whose demands and emphases have altered and broadened considerably under his technical and administrative leadership.

The SCS gives technical conservation help to more than 2 million landowners and operators, including a growing number who are not engaged in farming.

It directs the National Cooperative Soil Survey and the periodic National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs to gain data useful in planning both land-use patterns and needed conservation land treatment . . .

It guides local efforts and Federal assistance in watershed projects and in resource conservation and development projects, which use resource protection as a stepping-stone to community improvement . . .

It leads the Great Plains conservation program, with technical and cost-sharing aid for controlling wind and water damage and making agriculture stable in the difficult Plains.

It helps in cooperative river basin studies to foster sound water-resource planning on a regionwide basis.

It carries on snow survey and water supply forecasting, monitoring of radioactivity, and other activities.

The SCS is able to carry on all these broad tasks with about the lowest proportionate "overhead" costs in the Government. This achievement mirrors the management skill and dedication of Dr. Williams. He faced the request for a nearly complete agency reorganization in his first year, and has formed a trim, smoothly functioning team at all levels of the agency. The career program of training and promotion that he instituted finds and brings along the highest caliber of men and women.

Dr. Williams' skills in public administration and resource management have been noticed around the world.

He has traveled to India several times at that country's request to offer his counsel on soil and water conservation problems, programs, and organizational needs.

He has advised governments of 16 other Nations, and serves as a consultant to the Ford Foundation in its international activities.

His skills have been noticed at home, too, where in addition to the Rockefeller Public Service Award he holds the Distinguished Service Award, the highest offered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts gave him its distinguished service award in 1957, attesting to the pride that local units of government and their citizen cooperators have for Dr. Williams, too.

I can tell you that South Dakota also is proud of him. South Dakota State University in 1956 made him an honorary doctor of agriculture, the first time such a degree was conferred.

The Public Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation recently urged USDA to help bring about orderly land use planning policies—to stop needless loss of prime farmland, waste of ground water, water pollution from unplanned suburbia, crowding of rural folk into already jammed cities, and other problems we face.

The committee urged USDA to train and equip its employees to deal better with the widening problems of environmental conservation, community-wide resource planning, and rural-urban balance.

Donald A. Williams has been at work for a long time doing just that—building in the Soil Conservation Service a staff capable of broad action in aiding community development. We should do what we can to help him.

I know the citizens of South Dakota join me in praising Dr. Williams for 32 years of inspiring work in the Nation's behalf, and honoring him along with the Rockefeller Foundation for his leadership of America's resource conservation programs. We wish him Godspeed.

THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, for myself, and on behalf of my Los Angeles constituents, I wish to express gratification over the wording of the conference report on S. 780 as filed, the Air Quality Act of 1967.

The act embodies features which constitute a significant step forward in our nationwide efforts to combat the proliferating menace of air pollution. It encourages cooperation between Federal and State agencies, between States, and between localities, resulting in joint, purposeful action. It designates a program for increased research and development, geared especially to the prevention and control of air pollution from combustion of fuels. Extending the requirement for automotive emission control devices, the disclosure by registration of fuel additives delivered in interstate com-

merce should further curb emissions of harmful chemicals into the atmosphere.

The act's program of Federal grants takes into account the need for proper planning on an interstate scale in keeping with regional air quality standards to be defined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with control measures proposed by the States and localities.

Most importantly for the people of California, it retains the right of our State to adopt more stringent standards for automobile emission controls than those promulgated by the Federal Government in order to deal decisively with the especially intense smog problems which frequently permeate our air regions.

The unanimous vote by which the Air Quality Act of 1967 passed both the House and the Senate clearly indicates, once again, the awareness of the Congress of the concerns of the American people throughout our land, and its impatience with less than effective legislation. While taking cognizance of all valid opinions, its Members again have not hesitated to speak out for their constituencies, attuning their legislative efforts to the needs and desires of the people they represent. The Congress can be proud of its leadership role in the fight for clean air.

I am looking forward to the enactment into law of the Air Quality Act of 1967.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "WHY THIS M.D. WON'T GO HOME AGAIN"

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my concern for the quality of health care in this country lead me on April 5, to introduce H.R. 8062, a bill to provide that in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain immigration restrictions shall not apply to certain alien doctors and nurses participating in exchange programs.

The bill would relax stringent application of the provisions of the Cultural Exchange Act in order to allow qualified medical doctors and nurses to remain in this country to help alleviate our shortage of health personnel. My statement on this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5, 1967, at page 8470, and the Legislative Digest of the Regan Report on Hospital Law featured it in its April 1967 issue—volume 8, No. 1.

More recently, the New York Times discussed the problem of the foreign physician in a series by Richard D. Lyons, which I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the general heading "Health Care in the United States" in the issue of October 5, commencing at page 27965.

Dr. Charles M. Poser, professor of neurology at the University of Missouri School of Medicine, Kansas City Division, who is vitally interested in this question, has brought to my attention an article entitled "Why This Foreign M.D. Won't Go Home Again," from the October 1967 issue of Hospital Physician.

This article deserves analysis in the consideration of H.R. 8062 and I bring it to the attention of my colleagues along with Dr. Poser's letter to me of October 18, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, KANSAS CITY DIVISION,

Kansas City, Mo., October 18, 1967.

Representative THEODORE KUPFERMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: I believe that you will be interested in the enclosed article entitled "why this foreign M.D. won't go home again" which appeared in the October, 1967 issue of Hospital Physician.

It illustrates so well conditions awaiting the returning physician after his period of training in the United States, in a country which could hardly be called a developing one and which is among those that are more vociferous about the brain drain.

It is this kind of evidence that an unbiased survey such as the one I have mentioned to you previously would unquestionably uncover and still the voices of the righteous representatives of the State Department who have testified against your bill.

I trust that you will be kind enough to keep me informed of the progress of the proposed legislation and let me know if there is any way that I can be of further help in this important matter.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES M. POSER, M.D.
Professor of Neurology.

[From Hospital Physician, October 1967]

WHY THIS FOREIGN M.D. WON'T GO HOME AGAIN

(NOTE.—In the spring of 1965, Alfred W. Bauer, a U.S.-trained pediatrician, returned to his native West Germany expecting to practice his specialty in a relaxed yet dignified and professionally gratifying atmosphere.

(Within months, Dr. Bauer's disillusionment was complete. Instead of the professional dignity he remembered, he found bitter and defeated doctors competing eagerly for small fees, padding the bills of state-paid patients, often milking their few private patients for all they were worth. Instead of cooperative hospital teamwork, he found an entrenched hierarchy jealously guarding beds. Instead of scrupulous standards, he found patient care secondary to administrative rules that sometimes supported outright quackery while prohibiting modern techniques. Instead of a community of dedicated physicians, he found one so divided it was powerless to initiate reforms or to deal effectively with the welfare state bureaucracy. Within a year, Dr. Bauer was ready to return to the U.S.—and his pediatrics practice in Seattle.

(Dr. Bauer tells his story fully in the following pages.)

(By Alfred W. Bauer, M.D.)

I arrived in my former hometown in the southern part of West Germany with my wife and three children, then left them temporarily settled there and set out in my new Opel to find a good place to practice. Driving throughout nearby areas, I stopped to talk with many practicing pediatricians. To my surprise, I learned that there was no shortage of physicians. In 1939, the nation had one physician for every 1,390 inhabitants. Now there was one for every 690—one of the lowest ratios in the world. In most places, I found sharp competition among the densely settled doctors.

One of the first communities I looked into was a bustling resort town. Twelve physicians, including three or four internists but no pediatrician, cared for 9,000 inhabitants and swarms of visitors. The general practitioners took care of the children in town and in the neighboring villages. But after studying the town for three days I concluded that, lacking a pediatrician or not, it was no place for me.

The highest pretax net income I could foresee there, after several years of uphill struggle against entrenched competition, was $7,250—the average 1965 pretax net of West Germany's pediatricians. Living costs were about 85 percent of those in the U.S.; a middle-class West German family of five residing in an apartment needed about $4,000 a year for living expenses. So at best, I estimated, I could save around $2,000 a year after taxes. And the cost of building a modest home-office combination, including the lot, would be about $80,000, well beyond my reach.

For eight weeks I continued to travel, visiting physicians, relatives, and friends. On one of my trips I went to see a well-known pediatrician with a large practice, private as well as socialized. He was too busy to receive me, but his wife did. She advised me to buy the practice of a recently deceased pediatrician, Dr. Kranz (not his real name), in a nearby industrial city. This place, she told me, offered the best opportunity in this part of the country. Dr. Kranz had established a huge practice and built a fine home, but he had worked himself to death three years later at the age of 57. The woman advised me not to work too hard, to start with modest ambitions, and build a simple house after some years of saving. But she conceded that her own husband worked quite hard to make a living and to pay for their recently built quadruplex, being "on the run day and night" making house calls in town and in nearby mountain villages. (Four months later, at 56, he was dead from a coronary.)

After another week of searching among the medium-sized towns of my favorite regions, with no success, I received another spontaneous recommendation that I buy Dr. Kranz's practice, this time from a pediatrician. So I drove to Dr. Kranz's town and met his widow and daughter. Six days later I agreed to purchase the practice for $11,250. Of this amount, $2,500 was for the rather poor equipment (no laboratory, no microscope, no typewriter) and $8,750 for the goodwill. Dr. Kranz's practice was economically one of the largest in West Germany. His annual gross income during the preceding five years had varied between $22,500 and $40,000—the latter sum being about two and a half times the gross of the average West German pediatrician.

It took me only two weeks in my new office to discover that I had made a colossal mistake.

In the first place, the practice turned out to be virtually nonexistent. There was only a trickle of patients, and half of them were *new cases*. Yet Frau Kranz had emphasized repeatedly how eager mothers still were to bring their chaldren to her late husband's spacious office, where they could be taken care of by a qualified successor. She claimed she had received about 15 telephone calls every day from mothers inquiring about the reopening date. But the fact was that, in the four months since Dr. Kranz's death, a large majority of the parents of his patients had made other arrangements. Most of them saw no reason to go to a new and unknown doctor, so they had sent their youngsters to other pediatricians and to general practitioners. In short, with the $8,750 I had promised to pay for the goodwill, I was buying something that was of almost no value.

Secondly, and more important, I made

shocking discoveries in the office files, which I now had plenty of time to analyze. In the active file there were about 7,100 patient cards. Of these, about 85 per cent were for socialized-medicine (S.M.) patients; only 15 per cent were for private patients—the usual percentages in West Germany. But about two-thirds of Dr. Kranz's income had been derived from private patients and only a third of it from S.M. patients!

Dr. Kranz's average annual income per private patient in the active file had been about $17.50—compared with $1.75 per S.M. patient. Obviously, he had greatly overtreated his private patients, the overtreatment consisting chiefly of an incredible number of house calls. Dr. Kranz was a fabulous worker, zooming through 40 to 60 house calls a day, besides seeing 50 to 90 patients during afternoon office hours. About 80 per cent of his house calls had been credited to his private patients; that was where the money was. Many of these patients were covered by private health insurance; they had received a house call on every working day of a month, only Sundays being omitted.

Forty of the ledger cards listed a total of 6,105 house calls. The time between the first and the last call in an average case was 42 months. During the same period, these 40 private patients had made only 145 visits to Dr. Kranz's office, the house-call/office-visit ratio thus being about 42 to 1. The total charges noted on the 40 cards added up to a staggering $15,000.

Twenty-three of the 40 patients had never appeared in Dr. Kranz's office at all, having been taken care of entirely in their homes. No case histories were provided for them because he kept practically no records on patients who did not come to his office. In minute scribbling between the series of crosses that indicated house calls, however, a few diagnoses were noted. The records of the other patients were merely a few barely legible words written in pencil. There were no laboratory reports other than an occasional hemoglobin or urinalysis without sediment. Nowhere in these scanty records appeared data about physical examinations, differential diagnoses, therapy, or therapeutic responses.

My study of the files revealed a sizable number of private patients to whom Dr. Kranz had given special insurance deals. Some patients with limited private-insurance coverage had apparently asked him for help, so he had charged for more work than was actually done. For instance, several patients got a 75 per cent compensation from their insurance carriers for their beefed-up bills—say, $37.50 of a $50 charge. Then Dr. Kranz allowed each patient a 25 per cent discount—as was noted on the ledger. Thus these patients, who should have been charged $37.50 originally, paid nothing. (Dr. Kranz would wait until the next year to bill those patients who had used up their maximum insurance allowance for a given year.) While the phony charges brought him no extra money, they helped tie these private patients to him.

The fact that Dr. Kranz had cheated the insurers this way was apparent to anyone who read the files. Frau Kranz had been the bookkeeper for her husband's private practice, and his policy of charging for phony house calls was revealed in her own handwriting. Some outlying village patients were uninsured for doctors' mileage fees. In such cases the cards were inscribed: "No mileage fee. Charge for more house calls." House calls actually made were entered as ink crosses and the fakes as pencil.

I later learned that for years Dr. Kranz had also treated some private patients for nonexistent diseases. Fortunately, most of his needless therapeutic efforts were harmless—every month, for example, he used innocuous tape dressings on several older children who had nonexistent umbilical hernias.

I challenged my contract with the widow and declared it invalid because of error and willful deceit. In a six-page letter, I summarized the state of the practice and suggested three courses of action: I would move out immediately; remain three months as a locum tenens under the usual conditions, to give Frau Kranz time to find somebody else; or buy the practice at a lower, realistic price.

Frau Kranz went into hysterics, and her daughter said she feared her mother "would not live through the weekend" unless I agreed to negotiate beyond the offers I made in my letter. Frau Kranz managed to survive, however, and went on to reject all three proposals and to threaten to sue me.

The case went to the local medical society and the Socialized Medicine Administration (S.M.A.) for mediation. It was August, and the directors of both organizations were on vacation. The two temporary chiefs, after reading my letter and conferring with Frau Kranz, arranged a conference with me. To my amazement, I was told I had little or no legal basis for challenging the contract! The officials claimed that Dr. Kranz had been well within the limits of the community's accepted standards of medical practice. What I saw as plain cheating, the officials viewed as "minor irregularities." His dishonest dealings had been "favors" he understandably granted to poorly insured or otherwise hard-pressed individuals and were additional evidence of his well-known kindness toward his patients. (I had to smile at this, having found a bundle of file cards showing that a collection agency he'd hired had coerced payment of private bills as low as $4 by court action.)

I was informed that my predecessor's reputation was very good. There had never been any complaints about him, and his professional abilities were beyond criticism. His lack of medical records was nothing unusual because, I was told, older doctors like him have plenty of experience, know their patients well, and are too busy for record-keeping, anyway. The society officials warned me that the chances of my being relieved from my contract in court were remote indeed: No local pediatrician would be willing to testify against a specialist colleague, especially a dead one.

Thus intimidated, I decided that I would consult a lawyer before further arbitration. But the officials strongly urged me not to do so because "lawyers like fat lawsuits" and aren't interested in protecting the financial interest of their clients. So, although I realized that the two officials were worried about a court action that could damage the reputation of the medical profession, I hesitated to take a strong stand. I suggested a compromise: I offered to work as a locum tenens for three months without salary, paying all office expenses myself, giving the gross income to the widow, and paying her a $250 penalty to free me from my contract.

Frau Kranz rejected even this offer, which represented about $2,500, probably because after my departure she couldn't possibly resell the practice. The vacant practice was a trap that could be used only once.

Finally, after the officials had told me plainly that I just didn't understand the workings of West German medicine and had shown marked disrespect to the memory of a dedicated colleague, we worked out a new agreement: Instead of paying $11,250 for the practice, I would buy it for $5,000.

I thereupon rented a corner of a quadruplex house for $150 a month and moved into it with my wife and three children. I felt sure I could rebuild the practice rapidly. If I couldn't succeed here, I could succeed nowhere in West Germany.

But I soon realized that I had badly underestimated the difficulties of coping with a system of which I was largely ignorant. That is, with socialized medicine. The West German S.M.A. apparatus is unbelievably complicated.

It employs thousands of secretaries and bookkeepers in every echelon of officialdom and, by consuming many millions of marks out of the health fund, contributes to the high cost of state-controlled medicine.

In large office buildings, every physician's performance in terms of patients treated (no quality control, just *quantity* control!) is analyzed by an army of clerks, who take three months after the end of each quarter to finish their calculations and send balance sheets and paychecks to the doctors. All prescriptions are scrutinized to make sure the medication is permissible for S.M. patients, and they're calculated down to the cost per patient. A physician who prescribes 10 per cent more than the specialty's average receives only a warning at first. But if he continues to trespass, he's billed for the difference. I knew of some recalcitrant physicians who displayed these bills without comment on the walls of their waiting rooms. The S.M.A. at once ordered them to remove the display or lose their S.M. privileges.

According to the 1965-66 contract between physicians and the S.M.A., the pay for an office call was 75 cents; for a detailed physical examination and consultation, $1.25; for a daytime house call, including traveling fee, $1.75. For pediatricians, the total reward for a three-month period of patient care was, on the average, $2.95 per patient. Of course, the amount was different for each specialty, going as high as $4.50 for an orthopedic surgeon. But practicing pediatricians, neurologists, and G.P.s are the pariahs of S.M. and at the bottom of the pay scale.

If a physician does more than the average amount of work for his S.M. patients in a quarter and if his billings reflect this, he gets a notice from the S.M.A. that he was so-and-so many percentage points above the average for his specialty and that he won't be compensated for this excess.

The income from patient care under S.M. is 15 to 20 per cent of that considered appropriate in the U.S. whereas, as I've said, the cost of living in Germany is 85 per cent of this country's. Besides $150 a month for our apartment, I paid $150 for my office, $125 for food, and $75 to run my car. Just a tankful of gasoline (11 gallons) cost $7—the total income from four house calls. I calculated that I had to take care of 400 to 500 S.M. patients a month to cover office expenses and another 200 to pay for living costs.

The private patients, who constitute 15 per cent of the average practice, can't make much financial difference—provided they are treated honestly. I myself refused to accept the double standard, which is widespread in Germany and apparently essential to a physician who wants to build his own home. Dr. Kranz had been famous for his use of this double standard. Like many other doctors, he had two waiting rooms—a simple one with washable furniture for the S.M. patients, and a luxurious one with fine furniture, rugs, and draperies, for the private patients. The latter, children whose fathers earned more than $300 a month, were examined, with much courtesy, ahead of many children of the lower classes who had arrived first and who often had to wait hours. Dr. Kranz, I was informed, often took two to four S.M. patients together into the examining room, talking to several mothers simultaneously, giving shots, checking weights, and rarely spending more than five minutes with any patient.

S.M. practice, in most hands, is mass-production work with hit-or-miss methods and results. No wonder that the stories about serious illnesses missed by S.M. physicians are legion. Many doctors don't even examine their patients, they just prescribe on the basis of the chief verbal complaint. Others check only the so-called socialize medicine triangle, formed when the patient opens his top three shirt buttons.

A good many West German physicians take curious paths in seeking ways out of their economic dissatisfactions. They may practice private medicine on or beyond the fringes of modern medical teachings. One doctor I know sustains a comfortable private practice in a resort chiefly through iris diagnosis. He keeps an iris microscope in his examining room and two large topographical iris maps (left vs. right eye) on the wall, and claims to be able to diagnose both past and present internal diseases from the structural details of the iris.

Another highly respected practitioner in a nearby village has accumulated a fortune by specializing in fresh-cell rejuvenation cures. He goes to a slaughterhouse, obtains fresh hypophyseal glands from young animals, homogenizes them, then injects them I.M. into the aging rich. The fee for a series of five to eight injections is about $200—more than the income from 100 house calls to S.M. patients. German medical literature contains a considerable number of papers about the complications, such as zoonoses, of such therapy.

Some doctors attract private patients by using acupuncture, the ancient Chinese technique of treating internal disease by scratching or puncturing the skin with gold or silver needles. Homeopathy is surprisingly widespread. Several major drug companies produce a large variety of therapeutics in the form of plant-tissue and animal-tissue extracts (usually pig) in extreme dilutions. For instance, a pig-hip cartilage extract is used to treat osteoarthritis of the hip. The chief advantage of these "remedies" is their lack of side effects. As therapeutics they are worthless, yet the S.M.A. pays for these expensive fluids, not asking for controlled studies but accepting testimonials. The S.M.A. seems unable to draw a line separating socialized medicine from socialized quackery. This is one of the many problems facing federally run and tax-financed medicine.

Since I rejected the customary double standard of care and since I am no fresh-cell therapist or herb doctor, I was unable to make up for my low S.M. income with high yields from private practice. All that my well-meaning, friendly, and very hard-working colleagues could suggest was that, for economic survival, I drop my American practice habits and accept the German routine as fast as possible.

Also unacceptable to me was the time-honored house-call tradition. The S.M.A. regulation permitting house calls only if the patient can't come to the office is ignored. During my first month of practice, I tried to keep house calls down and asked every month on the phone if such a call was really necessary. Very soon I learned that it would be impossible to turn the tide single-handedly—to break the local mothers' custom of calling the doctor to their homes whenever their children had minor febrile illnesses. I became notorious as the new pediatrician from America who refused to make house calls because he was too lazy. Mothers visiting my office for the first time usually asked: "You make house calls when we call you, don't you?" During August I answered: "Yes, in emergencies, or if I think they're necessary." After the first of September, I answered meekly: "Yes, gladly, anytime, anywhere."

Making home calls in West Germany is no easier than here. The streets in town are crowded, and there's a serious parking problem. Often it's very difficult to find house numbers, because many apartment entrances face the inner courts and aren't visible from the streets. Many a time on a stormy winter night I drove up and down through dark, snowy streets along endless rows of apartment buildings, searching with a flashlight for a house number, stepping out of my car several times, knocking and asking at the wrong door until I finally found the right place. Then too, many of my patients lived in the upper flats of 7- to 10-story buildings.

When I would finally arrive, there would be the usual upper-respiratory infection or common cold and a mother who would never dream of bringing a febrile child to the doctor during office hours. At least 90 per cent of my house calls were unnecessary, and most of the rest were required only for such reasons as the lack of transportation.

During my stay in Germany, I tried my best to introduce new and better ways of doing things. I thought of having patients transported to my office in taxis, and I discussed this with S.M.A. officials. I was told that it could be permitted only in exceptional cases. Whereas my flat S.M. transportation fee for a house call was 25 cents, a taxi ride, round trip, was usually $2. Naturally, the S.M.A. preferred to pay the specialist 25 cents.

I suggested to my colleagues a moratorium on unnecessary house calls throughout the town, but they demurred. So every established pediatrician continued to go all over town every day, traveling 70 miles as a daily average, making at least 20 house calls and often many more.

Having to be always available for house calls made me miss even more the association I had had with other physicians in a successful group practice. But while lawyers and architects in West Germany practice in groups, this is frowned on as far as physicians are concerned. The S.M.A. maintains that group practice interferes with the patient's free choice of physician—that a doctor the patient doesn't want might be on call on a given night. This, of course, is ridiculous, and the real reason probably lies elsewhere. It would be economically possible for physicians in group practice outside a hospital to build well-equipped clinics that could compete successfully with a hospital's outpatient department. Since the outpatients are a source of needed revenue, the local governments, which run the hospitals, have an interest in keeping things the way they are. Nonetheless, the attitude against group practice may soon be challenged by the younger physicians in the country who have seen the advantages of group practice for doctors and patients in the U.S.

I had planned to install a small bacteriological laboratory in my office and possibly offer its services to my colleagues. I soon abandoned the idea; I realized I would need all my time and energy to take care of as many patients and collect as many "sick slips" as possible. I gave up the project reluctantly, for apparently there was not a single practicing physician in that part of Germany who handled his own bacteriology. Nobody seemed very disturbed about this medical shortcoming. In fact, one of the two local children's hospitals, a 300-bed institution, possessed no bacteriology facilities—and this in the land of Koch and Ehrlich!

I also broke with tradition by not using long-acting sulfonamides, chloramphenicol, or tetracyclines to treat the common viral upper-respiratory infections and diarrheas. I used less medication than any other pediatrician in town, teaching instead the use of diet, cooling off, correct clothing, and wholesome living in general. In spite of my thrift in prescribing, I received two bills from the S.M.A. for the hexachlorophene soap I had used to treat impetigo. Hexachlorophene soap, like many other agents, is not permitted in S.M. practice. S.M.A. decisions on whether to pay or not to pay are often quite irrational. DPT immunizations are refused, but the cost of many weeks in the hospital for infants with whooping cough, still a widespread disease in Germany, is paid without question. Two years after the introduction of measles vaccine in the U.S., its use in Germany is still forbidden by law.

On many nights I spent half an hour in some overheated living room, first pulling a highly febrile, exhausted infant from the depths of a padded crib, from beneath four covers (the top being the common featherbed) and out of its plastic wrappings, then cooling the baby down by washing it on a towel on the tabletop in front of the wide-eyed parents. They were sure this would cause pneumonia by the following day. None of the hundreds of mothers ever seemed to have heard from their other doctors that a highly febrile child should be cooled off. All had the notion of 40 years ago that fever warrants more heat in the house and heavier covers. The other pediatricians seemed to have no time to teach them otherwise. They were too busy running around collecting sick slips.

Parents would also be surprised when I'd leave a patient without prescribing antibiotics or sulfonamides (my predecessor had been lavish in this regard). I would try to explain the difference between viral and bacterial infections and to point out that the risks of therapy sometimes outweighed the risks of illness. I succeeded in creating confidence in a few of my patients and uneasiness in the majority. Predictably, I had few recommendations by word of mouth, and my practice increased slowly.

I spent much of my time trying to educate my patients, to teach them how to avoid unnecessary office or house calls, how to handle minor problems such as common colds and simple diarrheas on their own. Again, my behavior was self-defeating. The welfare state doesn't pay for preventive medicine, such as well-baby care and immunizations, and there is little money for it in private practice.

Then there was the time I established an appointment system. As a result, my waiting rooms, with a capacity of more than 30, were usually empty—most patients walked right into the examination room. One of my colleagues thought this a poor way to get started and suggested that all 15 patients for one afternoon be scheduled for the same time. Waiting patients, he said, seem to be impressed by the number of other patients present, and find security and confidence in them.

In short, by practicing medicine effectively, I hurt my practice. And I hurt it also by practicing ethically. On one occasion, for example, I was able to make an early diagnosis of meningitis in an infant. The next day, as a gesture of appreciation, the mother brought three sick slips for her other children. The children were healthy, so I turned the papers in unused. To the S.M. physicians, my way of handling the situation was considered the very height of self-destructive folly.

The fraudulent custom of collecting sick slips for healthy patients, inventing diagnoses, and turning the slips over to the S.M.A. is widespread, and in some practices it's routine. The maximum pay per patient per quarter being fixed, this is the only way to increase the revenue from S.M. sources. Some families are so well trained that they bring sick slips to their doctors for the entire family, from the grandmother to the baby, shortly after the beginning of the new quarter, regardless of health and sickness.

At one time, it's true, the Government proposed a change in the S.M. law that would have required patients to pay part of the charges for medical services. This would have cut down sharply on dishonest sick-slip collection habits. Unfortunately, the plan was voted down by the majority of the country's doctors.

About 20 percent of my patients had no illnesses. I filled in their sick slips with such notations as "well child, examination negative," knowing I would not be paid. S.M.A. officials told me that I was most unwise. Their view was that there is always something a little wrong with a patient, some diag-

nosis to be made. It was considered foolish to fill in "well child," the pay for the care of illness being as low as it was. Indeed, my quarterly receipts from the S.M.A. were "pitifully low," as one official sympathetically said.

To succeed in medical practice in West Germany, I found a doctor had to be willing to stretch his conscience and practice inferior, mass-production medicine. Still, I had no inclination to join a hospital staff, although I had a chance to become the assistant chief in a pediatric hospital. Such positions carry salaries of about $8,750 a year. But I felt unable to readjust myself to a German hospital with a full-time staff.

The chief of the surgical department usually is also the hospital director. This means that he outranks the business administrator—but not the other department chiefs, each of whom is, in his own bailiwick, an all-powerful figure who runs his department's show as undisputed prima donna. The surgical chief's income is somewhere between $20,000 and $50,000 a year—way out of line with any other physician's. The next-best-paid man is the assistant chief. He may be doing exactly the same kind of work as the chief, often more of it, and he's the responsible locum tenens during the chief's vacations and meetings. Yet he may be earning as little as one-fourth of the chief's income.

There's fierce competition among West German specialists for these top hospital positions, and it's common for 50 or more to apply for one opening. Many assistant chiefs eventually realize, after years of hard work as the second man, that they have no chance of reaching the top. An assistant chief, who for 5 to 10 years has done stomach resections, cholecystectomies, and struma operations (Germany still has plenty of thyroid hypertrophy), may suddenly leave the hospital and go into general practice, never again to do major surgery for the rest of his life. This represents an enormous waste of skills and training.

In the U.S. I had been accustomed to working in a hospital's pediatric department as one of several cooperating specialists where the chief is elected for a period of two years. Every pediatrician is responsible for a few (rarely more than four) hospitalized patients and can give them the best of care. In West German hospitals, the chief is often in charge of more than 200 beds and is supposed to know all these patients and to supervise their care. Obviously this is impossible. Common sense dictates that these mammoth departments be divided into smaller units, each headed by a salaried specialist who is assisted by interns and residents. Yet many West German hospitals with more than 200 beds have only a surgical and a medical department, ruled by one chief surgeon and one chief internist.

These departments supposedly take care of the other specialties also, although the town may have an obstetrician, a pediatrician, and an otolaryngologist in practice. The town specialists often have no hospital privileges whatsoever because the hospital's surgeon and internist jealously defend their beds against intrusion. It's extremely frustrating for these often very well-trained men to send seriously ill patients to the hospital and thus transfer them to somebody who knows less about their patients' problems than they do.

One highly trained obstetrician, a friend of mine, settled in a town of 10,000 after 10 years of university hospital residency. He had to practice without privileges in the 300-bed county hospital; all his applications were rejected by the county council and the chief of surgery, a surgeon who practiced OBG as a sideline. For years my friend did minor gynecological surgery in his office, carried the still-anesthetized patients downstairs into his Volkswagen, and drove them home. In the same hospital the pediatric ward was taken care of by one of the medical residents, although a pediatrician was in town.

Few hospitals in West Germany have their own radiologist and pathologist—and this in the land of Roentgen, Aschoff, and Virchow. During my earlier training there, I was pediatric resident in an 800-bed general hospital without a pathologist. My chief was amazed when I performed my own autopsies: My U.S. internship had taught me to ask questions after a patient died.

Most West German hospitals have no internship and residency training programs to speak of, other than casual bedside teaching; many even lack libraries. The majority of hospitals would not fulfill the U.S. requirements for accreditation, and West German hospital training is not, in fact, approved in the U.S.

There is no question that West Germany today is, medically speaking, in many ways an underdeveloped country. Once the teacher of the world's physicians, she has been unable since World War II to return to the forefront of medical progress. This is not due to any shortage of brains or money; the nation has plenty of both. The blame lies with the hospital hierarchy system, which paralyzes competitive striving for excellence, and with socialized medicine, which rewards quantity, not quality. Furthermore, though the Germans have a tradition of knowing how to give and obey orders, the techniques of working together on an *equal* level, the team attitude and spirit so familiar to Americans, are relatively new to them. In the days when the solitary genius was able to achieve breakthroughs in medical theory and practice by observation and laboratory experiment, the Germans did very well indeed. But most advances in modern medicine have been and will be made by teams. The word "team" is not translatable into the German language.

One of the most disturbing features of West German hospital life is the needlessly long hospitalizations. The average stay is 21 days—compared with six days in the U.S. Since the S.M.A. pays hospitals on a patient-day basis and the daily fee is only $6, there is a marked tendency to delay discharge well into convalescence. Once the days of intensive care have passed, the hospital begins to get back into black ink. If a hospital were to deal with seriously ill patients exclusively and discharge them as soon as was feasible, it would quickly get into financial troubles, needing more state subsidies than others.

When a friend of mine was a resident in a West German hospital, he was once asked by the administrator not to discharge his patients so fast. "We're losing money on your floor because of all these empty beds," he was told. "We have to keep this station fully occupied, the way it was before you came, or our application for a new wing will never be passed by the county council."

Obviously, crowded hospitals necessitate enlargement, more beds, new buildings, and consequently higher salaries, more power, and greater prestige for the chief and the administrator. Hospital chiefs have been known to place patient beds in corridors and lounges deliberately, then invite officials to see the deplorable overcrowding and the need for a new wing. These "crowded conditions" gain much publicity in the local press, and money is made available because health care has a high priority. One wonders if anyone ever had the idea of establishing utilization committees in Germany.

The county I worked in had 310,000 inhabitants and, astonishingly, more than 500 pediatric beds. My pediatric department in the U.S. took care of 85,000 people with only 20 beds. I saw large pediatric wards in West German hospitals where the boys jumped about in their nightshirts enjoying pillow fights and other active play and eating hearty meals. These children were being kept there, clearly enough, for reasons other than sickness.

Unnecessary admissions could be discouraged if outside physicians received a financial reward for supervising ambulatory patients, as opposed to hospitalized patients. But at present, their average income per patient per quarter is a fixed figure. As it is now, patients often exert pressure to be admitted in order to get a vacation from work or household duties. I lost several S.M. patients by refusing them hospitalization for minor illnesses.

Hospital construction in West Germany is just as expensive as it is in the U.S. In 1965 one West German hospital bed cost an average of $22,500. Thus, the total cost of the hospital system is enormous and constitutes a key reason for the relatively high monthly premiums deducted for the S.M.A. from employes' salaries. A skilled laborer with a monthly salary of $225 pays a monthly premium of $15, and his employer pays a matching sum. This $30 premium, which unquestionably finances second-class medical care, would be sufficient to buy private health insurance for a laborer in the U.S.*

Can West German doctors ever escape from the yoke of servitude imposed on them? I don't see how. The medical profession is splintered into rival factions and organizations. No common position is taken on any issue. There's an association for the hospital chiefs, one for the residents and interns, two for physicians in practice, one for government-employed physicians, one for the S.M. supervisors, and so on. Each group has interests that are often opposed to those of the others.

During the frequent, endless arguments with the S.M.A. about new contracts, German physicians fight for increases in pay of 5 or 10 per cent—for example, to get the $1.25 fee for a complete physical and consultation raised to $1.35. Yet a three-fold increase would be justified.

There is little hope that these conditions will improve. True, some West German physicians impressed me as being hard-working and honest, trying to do the best they could under the system. But they know that not many doctors would be willing to act together on any given issue.

In the years to come, West Germany will continue to have one of the highest physician densities in the world. At present, about 4,800 graduates enter the profession every year, and only 2,200 physicians retire. The medical schools at the universities are overcrowded. Students sit on the stairs and windowsills of the overflowing lecture rooms, listening to professors they rarely get to meet personally. Several new medical schools are in the planning stage or under construction. As the number of doctors grows, the professions bargaining position will deteriorate further. Mass emigration of West German physicians will then be likely.

After seven months of practice in West Germany, I was convinced I could not keep up my specialist standards under the system. Like most other German pediatricians, I had no access to hospital beds. I was downgraded to a mass-screening type of G.P. for the younger age group. In my seven months of practice, I had never started an I.V. infusion, calculated the requirements of electrolyte and fluid balance, adjusted therapy for a diabetic, or treated a case of meningitis, sepsis, or other life-threatening infection. I had never looked at an I.V.P., a pneumoencephalogram, an ECG, a bone marrow, or a bacterial-culture plate. I had not been involved in newborn or premature care, which had been one of my favorite fields of practice.

I was swamped with red tape and deluged by pamphlets, memos, reports, and regulations from the S.M.A. bureaucracy. The pay I received from the Government per patient per quarter was just about adequate for the

*Private health insurance in West Germany is also more expensive than it should be because of the overtreatment of private patients by so many physicians. Full protection for a family of five may cost as much as $100 a month.

effort I put into filling out the forms, putting together final reports, and so forth.

The main thing I'd hoped for to going back—a return to the simple, more relaxed life I had remembered in the old country—proved illusory. What I found was a far more hectic life, with more pressures, more anxiety, more difficulties in providing the necessities of life, and more complications in dealing with my surroundings, from the corner grocery to the tax office, than I had ever endured before. It wasn't until my seventh month of practice that I was able, for the first time, to earn enough to cover my $600-a-month office expenses. Every working day I made about five house calls and saw 10 office patients; on weekends, I averaged about 30 house calls. All this required about the same energy output as my U.S. practice had, with its 28 office calls a day in addition to hospital duties.

At the end of that month, I offered my practice for sale. When I showed the recent practice volume to three residents who called, they immediately lost interest. Anyhow, all three admitted, they were afraid to exchange the security of hospital life for the pressures and the misery of pediatric practice under the S.M.A. So I sold most of my equipment and supplies, piece by piece or in lots, and gave the rest away.

When I was ready to leave, I put a sign on my office door, decorated—it was carnival time—with a Mardi Gras clown: "Pediatrician Bauer is starving. This office is closed as of March 1, 1966. Dr. Bauer's S.M. patients will be seen in March by Dr. Herder." I printed the word "starving" in letters that decreased in size.

A few days later I received a letter from the president of the county medical society. My patients had told him of my announcement, and he had sent a secretary to verify the wording of the sign. I was ordered to remove it immediately because such wry humor was incompatible with the professional code. You see, under the system of federal medicine in the welfare state, administrators, patients, *and* physicians are supposed to be satisfied and happy. When a competent and diligent physician, who wants to provide quality care and at the same time follow the written and unwritten rules of ethical practice, can't make ends meet and admits his failure freely, he is disturbing this illusion.

I returned to the U.S. 10 days after closing my office and at once rejoined my group. I felt vastly relieved. I was thankful that there still is a country where quality work is expected and appreciated, and where a pediatrician may practice with dignity and self-respect. The emotional shock and financial loss—about $22,000—that I suffered in attempting to fit myself back into my homeland had been great. But the lesson was worth the tuition. I had gained contentment with life in my new country. I had freed myself from the burden of nostalgia and from any uncertainty about belonging in America.

DONALD A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, RECEIVES ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD FOR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, as the recipient of the Rockefeller public service award for administration. I am sure that there are thousands across the country—conservation district supervisors, professional groups, farmers and ranchers, and Government officials at all levels—who join me in applauding this distinguished conservationist.

Dr. Williams has for nearly 15 years given superb national leadership and technical guidance to resource conservation programs that have gained extraordinary stature in that time.

But his leadership ability goes back further than that. His early career was spent in the West, administering the technical operations of several western States, including California. The soundness of his philosophy and concepts then has been borne out by their national acceptance.

Today's United States sees no boundaries between rural and urban people. Their economy and social welfare are interrelated. So are their soil and water problems. Dr. Williams' influence has been great in changing attitudes toward the rural-urban relationship in resource conservation and development. He has pioneered the way—even though there is still a long way to go—in getting land users to recognize that land and waters use and management can not be manipulated as things apart and that careful conservation planning is essential whether land is to be used for farm, ranch, recreation, housing subdivision, or factory. In addition to his stature as technical leader in soil and water conservation on agricultural land he has become known as an authority on conservation and development of nonagricultural land as a result of his insight in urbanization resource problems and his contributions to their solution.

The small watershed program, soil survey, water supply forecasting, resource conservation and development projects, soil conservation district, and other activities that Dr. Williams directs all embody this thinking. They also stress a Federal-State-local partnership that Don Williams has strengthened as he worked to gain wider support for resource conservation.

In California we are aware that land and water problems call for close attention and we subscribe to Don Williams' philosophy of teamwork. We are proud of our State's financial and other support of soil and water conservation activities.

In California we are losing much of our good agricultural land to other uses. A soil survey being made in my congressional district—in the Ventura area—will help avoid expensive errors in making land-use changes. It will help planners in areas where new homes, roads, reservoirs, or parks will be built. The survey is being made in partnership—with Federal, State, and local people contributing a share. When published, this and other soil surveys now contain information invaluable to planners who are faced with mounting problems of land use and development.

Don Williams has demonstrated great skill in directing the national soil and water conservation program to meet the increasing needs of a growing population. He has given local people an opportunity to take a major part in the planning. He has insisted that soil and water conservation serve the people. This philosophy has made the work of the Soil Conservation Service effective and popular.

Never before has the close relationship of water supply, housing developments, farming, roads, clear streams, marketing, employment opportunity, and soil and water conservation and development been recognized so widely as it is today. Dr. Williams has been the leader in making it that way. He richly deserves this public service award.

As the ranking Republican on the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have been in a position to observe the excellent and nonpartisan work of Don Williams and his splendid staff.

TRIBUTE TO OUR BOYS IN VIETNAM

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, to the residents of central Florida, the Vietnam war is no longer a series of mere statistics. It is a complete picture of its most vital element—the men who are fighting it. They are no longer names, but personalities—living individuals with emotions.

This is mainly due to the efforts of a newspaper man in my district—Charlie Wadsworth of the Orlando Sentinel. He left Orlando to cover the war and spent the majority of his time interviewing the men who were fighting and not sitting behind desks or protesting. He found them, whether they were in foxholes or canteens, and recorded their feelings. He told of the hardships, the heartbreak, and the desire to do what was right for their country. And, in doing so, illustrated a side of the press that is often neglected—the sincerity rather than the sensationalism. His articles were an inspiration not only to the residents of Florida but also the men he covered.

I include a few in the RECORD as a means of showing tribute to our boys in Vietnam and as an illustration that Americans appreciate their sacrifice:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Sept. 29, 1967]

MARINES DON'T LIKE WAR, BUT FEEL THEY'RE DOING RIGHT

(By Charlie Wadsworth)

FIRST MARINES, DA NANG.—Inside the tin covered shack, out of the broiling sun and thick dust, I could see one Marine who obviously wasn't a member of the staff, sitting and waiting.

Two more moved out from the side of the divisional information office where they had been sitting in the shade. All were scrubbed and polished. They had prepared for the in-

terview in much the same way they would get ready for an inspection.

They were, "from left to right," they shyly informed me, Lt. John Easton of Wildwood, Cpl. Daniel Orr of Orlando and Cpl. Roy Tiner of Haines City. I know Orr's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Phil Orr. And he's a chip off the old block.

Easton and Orr have been in the thick of it. Tiner is with the 11th Motor Battalion just outside the divisional areas. He is acting platoon sergeant who has the back-breaking, around-the-clock-when-needed job of having transportation ready and operational.

One thing all Marines tell you: When the rockets and mortar attacks come, Charlie can't distinguish a transportation man from a rifle platoon CO or a minesweeper, so he shoots at everybody, and everybody within his range is in for it.

Before coming into the Marines he worked for his father, J. H. Tiner, a citrus man in Haines City. When he gets out a little over a year from now he's going back to Haines City to his wife and the job with his father's company. He has four more months to go in Vietnam.

Orr is with an engineer outfit. He summed up his job duties rather succinctly—"sweeping mines." Well, everybody knows there's more to a job like that. About 30 minutes of conversation later I found that:

Orr's unit operates about 14 miles south of here along the coast. They go out each day to clear mines Charlie might have placed the night before or the year before, and when they clear an area they remain behind awhile and build bunkers.

He hasn't been back to his home base in eight months. He is attached to different outfits and has been out all that time.

It's dangerous work. Finding and removing mines is hazardous enough, but being almost constantly exposed to enemy guns is something else.

"We've had sniper fire, especially when sweeping tank trails, but I've been lucky so far. I haven't been hit and I haven't been hurt." That's how quiet spoken Dan Orr explained his duties. Up here on the side of this mountain in the dust and heat, he regarded the accommodations as vacation land. Later he was going to have another shower and something he hadn't seen much of lately, a hot meal served in a mess hall. The interview, he agreed with a laugh, was worth coming over for.

Easton, who played football for Byrd Whigham at Wildwood before Whigham went to Melbourne and thence to Auburn, did "hill" duty at first, from Hill 41 southwest to DiLoc then to 10 and later to Hill 41. The Marines number all of the hills—they're more like mountains—out here. A correspondent asks about the location in a detached way, not wishing to display his ignorance, then spends 15 minutes looking them up first time he finds a situation map.

This young man has traveled extensively around here. I can vouch for that, and all of it on foot.

"I haven't been on a helicopter since I got here four months ago," he said.

For awhile he was out on patrols and operations when called (he's been on five of them, WAZO the largest). When Da Nang Air Force Base was blasted last July he changed jobs.

He was assigned to the "Rocket Belt," going up in the hills and looking for rocket launchers and sites. The day after the big attack his outfit found some rocket cases, then ran into a VC ambush.

"We got caught in the valley. There was just one trail leading up to where they were and they had that covered. We couldn't move out on the flanks because of the underbrush. We fought our way out. The VC don't carry the gear that we do and can move faster. We couldn't tell if we got any of them because they carry out their dead and wounded with them most of the time," he said.

Easton has been out 25 days during the past month on this patrol and gets sniper fire "all the time."

"Two nights ago," he volunteered, "they sent in 96 mortars but all but five landed at the bottom of the hill (he pointed out to his left to the mountain ranges between here and the harbor) but nobody got hurt.

"I haven't had a scratch," he added.

Lance Cpl. James Sparks came walking up about that time. He's with the First Force Reconnaissance, and from Lockhart, a graduate of Maynard Evans High. Orr is a Boone graduate.

Sparks has been out here a long time. He leaves in mid-October for home. "Sure wish I was back there now," he observed.

His job is a hairy one also, but one in which he takes the greatest of pride. That's something else I've noticed. Regardless of how dangerous or routine the job, every Marine takes pride in it and every outfit is the "best in the Corps." The morale is so high it makes your hair tingle. It also makes you very, very proud of these American lads, I might add.

The job of recon patrols, he explained, is not to be seen, not to make contact if at all possible. They look for and uncover information for intelligence.

"They tell the Grunts (Marine infantrymen) and they go in and do the work we find for them," he said.

How far do you have to go to make contact, he was asked. He stood up. All four grinned.

"Right over there. You have Happy Valley, Mortar Valley, Leech Valley, Garden of Eden, take your pick. Whatever you want it's just right over there," he answered. "Right over there" appeared to be maybe four or five miles.

Sparks will carry scars home with him along with his memories. He was aboard a helicopter going out to a patrol point. They came under fire and shrapnel hit him in the face and hands.

"I have the Purple Heart," he said in a noncommittal sort of way which I took to mean that thousands of Marines get the Purple Heart out here. The lucky ones don't wear it.

What do they think about this war, I asked these 19 and 20-year olds. Easton, by the way, is a graduate of Baylor University.

"I don't particularly like it," he said after several seconds of hesitation and thought. The others looked at him and nodded, so he continued. He had their approval.

"I've been taught a lot about the people in the Corps and the Corps itself. I wanted to be a Marine in the first place. Secondly, believe in this war, think it's right what we are doing. I think the pacification program will work in time and show these South Vietnamese people that we are here to work with and for them, not to take over their country.

"The job is to liberate them from communism. I don't like the war but I believe in it."

"The lieutenant covered it for me," Sparks said.

"That's the way I feel," observed Tiner.

Sgt. Jim Totman, another Orlandoan, was due.

"I saw him yesterday. He's with the air wing with base engineers. He must be busy or something. And I talked to my best buddy, David Bruce Roy, on telephone the other day. He's with the 121st Signal Brigade in Saigon. Guess he couldn't get up here for this."

This is how I spent part of a Sunday. You know, not until this moment have I even thought of the Sunday football telecasts back home.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Oct. 3, 1967]

APOPKA PILOT FLIES WAR'S SAD CARGO

DA NANG.—Lt. David Blum of Apopka pilots an Air Force twin-engine cargo plane. His job includes the grimmest story of this war, and its saddest.

One of his duties is to fly KIA, the Americans killed in action, out of forward combat areas.

"It is," he observed with a slight frown and shaking of his head, "the most displeasing story here. We carry mostly Marines because our primary mission is in support of the Marine."

We talked more about this unpleasant subject mostly because I thought people back home should know a little more about it. Lt. Blum agreed.

The bodies he and other members of his squadron have been flying out come mostly from the hot spot areas—Hill 861, Khe Sanh, Con Thien, Phu Bai and Dong Ha. These are the areas in which most of the recent action has taken place.

"They are priority cargo," Lt. Blum said. "If you want to be perfectly honest about this, should something happen to the plane in flight and we had to lighten the load, we'd never touch the dead. They get the best care, period."

The bodies are removed from the combat zones and moved to the nearest hospital area such as Phu Bai or Dong Ha. There they are placed in plastic bags and are evacuated as soon as possible. That's usually the next plane.

Lt. Blum makes regular stops for them, from area to area. The bodies are handled by Marines, placed on the floor of the plane with each head facing forward. If there are many of them, litters are used.

"They are never stacked," he said.

Each body from this five-province I Corps area comes to Da Nang and then to Saigon where the remains are forwarded home.

"It's displeasing but unfortunately part of all this," Lt. Blum added.

It was almost like being back home in the office again.

Lt. Blum was a Sentinel Star Company employe, working in display advertising and the composing room before going to Florida Presbyterian College.

Between the newspaper and college he had been recalled from the reserve. After college he returned to the Air Force and went to flying school.

His cargo isn't always sad.

"We haul just about anything you can name—livestock to special forces camps, milk, ammunition, anything. Also wounded," he explained.

Is it a lively duty? This drew a smile.

"Everytime we fly low we get shot at," he said. "We usually try to seek out safer areas and good weather because of the people we fly. This and the Delta are active areas."

His plane took four rounds on his eighth mission and he's been shelled at Dong Ha. And he flies both day and night now, with the monsoon coming.

Like others, his thoughts about the war are mixed.

"We are making headway in some places," he said. "Around here it's like trying to kill ants with a hammer. Maybe it's a case of looking for a rapid solution.

"We're not getting anywhere it seems, but then you don't know. We're probably doing better in other areas.

"As far as facilities go the bases are becoming better, more like stateside with ice cream, air-conditioned movies, bowling alleys. It seems strange for a battlefield.

"Oh, do me a favor," he asked. "Say hello to Jim Neff, Benny Linton, and Howard Cornwell back at The Sentinel for me, will you?"

Orlandoan Forrest Butler, an airman first class also stationed here at Da Nang, hadn't had his coffee. So we walked around the corner to the airman's club.

He's in aircraft structural repair. He and three men assigned to him rebuild damaged airplanes. At the moment they are working on an 02 made by Cessna.

"Give them a plug," he said. "They'll appreciate it. The nose wheel collapsed on this plane."

Butler is going to extend his stay here in Vietnam six months.

"You either hate these people (the Vietnamese) or you get to like them. That's about it," he said by way of explanation.

Life is the same all the time out here. One day is like any other day. There is no place to go, nothing to do except work. He works 15 hours a day sometimes.

"If it's asked of you, you got to do it," he said with a shrug.

"The work won't go away. You have to get out there and do it. I'm responsible for 20 aircraft. We really run a depot maintenance although we are not equipped suitably for it.

"Are we winning the war? Yeh, we are. We're still here aren't we? But I don't go along with that theory that the VC and NVA can't take much more.

"After the attack in July we found a dud rocket. I was amazed to learn that they had to haul them on their backs 30 to 40 miles. I have respect for old Charlie.

"I don't like the way things are bunched around here. I think they should be scattered out. The base is too confined. There are too many valuable people and planes bunched together, and too many fuel tanks too close by," he concluded.

This tall, light-complexioned young man of about 20 has been through six rocket attacks here at Da Nang and thinks he probably will make the Air Force a career. He is the son of Mrs. Roy Hemp.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Oct. 4, 1967]

ARTILLERY FIRE HITS CLOSE: CHARLIE HEARS DEADLY WHISTLING

DONG HA.—The view from the window of the circling food cargo plane provided a rather chilling panorama of the incredible pounding this supply base has been taking for three months.

Flooding conditions caught the eye first. Twenty inches of rain fell here in three days. Over 25 inches fell in August. Then on higher areas you picked up the pockmarks dug out by NVA and VC artillery and rocket fire. It seemed like no foot of real estate had been spared. Clearly visible was the gaping hole left by the ammo dump which was hit a couple of weeks ago.

But there was another view, one that sort of balanced the ledger. Immediately outside the supply area, huge craters, some filled with water, others fresh enough to be dry, stretched as far as the eye could see.

These were the calling cards left by the B52 bombers from Guam and Thailand.

Smaller craters intermingled with these came from supporting jets and answering artillery from the supply base. So it hasn't been one-sided by any means. The only trouble is there is no way of knowing how many of the enemy has been killed. You know, however, that he has been hurt, maybe clobbered.

There was something else in store, too, quite a shock at first, I might add.

I came under artillery fire for the first time out here.

There was no warning. The first inkling I had that something was wrong was when the man ahead of me stepped off the rear platform and started running. I jumped down, looked around and saw something I won't forget for awhile.

A big guy wearing a flak vest around his shirtless chest and a dusty camouflaged helmet, was standing up in a slit trench beckoning furiously. At precisely that moment, Bob Hayes became the second fastest human being in the world.

You couldn't hear anything over the noise of the plane's engines but one fellow shouted that he could see explosions around the end of the runway we had just landed on. Then it was over. The plane's engines were shut off.

Two jets streaked across the area and dropped bombs on the nearby mountainside where the NVA and VC artillery came from. You could see the explosions, then seconds later hear the booms. By then I was wiping mud from my face and shaking sand and pebbles out of my fatigue jacket.

It was harassing fire, I was told. We were to be harassed four more times during the five hours I was at Dong Ha. The night before Charlie had done more than harassed. He had worked the places over again. I guess someone had told him about the briefing at which it was said that Charlie wasn't firing much at night any more because he gave away his positions and Marine artillery and patrols found him in a hurry.

Ironically, one of the trenches I landed in during one of the afternoon harassments was the same one I had stood over two days before and looking at the knee deep water and mud inside, had said I would prefer the high ground.

But when you hear that strange rushing, whistling sound you don't think. You move. As I was waiting to fly out a little later another attack came. This time I could see three rounds exploding between the hospital area and runway. Strangely enough, the fire seemed to be concentrating on putting the runway out of commission rather than on the mountains of supplies stacked here to be lifted by helicopters to Con Thien, 40 miles to the north.

Dong Ha, by the way, is 11 miles from the DMZ.

I can say this about my reaction to the artillery fire: I was one hell of a lot more nervous than excited. The rest of what I thought cannot be printed in this family newspaper.

Again it was a fruitless journey. I got on a supply chopper headed for Con Thien so I could take a look at this valuable fortress rock which overlooks the strategic Ben Hi road, but the weather turned bad and we couldn't make it.

And L/Cpl. Ray Tremain, whom I had a date to see, was at the Rick Pile, out beyond strategic Camp Carroll. The Rick Pile is a small mountain, a valuable observation point.

Highway 1 was out because it had been mined. The rain had put a bridge out of commission. Cpl. Tremain was on guard duty and no correspondents were allowed at the pile. And the Marines were adamant about this. I didn't argue. Neither did any of the other correspondents.

Neither could I see PFC Wes Akins, Cpl. G. R. Dunanee or Capt. C. R. Allen, Cpl. T. C. Fisher was at Khe Sanh "and you won't be able to get out there for awhile either."

A Marine colonel from MACV in Saigon was up to visit a friend. He found upon his arrival that the friend had drowned two days before during an amphib mission. There was nothing to do except come back to Da Nang, he sighed.

You do interviewing in the field but a typewriter wouldn't last very long in this dust. Amazingly, in spite of the heavy rainfall, and with water standing in every dip and shell hole, the wind is whipping a dust off the high ground areas. That's the kind of weather you live with here.

Two planes came in but both were priority jobs. One carried out dead. The pilot wasn't Lt. Dave Blum this time. The other was a medevac plane and we could see the results of last night's artillery. There were litter cases but a number of the Marines walked from the ambulance to the plane.

Later, back at Da Nang, I learned that a correspondent with the Associated Press, Henri Huet, had been wounded at Con Thien that morning. The man he was interviewing had been killed.

A corporal from Kentucky riding back on the same plane said the doctors were sending him to Da Nang for a couple of days rest. His platoon had been hit badly the night before. It was thought that he might have a concussion from the shelling.

I was prepared to hear some words from an embittered man. Instead, I encountered a savage desire to get this trip over and get back to his outfit.

After all of these attacks I thought I would find morale low and this sprawling most forward Marine supply base in trouble. On the contrary. They take this in stride and I have to once again echo Dr. John Parrish's admiration of these young men. They are magnificent.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Oct. 7, 1967]

SOUNDS OF WAR RECORDED ON TAPE: HOW ARMY SNIFFS OUT VIETCONG

CHU LAI.—Capt. Tom Morris had, he softly informed, just returned from a "Sniffer mission."

Standing in front of the heavily sandbagged operations center he hesitated, then continued.

The Army has a device capable of detecting human beings on the ground from an aircraft.

"Human beings and chimpanzees emit some sort of an ammonia odor which can be picked up. You can find out if anybody is up there," he explained, waving northward and around to the west.

Was anybody up there?

He smiled and answered very quietly "affirmative." But that was all he would say. Putting two and two together out here you frequently get three, but there are no chimps and "up there" is not friendly country. He did not have to elaborate.

Capt. Morris, whose parents live on Eastern Parkway (the "Winter Park side of Audubon Park"), is the chemical officer of the 196th Light Infantry Brigade. He is also one of the operations team.

"I spend about 10 hours a day in there," he added, motioning toward the tin-topped building. The top could barely be seen above the bags.

The mountains in front of us obviously had been burned. So had the one to the left. It looked like someone had dropped some napalm there.

"We defoliated the area in front of us. Charlie was able to get up there in the bush and operate freely. We have a bunker line in there now and we wanted the men to have some free vision. Over there we used a mechanical flame thrower to burn away some brush and jungle growth for the same reason."

They draw harassing sniper fire just about every day. In spite of the defoliating and burning, Charlie finds a spot somewhere around and fires a few rifle rounds, just to stay in practice, I guess. He hasn't hit anybody.

Ever so often, however, he switches to rifle grenades and when he does that he creates considerable excitement and bunker activity.

Capt. Morris has sent some sounds of the war he personally taped so his friends will have "some idea of what it sounds like out here." A guitar player, this nine-letterman athlete at Winter Park High School also has sent home some tapes of songs he's picked up, written by troops he knows in Vietnam.

He points out the demonstrations back home do not affect him personally and he wishes the war wasn't so.

"I'll say it's a just cause but it's too bad we had to get into it.

"I can't see any changes, not any major changes. It's going to be slow and tedious. Like other nations, instead of living like their ancestors I think this country will develop like Japan and Korea. Here it's going to be slower because this is not a conventional war," he said.

A chemical major at Furman, Capt. Morris wants to get back into physical education and hopes some school in Central Florida will have a spot for him.

The serenity of the afternoon was broken—by the charred brush leading to the bunker lines on the mountain and by a battery of 155's to our left about a distance of two blocks away, booming harassment fire in one and two round answers every 10 or 15 minutes.

Next morning Rosevelt Richmond came around to the information office. He was tired and looked it—and with good reason. He'd been out on recon patrol all night. He carried a grenade launcher. "There is only one "O" in the Rosevelt," he pointed out humorously.

This is the second tour out here for the son of Mr. and Mrs. Solomon Richmond of Apopka. His first tour was cut short when a mortar blast struck him in the face. He was sent home, then volunteered to return. Why?

The interview was making him nervous. He asked twice, possibily to reassure himself that I was from home, if I was from Orlando.

"The first time here I didn't get much out of it. I didn't get much out of duty in the states and felt I was needed more over here. I felt I was best qualified here, more than in the states," he answered.

Sgt. Richmond doesn't follow the trouble back home closely.

"I don't see any sense in riots and demonstrations back home when we are fighting over here. This war takes the cooperation of all the guys and we will come out ahead," he added.

Richmond has had first hand information on the way the VC and NVA operate and he doesn't like it. They recruit young boys from villages around here now, he pointed out.

"I hear they have three regiments around here and one of them has the prime mission of getting the 196th. We'll stop that," he said, and went to get something to eat.

Young Spec. 5 Frank Dame of Winter Park, is one of the many reasons why this trip has been so rewarding. He was delighted to see somebody from home, "even a newspaperman."

"Boy! You been getting around, haven't you? I've been following you in the Stars and Stripes," he said. I had to look around to see if he was talking to me or somebody else.

He's the non-commissioned officer in charge of Publications and Reproductions for the brigade. He takes care of the surrounding units. He also works at the NCO club at night.

I guess Spec. 5 Dame must be the most popular man in this camp. From his office come the forms which personnel going on R&R or returning home must fill out from which come the traveling orders. He has his own ideas about this war, too.

"Once you know what you are fighting for then it's worth fighting for. I feel this is. These people are not living the best of life here. I think the Vietnamese want to get ahead. I also hate to see demonstrations back home. That's a big disappointment," he said.

He came out in June. When he gets out of the Army he wants to make commercial aviation his career—after he gets married. Does he have a girl in mind?

"Sure do," he answered with a grin.

Spec. 4 William Semuta, whose parents live at 505 E. Harding St., also had been up all of the night before.

He's a radar operator for the 82nd Artillery. Radar can pick up incoming mortar. It picks up the mortars, spots areas from which it was launched and call in artillery. He can pick up the rounds in seconds, notify artillery and then tell on his set if the artillery has been accurate.

"I have my own opinions about the war. It's stupid," he said.

"We can't fire on people unless we have clearance. If you pick up a mortar and it's too close to a town, you can't fire on it.

"But," he continued, "it is getting a little bit better. They are starting to evacuate villages and hamlets now so we know there are no friendlies in the area."

Has he noticed any gains, any advances made by the U.S.?

"I've only been here four months," the tired, blond young man shrugged.

Semuta, who said he had grown a moustache before coming out here, but shaved it off after arriving, was in Germany before being assigned to Vietnam. His wife is there plus a 1-year-old son.

He intends to return to his family in Germany and work in the European Post Exchange Service. And he hopes that day comes "real soon, real, real soon."

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Oct. 16, 1967]

HUSH PUPPIES

(By Charlie Wadsworth)

SAIGON.—At Ankhe a few hours ago, I missed another Orlandoan by, his top sergeant said, "two days, two ambushes and one fine set of orders from an understanding company commander."

Peck Morin is a member of the Military Police. The MPs and the SGs (Security Guard) do a magnificent job over here, but theirs is a thankless and vastly underpublicized role.

Morin is "short." He has about 14 days left before he goes home. About 10 days ago he got caught in an ambush on a road near here. Three days ago he was in another one and again got out of it okay.

When he returned to his company unit his company commander was waiting. Morin was promptly shipped over to the coast 25 miles away to a less hazardous area known as Qui Nhon to await his departure home.

It's one of many such heartwarming stories you hear.

To keep the record straight, however, it should be pointed out that in many outfits, especially the ones involved in almost daily contact with the enemy, men whose time over here grows short are often relieved and moved to rear area jobs.

A man whose tour is about to end becomes overcautious, doesn't react as quickly as he once did. Nobody blames him. It happens to everyone, quite understandably.

So, there are two things a GI going into a fire fight doesn't want around him—guys who are "short" and correspondents.

Now I'm in the base area of the second battalion, third infantry, 199th Infantry Brigade, more famously known as "The Old Guard" and "defenders of Saigon."

Inside the base compound, members of the 199th wear tri-cornered hats and wear them proudly. The 199th was the first brigade to be formed in the U.S.

There are three brigades. One is here, a second in Hawaii and the third in Virginia. From this Virginia based unit come special guards for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and for the late President Kennedy's burial site.

There are many Central Floridians here, such as PFC Gary Vickery of Eau Gallie, Spec. 4 Frank King, Cocoa; PFC Frankie L. Howard, Eustis; PFC Clifford Tittle, Orlando; S. Sgt. Ivory Mack, Ocala; Sgt. Edward B. Taylor, Orlando; Spec. 4 John Rogers, Deland; PFC John Stanley, Webster; and Spec. 4 William Gilgrease Jr., Eau Gallie.

But again it's the same story. They're gone, some to Long Binh for a rest and refitting, and some have moved over to other companies to pinchhit for personnel on leave or out for various reasons, including wounds and sickness.

Forward areas for The Old Guard are just short hops away, some of which have to be made by helicopters because of high water and poor road conditions.

The troops actually live in Vietnamese villages. At night they go on patrol or set up ambushes across the Nha Be River. By day they live in the district villages, working at the pacification program. It is in these villages that you see strong pacification progress being made.

It was here I met PFC Bobby G. Mims of Winter Haven. A short, solidly built young man, he walked down the strip in his unit command area wearing his shower clogs.

"When we are not out on patrol we have to wear these so our feet can get some sun and air and dry out. Otherwise our feet would be in a mess," he explained.

The tide, which varies from 10 to 12 feet, was at its highest and water was beginning to creep into the orderly room area.

"The relationship here with the villagers is very good, No. 1, and we are making headway. We are going to make it all right," he said.

"People," he continued after a slight hesitation, "are helping us now. The other afternoon on a mission an old man came out of his hooch (house) and showed us where the VC had placed their booby traps and mines. This is happening more frequently. It is a great help."

Mims goes on patrol every second day and they are long patrols, across paddies and other areas where the water is often between waist and chest high.

"It's not too bad over here though. It takes you away from your family and your girl friend. That's the bad part," he added.

Bobby worked in the water ski factory Dick Pope Jr. directs in Winter Haven. I asked him if he also doubled as a water skier for Pope.

"No," he grinned. "I was just learning to ski when the Army came along and called my name."

Another familiar name out here and one who is doing a fine job is that of Capt. Lou Johnson.

Back in 1961 Johnson was in the same backfield at Florida A&M with Bob Hayes. He went to the Houston Oilers but had an obligation to ROTC and now, six years later, he's here, and in that period where he will decide whether to be a career man or leave the service.

His home was in Bartow but now he lives in Fort Lauderdale. He has relatives in Orlando.

He was a line company commander for five months out here. Now he's in supply and logistics, and he has "74 days and a wakeup" left out here. A "wakeup" means the day you are leaving Vietnam for home.

SUMMARIES OF REPLIES TO RECENT QUESTIONNAIRE ON FIVE PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to share with other Members of the House the views of 6,651 of my constituents as

shown by their answers to a recent questionnaire on five problems before Congress. Here are summaries of the replies, all from the metropolitan area in and around Columbus, Ohio:

VIETNAM

This query completed in October, followed an earlier March poll on the same subject and was intended to show especially the extent and nature of recent change, if any, of opinion on the conduct of the war. Replies reveal that 31 percent of those responding have changed their opinions, 47 percent have not changed, 23 percent say they are undecided.

Of those who have changed, 59 percent have gone over to more aggressive military effort.

Of those who say they have not changed, 60 percent favor greater military effort. The remainder here, as for those who changed, is divided among votes for less bombing, continuing on the present scale, or immediate withdrawal.

On the earlier poll, where emphasis was not on change of opinion, 75 percent of those replying still were favoring ending the hostilities by negotiations. Asked their view if negotiations failed, 85 percent would continue military action to a successful conclusion.

The significant conclusion of this latest poll is that nearly a third of those responding have changed their views in 1967, most of them to more aggressive military effort. Many were not content with marking the "ballots"—they added forceful letters in which the most common comments were "win and get out," or "win or get out."

A close study of replies to the two questionnaires on Vietnam gives evidence that those responding favor ending the war through greater military effort by a margin of about 3½ to 1.

FOREIGN AID

Sentiment is overwhelmingly for a drastic cut in foreign aid. The summary shows 40 percent want all foreign aid discontinued, 47 percent want aid continued only for friendly nations, thus eliminating members of the Communist bloc. Having opposite views are 6 percent who would continue aid on the present scale and 7 percent who would increase foreign aid.

SPACE PROGRAM

Here again the sentiment is strongly against increases in spending. The summary shows 41 percent for continuing on the present scale, 32 percent for a reduced program. The report reveals only 10 percent would increase the program, while 17 percent would discontinue entirely.

TRUTH IN LENDING

On this proposal to spell out more clearly charges for loans and deferred payments, the favorable sentiment is overwhelming—94 percent for, 6 percent against.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This vote, on a proposed constitutional amendment to overcome a Supreme Court decision forbidding prayers in public schools, is 90 percent for, 10 percent against.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: WE NEED ACTION NOW

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column entitled, "Congress Needs Budget Knowledge," Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Marshall McNeil points to the inadequacy of Congress in exercising its power of the purse.

Mr. McNeil notes that S. 355, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, which passed the Senate last March by a vote of 75 to 9, and which is now stalled in the House, seeks to strengthen congressional control over spending programs and its review of the performance of executive agencies and expenditures of public funds. The act would improve the staffs of committees, earmark the function of legislative "oversight" or review, and study ways in which modern devices such as computers can be of assistance in providing information on the numerous and varied programs and expenditures of the Federal Government.

I think this column will be of interest to my colleagues, especially to those who are concerned that the Congress is not fully exercising its important policymaking function under our constitution and, therefore, are convinced of the need for congressional reform.

The text of the article, which appeared in the October 24, 1967, issue of the Birmingham, Ala., Post-Herald, is as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS BUDGET KNOWLEDGE

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—If Congress learns anything from the budget-cutting fuss in which lately it has been embroiled, it should be this:

Congress is woefully ignorant about the budget, and it had better correct this soon if it is to make good on its constitutional role of keeper of the Federal purse.

The budget is, of course, a vast and complex document that annually seems to become more so. It sometimes cloaks rather than reveals facts.

It is at best an educated guess by the Budget Bureau, the Treasury and the President on what the Government's income and outgo will be in any given fiscal year. The catch is that this guess must be made and committed to paper in an official document from six to eight months before that fiscal year begins. This requires a special capacity for crystal gazing.

Congress gets the budget in January, and refers it to its two appropriations committees. These are staffed by dedicated experts, but the staffs aren't large enough. Except for sporadic investigations carried on by the staff or by experts borrowed from government agencies, there is no continuing study of Administration spending programs. The committees depend almost solely for information on bureaucrats who have vested interests in getting and spending money, in building up their bureaus and the scope of their influence. This is hardly objective.

In the House, the Appropriations Committee is exclusive. That is, its members serve on no other committees. Thus, theoretically, they can give full time to their districts and to their committee work.

In the Senate, Appropriations Committee members also are members and chairmen of other committees. They just don't have time to devote themselves wholeheartedly to the problems of the budget. And this shows.

Both committees should be able to pinpoint quickly and surely where money is being wasted, where money can be saved, where programs can be stretched out, where programs have outlived their usefulness, where programs need to be beefed up, replaced or have their emphasis shifted.

Instead of calling on the President to cut his budget, or demanding that a flat percentage cut be made in all spending, Congress should be able to spell specifically where money should be saved and where money should be spent. That is its constitutional job.

Ways to make Congress more knowledgeable about the budget are provided in a bill the Senate has passed but which the House has ignored.

It's the Congressional Reorganization Bill. Among other things, it would provide the Appropriations Committees with modern devices—computers—to help them understand a budget. It also would provide each legislative committee with a special staff man whose only job would be to keep abreast of the conduct and administration of the programs rooted in laws those committees approved and Congress passed.

If this so-called "legislative oversight"—competent, thorough, continuous, and hard-headed—had been the practice Congress might not now be in the mess it's in.

Taxpayers suffer, the economy is damaged, programs falter, defense is affected and Congress degrades itself if it does not make good on all its responsibilities as the sole, single source of all Federal spending. For no money can be spent by the Government unless Congress appropriates it.

Basic to these responsibilities is the necessity for full knowledge of the subject and everything it contains . . . and why.

TITLE IV AMENDMENTS ARE VITAL

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about poverty, its causes and its cures, during the past few days of debate on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments. However, only one portion of S. 2388 contains a program designed specifically to relieve the economic plight of the ghetto areas of our country—title IV.

Those opposed to the title IV amendments contained in the committee bill have claimed that it will result in diminishing the independence of the Small Business Administration. They have claimed that it will be a duplication of present programs. They have claimed it was tried before and failed. They have claimed that it has been studied and rejected.

The opponents, however, all come back to but one argument—that it will some way sound the death knell of SBA as an independent agency. I will repeat what I have already said a number of times—

it is not the purpose or intent or the intended result of the title IV amendments to transfer any authority from SBA and certainly not to jeopardize the role of SBA.

Let us look at the facts. So that my colleagues might be familiar with exactly what is involved I include section 406 of S. 2388 as part of my remarks, as follows:

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;

(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities, and the stimulation of new private capital resources through the use of guarantees, pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, during the examination of the war on poverty by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the other body, the then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Bernard L. Boutin, described his feelings on mixing a loan program with a management assistance program such as provided for in section 406 as like mixing "gasoline and matches." I believe Mr. Boutin's conclusion is sound and for the information of my colleagues I include a portion of his testimony as part of my remarks. From the hearings on S. 1545, page 3049:

Mr. BOUTIN. In my own mind, and I want to make it clear to the members of the committee, that if the Congress does instruct OEO to continue to finance SBDC's, we will cooperate with them. I ask for heavens sakes not to amend the bill so that this grant function would come to SBA. We are not equipped for that, and a grant program mixed with a business-type program would be like gasoline and matches. So I would advocate not doing that.

It is clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that SBA did not at that time want a program like the one in section 406.

In order to assess the impact SBA has had with its loan program in the major population areas, I wrote to Administrator Moot on October 26 with a request for information along these lines. For the information of my colleagues, I enclose a copy of that letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1967.

Mr. ROBERT MOOT,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOOT: In recent weeks I have tried to secure additional information on SBA's Economic Opportunity Loan program. I would like to bring to the attention of the House more specific data on the number of loans and the amounts granted in both urban and rural areas with a high proportion of unemployed persons.

During a conversation with Mr. Roger Lowe of your agency, I requested these figures. Subsequently I was told by Mr. Lowe that this information is not obtainable. I wish to renew my request for this data and ask that you kindly make it available to me or make it possible for a member of my staff to meet with representatives of your agency to discuss the data.

The need for extensive economic development in the poverty areas has, if anything, increased in the past year. I know that you share my conviction that we must take the most intelligent approach, based on the best possible information, to meet this need. I look forward to SBA's cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Moot answered my letter on October 30. In his letter, Mr. Moot said:

Though there is no reasonably standard definition of urban vs. rural areas our recent publication "Loans in Unemployment Areas, Fiscal Year 1967", identifies SBA loans to all counties designated as areas of substantial unemployment by the Department of Labor.

Mr. Moot also sent a summary of all SBA loans approved during fiscal year 1967 showing totals by State and by loan program. For the information of my colleagues, I include the letter of October 30 from Mr. Moot, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I am pleased to reply to your letter of October 26, 1967, requesting information on SBA's Economic Opportunity Loan Program and the amounts granted to urban and rural areas having a high proportion of unemployed persons.

Though there is no reasonably standard definition of urban vs. rural areas our recent publication "Loans in Unemployment Areas, Fiscal Year 1967," identifies SBA loans to all counties designated as areas of substantial unemployment by the Department of Labor. This publication identifies other types of loans, in addition to the Economic Opportunity Loan Program, thereby providing a greater degree of detail regarding SBA's assistance to unemployment areas than was contemplated in your letter.

For your additional information, there is also enclosed a summary of all SBA loans approved during Fiscal Year 1967 showing totals by state and by loan program. These totals are reconcilable to page 4 of the unemployment report by program totals. The larger total for SBA loans shown in this enclosure is accounted for by two factors (1) the inclusion of Disaster Loans and (2) revised data for the Development Company Loans (501, 502).

I hope these data will be useful. We appreciate your interest and if we can be of further service, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. MOOT,
Administrator.

I trust that my colleagues are already familiar with the chart I included in the RECORD of November 6, and which appeared on page 31341. That chart showed that the SBA loans to unemployment areas in 1967 went to counties which averaged no more than 60,000 in population nationwide. While it is certainly necessary to conduct programs in the more rural areas, it is equally as important to conduct the type of program contained in section 406, aimed strictly at the major metropolitan areas of our country.

Mr. Moot responded to that chart with another letter in which he stated:

I feel, however, that one element of your remarks may be misconstrued by your colleagues. I refer to your statement "that the vast majority of loans made by the SBA under their program of 'loans in unemployment areas' were made in the rural areas."

Mr. Moot went on to say:

During the past year the Small Business Administration has made every effort to bring the Economic Opportunity Loan Program to the disadvantaged in urban areas, as well as rural areas. For example: in New York City alone more than 700 Title IV Economic Opportunity Loans have been approved.

For the information of my colleagues, I include Mr. Moot's letter as part of my remarks:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 8, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: I have read with interest your remarks of November 6 in

the Congressional Record about the provisions of Title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments now being considered by the Congress. We appreciate your very favorable comments concerning the programs of the Small Business Administration.

I feel, however, that one element of your remarks may be misconstrued by your colleagues. I refer to your statement "that the vast majority of loans made by the SBA under their program of 'loans in unemployment areas' were made in the rural areas." This statement is followed by a compilation apparently drawn from the booklet furnished you at the time of your visit to the Agency last week. This compilation indicates SBA loan activity in unemployment areas designated by the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce. I am sure you are aware that inner city ghetto poverty areas may not be specifically designated as EDA areas, and therefore this particular compilation would most certainly indicate a preponderance of rural activity. The compilation, alone, does not, however, provide the full picture as we believe you will readily see. It was for this reason that we also furnished you a National Summary by state and by program of total SBA loan activity during fiscal year 1967.

During the past year the Small Business Administration has made every effort to bring the Economic Opportunity Loan Program to the disadvantaged in urban areas, as well as rural areas. For example: in New York City alone more than 700 Title IV Economic Opportunity Loans have been approved.

We are sure it will also interest you to know that we have recently modified our Regulations governing our remarkably successful Local Development Company Loan Program to reduce the local share requirement from 20% to 10% in so called "Ghetto, Target or High Unemployment Areas" designated by the Administrator, SBA. This action was taken expressly to stimulate the utilization of the Development Company Loan Program in the urban poverty areas.

We also believe that our new Lease Guarantee Program is an ideal vehicle to develop business opportunities in the urban ghettos, and we intend to use it fully.

You may be sure that your interest in helping the disadvantaged in our urban areas is fully appreciated and shared here.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. MOOT,
Administrator.

Upon further examination, I have found that the 700 loans Mr. Moot indicated were made in 1967 were actually made since the inception of the program in 1964. Furthermore, the total number of loans New York City received in 1967 for all categories, including the economic opportunity loan program, number only 511.

To further illustrate the SBA activity in the urban areas, Mr. Moot sent me a copy of the "Loans Approved by State by Program for Fiscal Year." I cannot really determine how this chart will show a high rate of activity of the type I have discussed in the major urban areas, but, for the information of my colleagues, I include it as part of my remarks:

LOANS APPROVED BY STATE BY PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1967

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Business		EOL I		EOL II		DBL		Disaster		501 and 502		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	183	$11,554	4	$24	17	$230	3	$313	4	$17	9	$2,065	220	$14,203
Alaska	66	4,126	2	30	2	50	12	467	96	5,831	13	1,830	191	12,334
Arkansas	127	4,791	46	413	9	113	12	784	1	42	4	525	199	6,668
Arizona	128	4,795	31	302	10	104	5	153	21	488	10	379	205	6,221
California	305	12,858	232	2,210	32	464	16	809	166	2,230	1	71	752	18,642
Colorado	227	9,327	13	110	36	651	5	1,028	10	108	3	364	294	11,588
Connecticut	70	2,982	6	185	22	276	12	571			1	108	111	4,122
Delaware	20	881	4	40									24	921
District of Columbia	44	1,005	16	185	7	93	12	515					79	1,798
Florida	443	21,423	118	1,045	38	476	2	29	55	221	5	2,088	661	25,282
Georgia	178	12,854	15	181	31	501	4	416	4	45	12	1,886	244	15,883
Hawaii	51	2,574			2	32	1	27			3	858	57	3,491
Idaho	132	7,497	1	8	3	70					3	790	139	8,365
Illinois	108	4,670	56	567	26	363	10	1,184	77	640	5	751	282	8,175
Indiana	79	4,253	20	131	12	125	3	169			1	48	115	4,726
Iowa	105	4,799	14	121	11	159	10	309	48	667	30	2,291	218	8,346
Kansas	257	12,319	23	283	7	79	4	751	185	1,694	12	1,958	488	17,084
Kentucky	169	9,166	29	281	27	443	13	866	20	137	4	762	262	11,655
Louisiana	139	6,089	10	88	16	251			798	6,649	4	791	967	13,868
Maine	62	2,597	43	426	13	229	4	410	16	22	8	1,056	146	4,740
Maryland	120	5,254	42	372	32	501	8	576	6	342	5	1,280	213	8,325
Massachusetts	309	16,740	19	213	42	399	54	9,391	60	100	7	1,381	491	28,224
Michigan	153	9,823	114	1,068	30	491	20	1,015	7	37	2	199	326	12,633
Minnesota	138	6,709	23	135	3	36	11	481	14	97	24	3,025	213	10,483
Mississippi	282	12,402	8	71	3	50	1	5	12	362	4	381	310	13,271
Missouri	322	16,934	42	288	25	284	6	237	14	133	12	1,936	421	19,812
Montana	79	3,667	1	8	4	55					4	300	88	4,030
Nebraska	127	6,479	3	20	1	10	2	263	32	132	12	1,393	177	8,297
Nevada	14	1,127	2	9			4	47					20	1,183
New Hampshire	78	4,653	5	30	4	44	19	478					106	5,205
New Jersey	105	4,621	55	524	54	1,719	7	244	51	931			272	8,039
New Mexico	94	3,056	11	112	26	414	3	440	5	60	1	57	140	4,139
New York	225	13,789	369	3,661	96	1,345	41	2,757	2	75	6	853	739	22,480
North Carolina	170	8,306	63	541	24	270	11	1,052	2	31	15	4,034	285	14,234
North Dakota	90	3,353	12	213	6	70			12	25	9	823	129	4,484
Ohio	96	5,232	34	299	28	360	8	537	18	104	1	150	185	6,682
Oklahoma	104	5,043	60	731	32	542	8	348			7	1,522	211	8,186
Oregon	68	4,313	1	5	2	21	6	423	2	381	3	278	82	5,421
Pennsylvania	153	8,029	69	569	42	534	8	453	16	138	8	1,568	296	11,291
Rhode Island	82	3,730	24	181	14	153	11	1,083	1	10			132	5,157
South Carolina	225	11,187	5	47	10	166	3	152			6	1,778	249	13,330
South Dakota	167	6,877	17	158	17	382	2	190	5	7	11	2,275	219	9,889
Tennessee	190	9,607	9	78	8	136	7	152			10	1,543	224	11,516
Texas	407	17,732	104	816	77	846	4	135	139	724	7	1,213	738	21,466
Utah	144	6,857	2	27	2	34					3	139	151	7,057
Vermont	64	3,055	5	42	8	118	3	217					80	3,432
Virginia	220	11,315	5	28	11	162	7	577	6	190	10	2,082	259	14,354
Washington	215	12,717	3	38	10	138	6	1,087	4	312	13	1,872	251	16,164
West Virginia	94	5,765	38	718	47	883	1	62	100	846	3	515	283	8,789
Wisconsin	84	5,725	13	107	16	159	1	216	6	18	5	502	125	6,727
Wyoming	94	4,233	2	12	1	25	1	253			4	780	102	5,303
Guam	10	687			1	10							11	697
Puerto Rico	457	10,416	62	293	109	1,674	1	4					629	12,387
Virgin Islands	7	315	2	5									9	320
Prior periods adjustments	(10)	(5,000)	61	(700)	(40)	(2,100)	(7)	1,000	22	1,300	21	6,200	47	700
Total	8,070	385,308	1,968	17,349	1,066	14,640	385	32,676	2,037	25,146	341	56,700	13,867	531,819

Mr. Speaker, during the past two and a half weeks I have been unable to obtain the necessary information from the Small Business Administration on their involvement in developing the economic life of our major urban areas. I have been interested in the kind of involvement they have in loan programs as well as the kind of management assistance programs contained in section 406.

As my colleagues and I have discussed this matter in the RECORD, one thing seems to be clear—there is little opposition to a program aimed at developing the economic life of our ghetto areas. It is my contention here that we need a dual program. We need a program of loans and we also need a specialized pro-

gram aimed at management assistance in the major urban areas. The two are not mutually exclusive.

It is also my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the loan program should be separate from the business training program because in Mr. Boutin's words the mixing of the two would be like "gasoline and matches." For these reasons I propose that the business management assistance program be designated to the Commerce Department as is outlined in section 406 of S. 2388.

THE GLORIES OF THE SOVIET STATE

Mr. RUPPE. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot these days about the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the Soviet October revolution. Rather than proclaiming a time of mourning for the victims of Communist treachery throughout the world, some people, including some segments of the news media, are proclaiming the success of the Soviet system.

My good friend, Bryce N. Harlow, formerly deputy assistant to President Eisenhower, has provided some sobering statistics which, seemingly, would qualify the United States as a successful state according to the Soviet standard of achievement, and reverse our headlong rush to extinction.

In order to enjoy the glories of the present Soviet system, we would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, 95 percent of our electric motor output, destroy two of every three of our hydroelectric plants, and get along on a tenth of our present volume of natural gas.

We would have to rip up 14 of every 15 miles of our paved highways and 2 of every 3 miles of our mainline railroad tracks. We would sink eight of every nine oceangoing ships, scrap 19 of every 20 cars and trucks, and shrink our civilian fleet to a shadow of its present size.

We would cut our living standard by three-fourths, destroy 40 million TV sets, nine of every 10 telephones, and seven of every 10 houses; and then we would have to put about 60,000,000 of our people back on the farm.

I would add that this is not the half of it. We would have to destroy most of our church spires and abolish 99 percent of our religious freedom. The party line would be preached in every one of our schools and colleges. Every neighbor would be watching you for signs of defection. All in all, we would have to destroy 99 percent of our cherished basic freedoms. Any takers?

HOSMER SPEECHES TO AMERICAN NUCLEAR SOCIETY

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my office has been receiving requests of copies of two speeches I have made this year at national meetings of the American Nuclear Society, there apparently is sufficient interest in the contents to warrant republication here.

The November 7 speech at Chicago follows:

Judged by any yardstick, the AEC laboratories have performed their role well—very well. Their work on nuclear weapons and propulsion for nuclear warships forms the basis of our nation's military security. No less impressive have been their exploits in connection with development of the civilian atom. These unusual AEC institutions are one of the unquestioned parents of peaceful nuclear energy. If the successes achieved by the progeny are any reflection on the vitality of the parent, the Commission's laboratories are indeed healthy specimens.

But I nevertheless believe that the time is fast drawing near for an intensive review of their role and functions. The last such review conducted by the Joint Committee occurred in 1960. The JCAE received a comprehensive Commission report on the subject, and solicited and received comments from a large number of industrial, educational and other organizations concerning the future of the labs. The Committee's findings noted the vital importance to the nation of intelligent long-range planning for the use and development of the laboratories.

Implicit was the need for periodic review of any long-range plan to determine that it continues to have validity in the light of changing circumstances. Now, seven years later, circumstances are changing. With that in mind, and with the objective of maximizing the contribution which the laboratories are capable of making to the national welfare, I want to express my thoughts on some of the things that ought to be done to improve them and to bring their role into greater harmony with national needs.

DIMENSIONS OF NUCLEAR PROGRAM

First, for perspective's sake, I'd like to trace briefly the history of the laboratories and outline the dimensions of the AEC's programs.

AEC operations are a major enterprise in anyone's classification. Commission contracts with industry and universities for operation of its facilities involve the efforts of 114,000 people. Construction projects require another 9,000 people. Adding the 7,500 AEC employees swells the total government-supported effort to 130,500. AEC's operating costs for the last full year we have returns on, fiscal year 1967, were approximately $2.5 billion. These figures include weapons and raw material costs. An analysis of these costs gives an indication of trends in the laboratories' fields of effort.

Twenty years ago the total effort in reactor development, physical research and biology and medicine was less than a hundred million dollars. In the last fiscal year, the operating costs for each of these programs exceeded the total effort two decades earlier. In FY 1967 reactor development costs were $528 million, physical research $292 million and biology and medicine $100 million. In addition to experiencing this large absolute increase, these three areas of AEC endeavor have been consuming a progressively greater percentage of the Commission's total budget. In 1967 37 percent of total AEC costs were devoted to them, compared to 24 percent in 1962 and 19 percent 10 years ago. Underscoring the significance of these increases is the fact that this absolute magnitude increase has taken place and is continuing even though the total cost of all AEC programs has decreased somewhat in recent years.

A further breakdown of the expenditure trends in these three programs is given in the table below:

OPERATION COSTS (PERCENT OF AEC TOTAL)

	1957		1962		1967	
	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent	Cost	Percent
Reactor development	$255,000,000	13	$433,000,000	16	$528,000,000	21
Physical research	70,000,000	4	172,000,000	6	292,000,000	32
Biology and medicine	33,000,000	2	63,000,000	2	95,000,000	4

For reference purposes there follows a breakdown of the total AEC laboratory operating costs for the past 8 years for each of the principal facilities. Also included are personnel and plant growth trends for each of the laboratories. [See attachment A.]

GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY-UNIVERSITY RELATIONSHIP

The Government-industry-university relationship which characterizes the publicly financed nuclear energy enterprise in this country is a rather unusual one, both in terms of what is being done in other countries and what is done in other areas of science in the United States. Almost from the outset it has been our practice to use industrial organizations and educational institutions to run the Atomic Energy Commission's laboratories. The Government furnishes the goal and broad outlines for achieving them; its partners furnish the technique.

I strongly support this mode of operation. The principal alternative, of course, is the performance of the research work directly by Government employees. The primary advantage I see to our method of operation is the strong intelligence communication circuit it fosters between industry and science. As an ancillary benefit, administrative red tape is reduced. In the latter connection, though, I fully realize that the increasing age of the Atomic Energy Commission has injected more red tape into the operations. Not unexpectedly, there's been a certain amount of hardening of the arteries. The exponential growth in numbers and sizes of the AEC administrative manuals attests to the proliferation of red tape. Some consolation can be drawn from the speculation that under alternate operating conditions the situation could be much worse.

Immediately after the war many scientists engaged in weapons work came to the conclusion that it had little purpose and lacked sufficient intellectual challenge to absorb them. In 1945–46, before the concept of broad research at the AEC laboratories was established, a great exodus of scientists from the AEC laboratories took place. At one point the rate of departure approached that which might be expected for rats deserting a sinking ship.

GROWTH OF AEC NATIONAL LABORATORIES

General Groves, first and always placing priority on bomb production, saw that if he was to hold the scientists, broader research programs had to be established for the laboratories. To that end in February 1946 he consulted and obtained the approval of Chief-of-Staff Eisenhower for budget com-

mitments considerably expanding the scope of research at the nuclear laboratories. This was the start of their truly national phase. Shortly thereafter a budget item was included for FY 1947 for national laboratories and general nuclear research work. At the same time a group of scientific advisors proposed creation of the Argonne and Brookhaven national laboratories. These factors, together with announced plans to provide major research facilities and equipment for advanced work in physics, chemistry, metallurgy and biology, motivated many scientists who had left the Government laboratories at the end of the war to reconsider. Influencing them also, I am sure, was their disillusionment at finding that the university and private laboratories to which they had returned could not begin to provide the management support to which they had grown accustomed from the Manhattan District. The upshot was a return of significant numbers of scientists to the AEC laboratories in the 1947–1948 period.

Work in the power reactor field in the early 50's resulted in much optimism concerning the future of civilian nuclear power. Managers of industry began to organize nuclear energy departments to be in the forefront of the nuclear age. In gearing up they naturally turned to the pool of scientific talent brought together by the AEC. This resulted in another exodus from the laboratories in the early 50's. In retrospect, we now see that the movement toward industrial nuclear power was premature at that time, but those with talent and ability weathered the dry period before the harvest of benefits started in the mid 1960's.

In the past few years there has been no radical ebb or flow of laboratory personnel—but there does seem to have been a fairly constant swell. In the period from 1960 to 1967 the number of laboratory personnel has grown from 41,000 to 51,000. Apparently not even the specially equipped national laboratories have been able to develop an immunity from Parkinson's disease.

I rather suspect that this growth in numbers is somewhat ascribable to a reluctance to scuttle older, less productive research programs while continuing to undertake new and exciting endeavors. Growth in overhead operations is probably another causative factor. Budget, accounting, purchasing, personnel and other such administrative functions must be closely watched. They tend to feed on each other and their primary purpose is soon lost. Emulation by some others in the AEC of Admiral Rickover's *modus operandi* in this connection might not be misplaced. Regularly he visits the Bettis and KAPL laboratories to review all of their operations. Not infrequently he finds functions which are no longer truly necessary to the efficient operation of the facility and makes appropriate changes. Such management techniques tend toward greater efficiency and vitality. They must, moreover, be applied by the Commission itself. The individual laboratory cannot be expected to monitor itself or to reform itself with the same singleminded purpose which a more disinterested observer can bring to bear.

OPTIMUM UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

A number of other things can be done to improve the operating efficiency of the AEC labs. Not the least among them would be greater use of existing facilities more nearly at their optimum capability. Illustrative in this connection is what the Commission planned to do for Fiscal 1968 with one of its more expensive machines—the Stanford Linear Accelerator. During Joint Committee hearings early this year we learned that while a 10-shift-per-week operation was proposed by AEC, a more efficient use of the machine would call for operation on a 15-shift-per-week basis. The reason for not proposing to use it more extensively was a budgetary one. After spending $114 million for the construction of SLAC, the AEC found that the yearly demand on operating funds by a number of accelerator facilities made it difficult to operate all of them at or near their optimum capability. The Committee, feeling that it makes no sense to invest large sums of money in a major scientific facility and then operate it at only one-half capacity, voted to increase operating funds for SLAC—but not without first chastising the AEC for building costly R&D facilities without paying sufficient regard to the availability of funds to operate them.

Duplication of unique or specialized facilities and equipment is another area of concern. This can occur between AEC laboratories; between Government and private industry; and between the research facilities of two or more governmental agencies. From time to time we find that certain work is being performed in AEC facilities which could be accomplished as easily and often more economically in existing commercial facilities. The result is usually additional costs and unnecessary delays. There may be legitimate reasons in special cases for doing in the laboratory what could just as easily be done in industry. This may be justified, for example, when it is necessary to retain special technical or engineering talent on standby during a period when they might otherwise be unproductively engaged. Occasionally, too, a sole source supplier, taking advantage of his position, will insist on an exorbitant price for his wares. Under these and similar circumstances the laboratories are justified in turning to in-house capabilities. On balance though, I thnk the error has been on the side of unnecessarily duplicating talents and services within the labs that were readily available without.

PROLIFERATION OF FEDERAL LABORATORIES

A worsening problem of late has been the tendency toward duplication of research facilities by numerous Federal agencies. Unless it is checked, we are going to see a costly proliferation of laboratories throughout the Federal structure. In the interest of efficiency, and certainly in the interest of the taxpayer, this is to be avoided.

I have suggested before that one way to do so would be to designate the AEC the executive agency of the United States Government for national scientific programs. The Commission's network of laboratories—representing as they do an investment of approximately $2.5 billion in plant and capital equipment alone—constitute an unsurpassed reservoir of scientific and technical capability. The concentration of skilled manpower that has been amassed by the AEC knows no equal. Without question, these laboratories and the men who man them comprise one of our most valuable national resources. I believe they should be tapped for a variety of national purposes. Then, too, the AEC is specially skilled in contracting out in numerous research areas and is aware of the need for a proper balance between research sponsored in-house and research sponsored elsewhere. This capability and understanding should not be wasted.

The practicalities of life are such that it is the Atomic Energy Commission which has achieved the position of pre-eminence in research. I believe this fact ought to be recognized and commensurate responsibilities placed on the Commission for conducting truly national scientic programs as executive agent acting on behalf of, and at the direction of, other Federal agencies having primary responsibilities in selected scientifice areas. I envision the AEC executing such programs in a way which would keep scientific costs to the minimum while giving us the maximum rate of return in terms of scientific progress. The mere physical location of the Commission's laboratories could greatly facilitate the execution of national programs. Located as they are throughout the country, the national laboratories could well serve on a geographic basis as the centers for direction of scientific research. Through this network the Commission could coordinate scientific research on a regional basis in order to assure maximum progress at least cost.

I am sure that to many such a suggestion sounds quite radical. To them I would simply suggest that the time has arrived to put an end to the unnecessary duplication, unjustified empire building and wasteful utilization of scarce talent. It is my firm belief that making one management responsible for the efficient use of our scientific facilities would go far toward bringing a semblance of order to an increasingly chaotic and wasteful situation. Almost daily in my job in the Congress I'm exposed to pressures to set up new governmental research facilities. One agency wants its own research center to solve air pollution problems. Another needs one to explore water pollution problems. Still another thinks it needs one to design new cities or unproved desalting plants. And so on down the list. Quite apart from the tremendous costs and the pirating of personnel which these efforts would entail, I consider this an exceedingly inefficient way to operate—one hopefully not to be tolerated in the future.

If perchance this idealistic solution cannot be achieved—and I fully realize that it might be easier to dig a new Panama Canal with a spoon than to bring it off—I would hope that, at a minimum, these other Federal agencies will look to the Commission's existing facilities and talents to perform for them those research activities which most lend themselves to the laboratories' areas of special competence and to contract for them in areas in which they are not skilled in contracting. In this connection I noted with interest the recent announcement by the Minister of Technology in the United Kingdom requesting the U. K. Atomic Energy Authority to undertake a five-year program of research into certain aspects of the character and behavior of atmospheric pollutants. According to press reports, the action was taken in recognition of the Harwell laboratory's work on the problems of radioactive atmospheric pollutants and the wide range of specialized analytic techniques it has developed appropriate to pollution studies. I believe governmental agencies in this country on a broad scale could make similarly meaningful use of the peculiar talents which exist in the AEC's laboratories.

I would also hope and fully expect that the Commission laboratories would pursue these assigned activities with the same vigor that they have demonstrated on atomic energy matters. I have found that most of the laboratory people are quite eager to contribute to the solution of these national problems, even though in some instances the work involved does not fall squarely within the lines of their customary endeavors. Occasionally, however, we get some static on this score from spokesmen for some of the scientists in the laboratories. Stripped of sophisticated federalese, their argument boils down to the lament that the work "is not within the AEC charter." My answer is simply this: If there really are technical legal problems which impede the use of these national assets on critical national problems, just let the Joint Committee know. It is part of our responsibility to recommend necessary corrections in the Commission's organic legislation.

I am pleased to report that some work, relatively minor as it is, has been started along these lines. For example, the AEC has entered into two agreements with the National Center for Air Pollution Control of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. At Brookhaven National Laboratory,

HEW is providing funds to accelerate studies, initiated with Commission support, to evaluate the uses of stable isotopes of sulfur to study the diffusion and chemical reactions of sulfur dioxides. The jointly funded program will evaluate the utility of the technique in large scale studies of SO_2 pollution and a methods of control.

More recent agreement, entered into in October, calls for the Argonne National Laboratory to provide a jointly funded research program for the National Air Pollution Control Center. These groups, working with the Department of Air Pollution Control of the City of Chicago, will develop a comprehensive air diffusion model for the City which will be used for both pollution control planning and enforcement.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Agency and the Bureau of Mines of Pennsylvania both have expressed interest in a process for the treatment of acid mine drainage with radiation developed at BNL. The process, which is in an early stage of development, could, if economic, have wide application. A number of meetings have been held and arrangements are being made with the State of Pennsylvania and with the FWPCA to undertake a cooperative program for the purpose of evaluating the radiation process and current and developing chemical methods.

The Commission has also been discussing with agencies responsible for pollution control the possibility of using the resources of AEC's multi-program laboratories in such matters as base line ecology studies, evaluation of the toxicity of pollutants, alternatives to the gasoline powered internal combustion engine, the development of chemical methods of analysis of pollutants, radiation treatment of sewage, membrane purification of water, the use of waste heat for sewage treatment and water purification, and a broad regional study of pollution. Some of these items are now under active discussion but I am not at all certain which ones will come to actual fruition. I am hopeful, however, that the Commission's talents will be availed of in a number of these areas.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are some of the problems and prospects of the national laboratories as I see them. As I noted at the outset, and as my remarks would easily indicate, I believe the time is near at hand for a full dress review of the long-range role of the national labs. I can think of few if any forums more appropriate than the American Nuclear Society before which to begin thoughtful discussions of this matter.

AEC LABORATORIES

[Dollar amounts in millions; fiscal years]

Laboratories	R. & D. costs			Plant and capital equipment investment at year end			Employees (year end)		
	1967	1965	1960	1967	1965	1960	1967	1965	1960
National laboratories:									
Ames	$8.1	$6.8	$3.8	$20.7	$13.3	$7.9	1,055	985	568
Argonne National Laboratory	73.9	67.1	40.1	325.3	272.3	117.3	[1] 5,388	[1] 5,738	4,255
Brookhaven National Laboratory	48.4	43.5	20.5	224.4	188.2	87.1	3,667	3,500	2,270
LRL:									
Berkeley	37.7	33.4	19.8	108.3	93.4	40.1	3,370	3,383	2,287
Livermore	108.9	102.0	66.1	185.1	159.7	69.2	5,735	5,538	4,189
Pacific Northwest [2]	42.7	32.7	21.3	98.3	82.5	56.4	2,437	2,145	1,382
LASL	91.5	83.7	58.3	242.5	211.6	143.0	4,452	4,255	3,539
Oak Ridge [3]	83.3	74.0	56.6	329.0	237.5	144.7	5,452	5,143	4,415
Other laboratories:									
Evendale	7.5	8.7	37.0	10.3	8.8	10.4	422	493	2,327
Argonne Cancer Research Hospital	2.8	2.7	2.0	5.5	5.3	4.6	201	215	202
Bettis Laboratory	60.5	57.0	51.1	131.1	128.5	102.5	2,896	3,112	3,308
Cambridge electron accelerator	8.4	7.9	.3	20.2	18.2	3.8	185	182	28
Knolls Laboratory	45.5	45.6	37.6	142.3	137.2	74.5	2,255	2,083	2,368
Mound Laboratory (Monsanto)	[4] 24.8	[4] 18.4	[4] 7.5	53.7	45.8	30.0	2,069	1,648	783
Oak Ridge associated universities	5.8	5.1	2.9	5.6	4.8	3.3	497	408	238
Princeton-Penn	7.9	6.8	1.1	30.2	27.8	.8	431	439	96
Princeton stellarator	6.3	6.3	14.1	24.9	24.2	4.6	425	405	371
Sandia Laboratory [5]	186.1	200.0	129.5	206.5	173.5	87.6	8,117	8,083	8,041
Savannah River	14.0	10.8	10.0	70.2	61.2	46.3	819	669	626
SLAC	15.3	7.3	.9	122.1	30.7	--------	1,228	1,202	--------
University of Rochester	3.0	2.5	1.7	6.6	4.0	2.8	320	302	272
Total	882.4	822.3	582.2	2,342.6	1,928.5	1,035.9	51,521	49,928	41,565

[1] Includes temporary and part time: 1967, 383; 1965, 729.
[2] Not completely considered a national laboratory in the same context as other national laboratories.
[3] Excludes reimbursable work for other agencies, R. & D. costs: 1967, $10,600,000; 1965, $7,100,000; 1960, $100,000.
[4] Total operating costs.
[5] Operating costs include non-R. & D. costs ($37,800,000 in 1967; $41,800,000 in 1965; $28,800,000 in 1960), but exclude reimbursable work for other agencies, R. & D. costs: 1967, $26,600,000; 1965, $7,500,000; 1960, $500,000.

The June 18 speech at San Diego follows:

I am happy the ANS picked my State for its meeting this year—and particularly the San Diego area because such important progress has centered here during the past weeks:

A giant nuclear desalting plant in which San Diego Gas and Electric is a major participant has passed the planning and authorization stages and will become a reality of meaningful scope in the peaceful application of nuclear resources.

Also, nearby General Atomics appears to have survived its tribulations as the advanced converter pioneer in the form of significantly trouble-free full-power runs at the Peach Bottom HTGR.

I mention these two companies specifically due to their geographical proximity. Indeed, the entire United States nuclear effort in all its ramifications and you, and all the people in it, deserve commendation. During these past two short decades since the peaceful atom was unwrapped, American free enterprise in partnership with Federal government enterprise has racked up an astounding unparalleled record of progress and accomplishment.

Of course, at American Nuclear Society meetings things like that are likely to be said. One of our critics, Congressman John Saylor from deep in the Pennsylvania coal country, charges that we are something like the man in front of the mirror who mutters "how handsome I am." He has introduced H.J. Res. 599 creating "a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to Review and Re-evaluate the Existing Civilian Nuclear Programs of the United States." His resolution would bar from membership on the Committee any member of the AEC or the Joint Committee—and apparently anyone else likely to be predisposed. Personally I am strongly supporting the Resolution. If the Committee does its job, it can only confirm what we have been telling ourselves all along.

You are familiar with that splendid record and I do not intend tonight to belabor the statistics on new nuclear generating plants, or enumerate proliferating isotopic applications, or call the roll of peacetime nuclear heroes and so on. We are not about to relax on our laurels, anyway. I believe a better thing to do is to make a brief assessment of where we are in relation to the future, quickly identify the players in our game and then get into some speculation as to the roles government and industry are likely to play in the future, for they may be different than in the past.

WHERE WE ARE

So, the first question: Where are we? This is something that really cannot be answered quantitatively or in much of any way except by order of magnitude comparison. That comparison, as I see it, pegs us at around the early Model T era both in technology and as to the peaceful atom's sociological acceptance and consequences. We have a long way yet to go and a vastly larger industry is in the making. The role of government, on the other hand, logically should dimish—but as a practical matter at a slower rate than some would like to see.

WHO THE PLAYERS ARE

This is apparent when one reviews the cast of characters on the nuclear stage representing industry, government and the academic community:

Industry.—This is the free enterprise element who wants to make a buck. And that is a very good goal. It has made America the greatest economic force in the world's history. It works just as well with the atom as it does with any other industry. The vast numbers of megabucks involved in getting the nuclear industry underway with the speed it is exhibiting were just not within the sole capacity of free, private enterprise to provide. It was necessary for government enterprise to come up with supplemental support which directly and indirectly runs in excess of a billion dollars a year. I suspect this government enterprise was inspired less by a clear view of the peaceful possibilities of the atom than it was by a tacit acknowledgment of a kind of national guilt complex arising from its initial military use. Spear-

heading swift civilian developments probably can be classified in the category of an atonement.

Continued large research and development costs to round out the national nuclear power capability in the form of advance converters and breeders makes continued substantial government participation in these areas mandatory for another 15 years or more. Of course factors like the impact of many civilian developments on military weaponry and security, safety, licensing, and regulation and other responsibilities will keep government in the picture indefinitely. However, not necessarily with money or control comparable to the present. Industry should be given as much opportunity as possible to permit economic forces to determine its future without regard to unreasonable government interference. An example of what I consider unreasonable interference is the recent AEC decision to put gas centrifuge technology under wraps on the theory this will delay nuclear weapons proliferation. If IAEA inspection is good enough to police plutonium, it ought to be good enough to police U235. Efforts to un-invent the wheel only make the AEC look silly.

Universities.—Universities as operators of AEC facilities have performed a splendid service which I hope will continue. They have played an even larger and more vital role in the production of Ph. D.'s. This will continue both by outright grants of various types and by a wide spectrum of research contracts. In contrast, I believe the so-called scientific community, as such, with its great public prestige and imperial command on federal dollars is due for a somewhat harsh awakening which I will discuss a little later.

Government.—Government participation in civilian atomic affairs has been unique and extraordinary, not just because of the depth of involvement legislated by the Atomic Energy Act, or because of vast public appropriations, or the extent to which international atomic activities have been fostered or the rigid adherence by both Democratic and Republican Administrations to an unswerving Atoms-for-Peace philosophy. Rather, it has been so because of the unflagging strength and zeal with which both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress, as represented by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, first, have pursued their responsibilities, *and,* second, have, shall we say euphemistically, cooperated with each other, or say realistically, competed with each other.

The net result is that—with exceptions of course—vacuums which might otherwise have arisen as to in government participation in civilian nuclear enterprise have been rather quickly filled by one or the other of these authorities.

Now it is alleged by some that AEC is passing through a menopause of spirit and purpose. That the objective of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act—the development of weapons—and the purposes of the 1954 Act—the development of peaceful uses—have been achieved and that the Commission should fade away and let the market place take over. To that let me say we have reached the millenium neither in weaponry nor unassisted civilian applications. AEC still has plenty of pep and nuclear sex appeal. Right now it is even taking some anti-monopoly birth control pills in the form of a comprehensive study of competition in the industry. More power to it. One or two companies dominating the field interested only in marketing bread and butter type reactors can tend to squelch innovation and progress. This situation has a parallel in the development of jet aircraft engines. Standard piston engine suppliers made regular and progressive refinements of their products. But the radically innovative jet engine emerged from other sources. Competition prevents monopoly and it fosters innovation. AEC's enterprise in going ahead with this study will serve the nation well.

We also hear allegations that the Joint Committee is a monolithic structure, akin almost to the Kremlin, hell-bent on self perpetuation and on ruling the nuclear affairs of this country by fear and intimidation. None of this do I deny. But, by way of confession and avoidance, I make my own allegation that the Committee has been instrumental in pushing many of the accomplishments which have permitted both industry and our national defense to reach their present stage of development. In the future as in the past the Committee will seek to insure United States preeminence across the entire spectrum of nuclear excellence.

Some people have asked me if all this will change drastically in the event the 1968 elections put a Republican in the White House to control AEC appointments and/or shift the JCAE majority and its chairmanship from Democratic to Republican. Based on the experience of the 1954 election and my own notions I would answer that changes there would be, but I doubt if they would be cataclysmic. For one thing, conditions underlying the cooperatively competitive relationship between the Commission and the Committee are extraneous to political circumstances. For another thing, both the Commission's operational programs and the Committee's legislative plans are rather long range in nature and essentially responsive to environmental conditions other than the political climate.

Therefore, whose political star shines brightest over Washington after November 1968 is likely to influence the pace and dimension of changes already underway rather than to alter percipitously their direction and nature.

FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, AND OTHERS

In any event these changes will affect the relative roles of government and industry and others in the future. They must be reckoned with by all of us and in the remaining time I want to touch lightly on a few of them.

THE SCIENTISTS

First let us take inventory on the nuclear physicists, chemists and any other disciplines to which by any stretch of the imagination the adjective "nuclear" could be applied. Once the wraps were taken off the Manhattan Project and Los Alamos, Hanford, Oakridge and other names became romantic fantasies, the American public engaged in a great love affair with science and scientists. They later were figuratively ensconced in a "Temple of the Living Gods," located immediately adjacent to the Federal Treasury with only swinging doors between. Time and the high cost of accelerators and other basic research tools have altered circumstances considerably.

A greater public appreciation has developed of the need to encourage and support engineers to put to public use the knowledge gained by scientists. Where previously congressmen and senators worried mostly about the proper allocation of public support for basic research between the various disciplines, now they worry about the allocation between basic research and practical developments for public use. It is safe to say that the "easy money" days for scientists are slipping into history.

THE GOVERNMENT LABORATORIES

It is also safe to predict that a searching examination of what already is known as the "government laboratory problem" is in the offing. Within the AEC itself the issue is how many and what kind of laboratories it should operate. Without being specific, I think the answer will be "less," not "more." Also within the AEC is the broader issue of the logic or illogic of its budgetary and management responsibility for large and expensive basic research programs which are loosely atomic related but might more appropriately come within the province of some agency more fundamentally oriented toward basic science only. I have in mind here the high energy accelerators as well as the possibility of revising and enlarging the charter of something like the National Science Foundation to encompass their operation, or rescoping the AEC as the government's R. & D. Agency as well as atom custodian.

Laboratories operated by the Defense Department and many other government agencies are part of this total picture as well as the nongovernmental laboratories and universities with which extensive research contracts are maintained. Because of the "in-house" laboratory problem is government-wide and because it is pressing, I think the AEC and the JCAE well might take an initiative in solving it in order both to set a government-wide example and to prevent AEC, if it fails to take early action, from being swept into some generalized scheme of reform which may not particularly fit its needs.

AEC PERIPHERAL ACTIVITIES

Somewhat akin to the laboratory problem, because it does involve research as well as development, is the issue of how much AEC should continue to promote peacetime civilian nuclear applications in such fields as medicine, biology, food preservation and similar activities. Those who sternly predict that once government gets into any kind of business "it never gets out" must be amazed to see how swiftly and voluntarily AEC relinquishes its isotope production activities the moment private operators can supply the market. The activities from which the AEC might recede I am talking about at this particular moment, however, fall into a different category than isotopes.

In medicine, biology and like areas we do not find a large involvement of private enterprise. The traditional responsibility has been one of government at some level, universities, research foundations and so forth. So the question really is, should the AEC be financing and managing the efforts because they are nuclear related, or should the AEC be urging those who traditionally have operated in an area to assume its nuclear related aspects as quickly as possible? I favor the second alternative.

In food processing and other applications of ionizing radiation by private industry the question boils down to the rate of progress you want to make as a matter of national policy. Perhaps we have tended to overestimate the economic and prestige rewards from moving here at forced draft rather than at a pace determined and financed by industry itself.

By way of contrast, space nuclear power has just one customer, the government, so private enterprise in this area is limited to the prime and subcontractor role. The questions government has not satisfactorily answered respecting it are simply what do we want to put in space and when. Space auxiliary nuclear power is another matter. The rapid penetration of industry into the ocean environment which makes similar power demands, brings government and industry back into partnership on this one.

RAW MATERIALS

Having just taken you quickly from outer space to under the oceans, I'd now like to take you to inner space for a moment—into the uranium mines from which the nuclear industry gets its basic raw material. These have been much in the headlines recently and the Joint Committee still is in the midst of extensive hearings on the uranium miner lung cancer problem. In the 1950's the na-

tional interest dictated discovery and production of vast quantities of uranium ore. The AEC dutifully and very successfully established a program of prizes and incentives which accomplished the objective. It has done a reasonably good job since of withdrawal in favor of private industry as the prime force sponsoring additional exploration and production. However, from the recent request of the Colorado Springs Operations Office for money to spend on large scale geological surveys, ore benefication research and the like, I gather that the spirit of bureaucratic empire building is not entirely dead within the AEC. Resurgent activity in the mining and milling industry leads me to believe, however, that it will be able to supply the new surge of yellow-cake demand even if Colorado Springs does not get all the money it asked for.

In its past efforts to spur uranium production the Commission logically and wisely refrained from attempting to nationalize the mining industry or regulate the mines. That was recognized as an area of state jurisdiction and responsibility. On that basis it was left to the states. Yet the Joint Committee and the Commission because they did so, have been subjected to the severe criticism that they have been neglectful in the matter of radon daughter induced lung cancer amongst the uranium miners. As pitiful as these cases are, it seems to me that we adopted a national philosophy of weaving the emerging nuclear industry into our existing political, economic and social fabric as normally as possible and therefore, that Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz's hasty move to put the government into the mines by way of Walsh-Healey Act regulation is not wise.

His regulation, according to testimony, is impractical and unenforceable. Instrumentation does not exist by which the required .3 working level radon concentrations can be monitored. Already the regulation has had to be amended to cure defects in the definition of the .3 level and to avoid closing down all our mines.

STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS

I believe the basic fault in this instance, if it can be pinpointed at all, is a lack of proper standards to guide the states in establishing their safety regulations.

In 1959 the Joint Committee attempted to create machinery to provide such safety guides for exposure to radiation. It gave statutory recognition to the Federal Radiation Council to assure their orderly, comprehensive and scientifically sound treatment. The Council was set up to permit inputs from all the executive agencies having talents and responsibilities in the field—AEC, HEW, Labor and others.

The first major radiation problem the Joint Committee recognized and handed FRC in 1961 was the development of protection action guides covering radioactive fallout. At the time, you will recall, atmospheric weapons tests were creating hot spots. In this case we got the FRC to come through, but it wasn't easy.

We had to call hearings in both 1962 and 1963 to keep things moving. We also wrote a lot of letters and finally got the protection guides in 1964.

As soon as these were out FRC work was directed toward radiation exposure of uranium miners. I have no doubt that its staff worked hard to come up with the needed guides, but it was obvious the progress was too slow. Again, the Joint Committee jumped in to move things along. As soon as we scheduled hearings, the next meeting of the Council was moved up to complete action on the guides beforehand. This was fine. But then things blew apart. FRC met on May 4th and there was a split decision. The object was to get together again and make one. But, somebody lost the script. The Secretary of Labor overreacted, bolted and put out his proposed regulation. This pre-empted FRC action and, even more seriously, the proposed order by Labor was garbled in a number of technical aspects.

In summary the way we laid things out when we passed the statute setting up the FRC broke down and something has to be done about it. What should be done? Abolish FRC and reorganize the executive to handle these problems? Strengthen the FRC to take care of this job? Or what?

I don't have the answers—only the questions. But I do know, as you know, that not only safety in the mines, but safety throughout the nuclear industry as well as public safety depends on getting them. And further, that the entire matter of standards and specifications in the broad sense is critical to the growth and development of the nuclear power industry. They are needed by the purchasers of reactors. They are needed by the manufacturers and by their suppliers. They are needed in order to avoid a breakdown of the licensing and regulation process in the face of the avalanche of new nuclear power plant orders.

Milton Shaw deserves great credit for zeroing in on this particular problem and working with all concerned to come up with some of the answers.

ADVANCED CONVERTERS AND BREEDERS

Mention of Shaw's name, of course, brings up the bitter issue of the best way to go about developing breeder reactors—a program in which private enterprise and government enterprise find themselves in ambiguous, uneasy, but necessary partnership. Milt wants to go the component development route. Industry wants a comprehensive approach, on the theory its objective is not building components, but whole reactors. When listening to Shaw I find myself favoring his approach and when listening to industry I favor its approach. I like to feel that this is not because I am wishy-washy but because I believe that the magnitude of the job—and the resources both government and industry eventually will devote to it—will permit both approaches.

Nor do I wish, by this emphasis on the breeders, to imply any belief that advance converters are in danger of disappearing from the mix of nuclear power systems this nation and the world eventually will end up with. It long has been the custom of a few key members of the Joint Committee to meet informally with both government and industry representatives to exchange views on specific major problems. We have listened individually to lots of discussion, estimates and speculation from burner, advance converter and breeder proponents. We have heard lots about sodium, steam, gas and other coolants. I think the time is reasonably close when we should bring them all together at a formal hearing and get a better fix on when and in what proportion these various types of reactors can be expected to capture their markets.

CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR REACTORS

I believe, in evaluating these markets, we cannot neglect the very real possibility that controlled thermonuclear reactors may be in the picture, too. The Joint Committee actively supports the program and regularly endorses an ever increasing budget. Progress in understanding and suppressing plasma instabilities is excellent. It would be reckless to expect a quick breakthrough in CTR. But it would be even more reckless to expect none at all. When it comes I am certain industry will move swiftly to exploit it.

PLOWSHARE

Since some of you probably think I am pretty far out on the fringes talking about controlled fusion and since my time is about exhausted, to conclude I will just switch to another area many believe is on the fringes but I do not. It is Plowshare. Recently EG&G's Herb Grier, wearing his hat as President of CER Geonuclear Corporation, explained why his company, Continental Oil and Reynolds Electric are pouring substantial sums not only into the Gasbuggy Project to liberate natural gas locked in hard shale, but to set themselves up in the general nuclear rock crushing business on a permanent basis.

Where else, asks Grier can you buy TNT for 30¢ a ton? And, how else can you stuff kilotons of it underground through an eight-inch hole?

Considering the locked up reserves of natural gas alone, Grier estimates that in five to ten years there will be 1,000 shots a year and a total of 30,000 shots is needed in the United States alone. This is a lot of business. I hope the enterprises amongst you will not let CER get it all.

But that is only one area of Plowshare application. Its techniques should be applicable to oil as well as natural gas recovery. As of this week the AEC has a team in Pennsylvania looking into the use of Plowshare to create vast underground storage cavities for natural gas imported into that state from elsewhere.

Our old friend Norman Hilberry of Argonne Laboratory went to Arizona to retire but instead he is developing a scheme to use Plowshare to solve that state's critical water shortage. He would use underground nuclear explosives to develop giant catch basins to retain the State's rainfall, 98% of which is otherwise lost to evaporation.

Then there is the intriguing idea Plowshare heat sinks. Where there is a potential thermal pollution from a new power plant, before its construction a Plowshare underground cavity could be blasted which would "cool down" while the plant is built. Then the excess btu.s from cooling might be dumped in the cavity as an alternative to thermal pollution or dissipation from towers. Some people think the heat sink idea might even be practical for systems of central heating in winter and cooling in summer for entire cities. I close with these far-out thoughts mostly to underscore my estimate that our atomic industry today really is still in the Model T era and that great opportunities and great rewards lie ahead for anyone with enterprise.

SATO SHOULD LIFT EMBARGO ON TEST RIFLES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. RUPPE. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister of Japan, Eisaku Sato, is here in Washington, seeking major concessions from the United States, I believe it is timely to draw to the attention of Congress and the public an important concession of vital interest to U.S. security that the Government of Japan has refused to grant this country.

Since last April, the Sato government has declined to approve an export permit to allow the shipment to this country of 75 American-designed AR-18 rifles, produced under license in Japan, which the U.S. Air Force wishes to test.

As my colleagues may recall, it was

the Air Force in 1962 that led the way in the testing and adoption of the M–16 rifle, when the Army was still fighting procurement of that weapon.

Now, the Air Force wants to buy test quantities of the newer AR–18 rifle, which is similar to the M–16—but lacks some of its more troublesome features for three reasons: First, because of the Air Force's long-established policy of seeking the best possible weaponry for its personnel; second, because the Air Force has been unable to get the quantities of M–16 it wants as quickly as it would like; and third, because of the problems that our forces have encountered with the M–16.

Prime Minister Sato is now conferring with President Johnson and other key American officials seeking several concessions of vital interest to Japan; namely, the return to Japanese control of the strategic island of Okinawa, as well as the Ryukyus, which the United States have held since World War II. Indeed, so important is the Okinawan question that it has been publicly suggested that the Sato government may fall if the Prime Minister fails to negotiate return of the island to Japan.

Therefore, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe it is in bad grace and bad faith for Mr. Sato—the head of a friendly nation—to seek such concessions from this country, when his own Ministry of International Trade and Industry—MITI—will not even approve the export to this country of 75 AR–18 rifles for test purposes.

And it could further be suggested that blocking this AR–18 shipment, valued at about $10,000, is in particularly poor grace when it is recalled that earlier this month, the United States turned over to the Japanese Government the "technical package" on America's Nike Zeus and Nike Hercules rockets, worth millions of dollars, so that Japanese manufacturers could produce these weapons for defense of the Japanese homeland.

Officially, the Japanese Government has given no explanation as to why the shipment of 75 AR–18 rifles is being held up. But unofficially, Japanese officials have made clear that they fear release of the rifles to the U.S. Air Force might prove embarrassing to the Sato government.

The Japanese Constitution forbids its Government to give direct aid to any foreign nation which is a combatant in an armed conflict. And the United States, of course, is deeply engaged in Vietnam.

So strong is the antiwar and anti-American feeling among the politically powerful left-wing extremists in Japan that the Sato government apparently fears this shipment of rifles, if released, might provoke some kind of a domestic incident.

But the facts of the situation mitigate against that possibility. For these guns are to be shipped to Lackland Air Force Base, for stateside testing, not to Vietnam. Here is the history of the situation:

The AR–18 rifle was designed and is owned by the Armalite Corp., of Costa Mesa, Calif. This is the same firm that developed the AR–15 rifle, which has been adopted by the U.S. military as the M–16. While Armalite sold manufacturing rights for the M–16 to Colt Industries, licensing it is as world's sole manufacturer, it has retained rights to the newer AR–18, which is also a light, fast-firing .223-caliber weapon.

That rifle is now being produced for Armalite, under license, by the firm of Howa, in Nagoya, Japan. It is from Armalite-Howa that the Air Force has contracted to buy 75 AR–18s.

And it is the export of those rifles to the United States which the Japanese have refused to approve since last April, despite efforts by the Air Force and the U.S. Department of State.

Air Force interest in the AR–18 was sufficient, at the outset of its discussions with Armalite, that the service sought to buy 150 of the weapons. Seventy-five of the rifles were to go for the tests at Lackland, and 75 were to be flown to Vietnam, for trial under combat conditions.

But the U.S. State Department, fully appreciating the difficulties faced by the Japanese Government, ordered the Vietnam part of the order canceled. So there can be no doubt of their intended test-use solely in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is apparent in this Congress a rising protectionist sentiment on matters of world trade. It is a trend of which I personally do not approve. And it is a trend that alarms many of the friendly nations with which we trade—particularly Japan, which sells considerable steel on the U.S. market.

It is my opinion that an incident like this one, involving an adverse action by the Japanese Government on this small quantity of AR–18 rifles, can only further stir the ire of many Members of Congress, and enhance the possibility that some kind of retaliatory action available to Congress—such as the voting of steel import quotas—may result.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how Mr. Sato can seek concessions from this country, such as the return of Okinawa and the manufacturing data on the Nike missiles, while withholding approval for the shipment of 75 rifles to the United States.

As a Member of Congress with a long record of active interest in obtaining top-quality weapons for American fighting men, I do not see how the Japanese action in this situation can be described as anything but deplorable.

Mr. Sato wishes American concessions, and wishes to retain the good will of Members of Congress. I believe he should release the AR–18 rifle shipment.

THE ORBITAL BOMBARDMENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense McNamara lifted the veil of secrecy and silence on the status of a far-reaching threat to our national security when he disclosed November 3, 1967, that the Soviets have been testing a system capable of placing in orbit and detonating on command a nuclear bomb—the orbital bombardment system—which could become operational in 1968.

A capability in the hands of the Soviet Union to bombard this Nation from orbiting missiles is a matter of grave concern, for it is a weapons system of awesome significance.

It cannot be otherwise, for it means that weapons of mass destruction can be orbiting the earth and the impact point of their warheads cannot be determined until they are about 3 minutes from the target.

In spite of efforts of the Secretary of Defense and other spokesmen to downgrade the importance of the orbiting bomb, there is widespread apprehension about the potential of this weapon. For example, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said on November 8, 1967, the weapon "could grow to be a threat of considerable proportions."

There is no quarrel with any attempts which may be made to allay public fears concerning this weapon. Obviously, we cannot allow this or any other development to have a weakening or immobilizing effect upon actions which may be required to do our best to safeguard our Nation's security and sovereignty.

But the apparent indifference of officials of the Defense Department as to the seriousness of the threat to us represented by the orbital bomb is a matter of deep concern.

This indifference, which is perhaps best described as an arbitrary refusal to see the orbital bombardment system and its potential for actual and psychological warfare for what it really is, has persisted over the years.

When Secretary McNamara appeared at the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearings on February 20, 1964, he described the threat of attack from enemy satellites as "not an important threat for the immediate future."

Shortly after that, Dr. Harold Brown, then Director of Defense Research and Engineering and now Secretary of the Air Force, testifying before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on March 11, 1964, said:

> It is therefore clear that [orbital bombardment system] weapons are not very great threats to us in the near future, and that they are unlikely ever to be. Such weapons would be largely anti-population in nature and would not appear to alter Soviet military posture sufficiently to justify the several obvious difficulties involved in their deployment.

He further testified during those hearings that "we have not more than three or four people" studying the question of orbital bombardment, and "we are not doing any hardware work."

Dr. Brown came up with such reasons for this as:

> It is not a very good idea.
>
> There now is a U.N. resolution which we subscribe to and the Soviets have subscribed to, not to put bombs in orbit.

And—

> Apparently neither the Russians nor we believe it is a very important strategic weapon.

In the meantime, the Soviets have aggressively applied space to military purposes, and in the case of the orbital

bombardment system they appear to be far ahead of the United States.

When President Johnson transmitted to the Congress the sixth annual report on the accomplishments of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on February 17, 1967, he said:

> The United States has anticipated the future by putting all of Antarctica, and more recently outer space, off limits to weapons of mass destruction.

Ironically, at the very time the statement was made that we put outer space off limits to weapons of mass destruction, according to press reports the Soviets had already fired three of 11 space shots from a military ICBM launch complex, a series of shots Secretary McNamara reportedly referred to when he revealed there was evidence that the Soviet orbital weapon system conceivably could be operational in the near future.

The situation we are confronted with, therefore, is that soon the orbital bombardment system could be an accomplished fact as a major weapons system in the Soviet arsenal.

In spite of this, at his November 3, 1967, news conference Secretary McNamara clearly indicated a continued lack of concern over the Soviet orbital bombardment system.

Secretary McNamara revealed that we are still relying on a concept of something which he calls "deterrent" as a basic defense against this offensive weapon.

Many have at times felt that the development of U.S. defense forces—particularly the strategic forces—under the stewardship of Secretary McNamara has been intentionally constrained, and that this seems to be bringing us into a position of parity with the Soviets.

In the application of space to military purposes there should exist no doubt that what the Soviets seek is superiority, not parity.

The development of an orbital bombardment system gives added evidence that the Soviet objective is to achieve strategic nuclear supremacy over the United States.

By attaining strategic nuclear superiority, the Soviets could: Complicate the problem we have in targeting and directing our strategic forces against the Soviet Union, reduce U.S. confidence in our ability to penetrate Soviet defenses and our ability to destroy Soviet targets, and achieve an exploitable capability permitting them freedom to pursue their aims without resorting to general nuclear war.

It is the military capabilities which the Soviets now possess or control which helps permit the Soviets a freedom to pursue their aims in North Vietnam and elsewhere without resorting to general nuclear war.

If one were to utilize a term often used by the Secretary of Defense, one could say that the Soviets have a deterrent. It is that Soviet deterrent which apparently deters this administration from successfully countering against the Soviet economic, political, and military support activity which the Soviets sustain against us in North Vietnam.

Furthermore, there is every reason to believe the Soviet leaders could, with an orbital bombardment system, be in a position to even more freely pursue their aims.

Officials in our Department of Defense and others in high positions seem to place extraordinary faith and reliance on mere words on paper as the means to deter the Soviet orbital bombardment system.

Throughout the story of the Soviet success and our failure to develop an orbital bombardment system there is a consistent theme of reliance on "agreement" or "resolution" or "understanding" or "arrangement" with the Soviets regarding weapons in space.

Assurances along these lines have been repeatedly advanced over the years and were again repeated in Secretary McNamara's recitation on November 3 that one of the reasons the Soviets were not likely to use the orbital missile as a weapon is that—

> It's a violation of an agreement they've entered into.

This was, of course, a reference to the Treaty on Outer Space. One of the major provisions of the treaty is designed to bar the orbiting or stationing of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in outer space. In this regard, many are puzzled and dismayed over Secretary McNamara's apparent eagerness to absolve the Soviets of any violations of the Space Treaty.

The Los Angeles Times, as one example, in a November 7, 1967, editorial entitled "Soviets Bend Space Treaty," asserted:

> But it is nothing short of incredible that the Johnson Administration seems unwilling to challenge Russian actions as a violation of the U.N. treaty banning nuclear weapons from outer space.
>
> Certainly the American people are unlikely to be satisfied with McNamara's explanation of why Soviet development and testing of the new weapons system does not violate the treaty, which the Russians signed only last January.

Secretary McNamara's announcement of the Soviet orbital bombardment system culminates a case history of an administration failure which we certainly cannot permit to be repeated.

The psychological or physical harm which may be inflicted upon the world by the Soviet's possession of the orbital bombing system may be of great significance. It could in fact determine our Nation's future.

Greater progress is needed to develop our own capability to counteract Soviet strategic weapons systems. Certainly we are faced with the necessity of developing a system to defend against orbiting bombardment missiles.

Our Nation and the world would be better off, too, if we challenged the Soviets on this weapon as a violation of the Space Treaty.

But mere words alone will not adequately shield the Nation.

Hard work and hardware are required to deal with weapons of mass destruction in space.

EVALUATION OF U.S. FOREIGN AID POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, before we begin debate on the foreign assistance and related agencies appropriations bill of 1968, I should like to offer for the consideration of our colleagues an evaluation of our overall approach to foreign assistance as embodied in the Foreign Aid Authorization Act, accepted last week by this body.

U.S. foreign aid policy has, of late, been subject to much criticism. But criticism is easy. The harder task is developing a realistic approach to U.S. foreign aid and defining the reasons for U.S. expenditures. My examination of our recently passed foreign aid conference report, excluding provisions for military and supportive assistance, convinced me that our approach to foreign aid is basically sound.

The United States has a crucial interest in the direction of development of the rest of the world. She cannot expect countries to follow similar paths of modernization. But she can affect the directions and rate of change. To keep peace during this time of turmoil and to help make other nations' interests compatible with her own are reason enough to continue foreign aid.

The foreign aid bill of 1968 recognizes that the problems developing nations face today are qualitatively different from those of both this Nation at inception and post-World War II Europe. Many countries have yet to achieve a sense of their own nationhood. The developing nations' insistence on immediate modernization, on a total changing of society without first developing the necessary technology, education, funds, and other equipment have led to bottlenecks and violence.

How do these conditions affect U.S. aid policies? No Marshall plan can solve the problems of underdeveloped nations. Modernization can only be achieved by a long-term process and the foreign aid bill of 1968 recognizes this. The U.S. approach must be a pragmatic and flexible one. She must constantly reexamine her policies and results of these policies and change them to fit the needs of individual countries now receiving aid. She must realize that she can expect no assurance that economic growth will lead to social and political changes desirable to herself and yet that she cannot stop her efforts. Finally, she must be willing to experiment and make mistakes.

S. 1872 is a step in the right direction. In his foreign aid message of 1967, President Johnson called self-help "the lifeblood of economic development." This bill recognizes that this country and other donors can supply only a small fraction of the resources needed for modernization; the initiative and much of the human and physical resources must be provided by the recipient country. Sections of the bill place further emphasis on the principle of self-help. It combines 20 years of experience by setting the criteria to judge the efforts of recipient countries to improve themselves.

This bill further recognizes the limitations of U.S. aid attempts. The United States cannot support the world. Thus,

this Nation has selected 16 key target nations for her major aid ventures.

This bill further recognizes the limitations of U.S. efforts by selecting areas of priority. Although much of the underdeveloped world is still agrarian, many nations are still incapable of feeding their own populations. Thus, the bill continues the 1961 provisions to increase the technology, marketing techniques, and to make recommendations of the most advisable crops a country should produce. While efforts are being made in the field of long-term improvements in agriculture, Public Law 480 provides unforeseen emergency famine relief. Recognizing that the world population cannot be fed in the future if current growth rates continue, the United States has increased her program urging voluntary family planning. Modernization is impossible unless a country's population is healthy and skilled; thus, S. 1872 continues U.S. priorities in these two areas also.

S. 1872 is a sound law because it allows the necessary flexibility of policies for development of countries. It provides the guidelines for project-tied and developmental aid, aid with and without strings, and both grants and loans of funds.

Project aid enables the United States to direct a country's development. By allocating funds and technology for specific projects, the United States can provide the necessary impetus for projects such as the Indus Basin project which a country without aid might never attempt. The United States also has other means of directing a nation's development besides specific project aid. She can attach strings, as demands for monetary or political reform to her contributions. But no nation can delegate upon herself the responsibility of determining the course of another country's development, and this H.R. 12048 recognizes. Thus, the 1968 bill has supplemented project aid and aid with strings with development aid and "soft aid," allocations for which the recipient country can determine her own uses, free from strings. A combination of these types of aid gives the recipient freedom to plan her own development.

Current U.S. aid places further emphasis on loans rather than grants. Thus, a "pipeline" or revolving fund for future aid ventures is created. The merits of this policy are apparent. But, I believe that future efforts in this direction should be tempered because of the fear of fiscal difficulties it creates in the recipient countries. U.S. accumulation of foreign currency lowers the circulating currency in developing nations and creates the fear that some day U.S. stockpiles of foreign currency will be released, flooding the market and leading to economic upheaval in the country receiving aid.

I must repeat that the United States can expect no mirror image of her own paths of development in the developing nations today. Private enterprise and nonprofit organizations do have an important role in our foreign aid which part II of the current bill recognizes. But we should neither demand that a nation buy our own products nor demand free enterprise as the only principle upon which an economy can be built.

Rapid change often demands regulation by the government and more regulated ownership than free enterprise. The United States should continue to support the free enterprise system and her own corporations, but be willing to make sacrifices. More orderly control by the government is often more of an assurance for the conditions in which democracy can flourish than a disorderly, bottlenecked, free enterprise system in which frustration and violence can become more rampant.

These efforts mentioned are limited to about 16 countries. But technological aid under title II of the development assistance program benefits a total of 40 countries. The United States is thus helping to train people in the necessary skills needed for modernization, and makes her foreign aid program a broader one.

Foreign aid is not simply a bilateral venture by this Nation. Some of the more promising features of this bill are contained in the provisions for U.S. support of international organizations such as the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, groups of nations acting in consortia, and the agencies of the United Nations. These groups have the potential of providing more funds and aid free from the pressure of the demands of any one government. My recent trips to Latin America and Africa have convinced me that, although these groups are now limited in scope and effectiveness, they have the potential to play a large part in the efforts of developing nations.

Just as the donor is not always one country, the recipient of aid may be an entire region. Countries are political boundaries and are not economically viable. Many projects like the Indus Basin project and plans like the Colombo plan must deal with an entire region to be effective. They can benefit a great area as well.

Through its Foreign Assistance Authorization Act, Congress has played an important role in creating U.S. foreign policy. Congress has provided the broad outlines and necessary flexibility for our foreign aid. The effectiveness of this improved foreign aid bill now depends upon efficient administration and implementation of its provisions.

I support this bill as a good definition of the needs of developing countries and hope that Congress will continue to play a role in this field by examining the implementation of policies throughout the duration of S. 1872.

IS THE SECRETARY OF LABOR ABOVE THE LAW?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, since April of this year, City Utilities, a municipally owned utility in my hometown of Springfield, Mo., has been fruitlessly trying to obtain the approval of a grant under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 for new buses and for air-conditioning units. The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers this act. However, section 13(c) of the act, which relates to labor standards, vests the Secretary of Labor an absolute veto over the awarding of these grants. The Secretary has not hesitated to use his veto in an arbitrary, inequitable, and unlawful manner in relation to this grant. His use of this veto has been exercised through the abdication of his authority to the International Amalgamated Transit Workers Union. In essence, the transit workers union must have a collective bargaining contract with the grant applicant before that grant receives the Secretary's stamp of approval. Therefore, because a publicly owned utility is forbidden by the State of Missouri and others—from entering into a collective bargaining contract with its employees—City Utilities has been denied its application, even though it has met the standards as established by HUD.

I first brought this situation to the attention of the House in a letter to all Members dated October 13, 1967. This letter was a response to the scheduling of House Joint Resolution 859 which was to extend section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 and was to come before the House under suspension of the rules. This letter set forth the dilemma faced by the citizens of Springfield, Mo., and was accompanied by an editorial that appeared in the September 17, 1967, edition of the Springfield Leader Press. Because of this action, House Joint Resolution 859 was deprogramed and hearings for a rule were obtained.

On November 2, 1967, I appeared before the Rules Committee to testify in favor of a special rule that would allow for the amendment of section 13(c) when House Joint Resolution 859 reached the House floor. I was unsuccessful in obtaining this special rule. What a paradox that the opposition in the Committee on Rules came from a colleague of my home State.

Prior to this, however, the representatives of City Utilities and officials of the Labor Department, along with members of my staff met—this meeting took place on September 12, 1967. When asked what specific conditions must be met to obtain Labor Department approval, the only reply was "What will you offer?" In response to this, City Utilities, acting through its general manager, Mr. Marvin Castleberry, restated their position to the Labor Department in a letter of October 19, 1967. This letter was then followed by a reply from Mr. Thomas R. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Labor, asking for a "satisfactory alternative." Mr. Speaker, what kind of "alternative"? The Missouri law is clear: Municipally owned utilities cannot enter into collective bargaining contracts with their employees.

This letter was then followed by a letter dated November 3, 1967, from Mr. J. W. Miller, counsel for City Utilities. Again the position of the publicly owned

utility is clearly and concretely stated; and again this correspondence was followed by a letter from Mr. Donahue, of the Labor Department, to City Utilities asking that City Utilities "consider the resumption of negotiations with the union."

Mr. Speaker, how absurd. What is there to negotiate? The State law precludes the type of negotiation that the transit workers union is demanding. It is indeed a sad state of affairs when one must negotiate and bargain with a nongovernmental group in order to obtain a Federal grant-in-aid. This perverts the entire concept of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier that the Secretary of Labor was acting unlawfully in implementing the provisions of section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act. I so stated in a letter I sent to the Secretary, dated October 17, 1967, at which time I brought to his attention the fact that he was violating 5 U.S.C. 552(1)(D) of the Public Information Act of 1966, which amends the Administrative Procedure Act. Under the provision of this statute—

> Each agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register . . . Substantive rules of general applicability adopted as authorized by law, and statements of general policy or interpretations of general applicability formulated and adopted by the agency.

I submit that the Secretary of Labor has never complied with the provisions of the Public Information Act in regard to section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act. Furthermore, he has chosen to ignore this charge, and in a letter dated October 31, 1967, Mr. Donahue acknowledged my letter containing my charge, but refused to defend the Department's actions. Query, Mr. Speaker: Does this failure to answer this violation of the Public Information Act constitute an admission of guilt?

I submit that no other conclusion can be reached, a conclusion which is supported by the June 1967 Attorney General's memorandum on the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The question then arises, if the Secretary of Labor will not adhere to the law, what actions can be taken by this body to insure that the intent of Congress is obeyed? This is not merely a situation involving the city of Springfield, Mo., although Springfield has most surely served to crystallize the fundamental issue at stake. Many other cities have had a distressing experience with the Secretary of Labor in his administration of section 13(c) of the Urban Transportation Act.

There is an action that can be taken, provided the House will agree to open section 13(c) of the basic act, to amendment, when the House considers House Joint Resolution 859. To demonstrate, beyond any question of doubt, the compelling need for such action, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD:

First. Letter of Representative DURWARD G. HALL, of October 13, 1967, to Members of the House.

Second. Editorial from the Springfield Leader Press of September 17, 1967.

Third. Remarks of Representative DURWARD G. HALL before the Committee on Rules on November 2, 1967.

Fourth. Letter from Marvin E. Castleberry, general manager of the City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Labor, of October 19, 1967.

Fifth. Letter from Thomas R. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Labor, to Marvin E. Castleberry, general manager of the City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., of October 31, 1967.

Sixth. Letter from J. W. Miller, counsel, City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., to Thomas R. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Labor, dated November 3, 1967.

Seventh. Letter of Thomas R. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Labor, to J. W. Miller, counsel for the City Utilities of Springfield, Mo., of November 9, 1967.

Eighth. Letter of Representative DURWARD G. HALL to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz of October 17, 1967.

Ninth. Letter of Thomas R. Donahue, Assistant Secretary of Labor, to Representative DURWARD G. HALL of October 31, 1967.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1967.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday, October 16, 1967, H.J. Res. 859 will come before the House under suspension of the rules. This House Joint Resolution will extend for one year Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

This Act is administered by the House and Urban Development Department. However, under Sec. 13(C) of the Act the approval of labor standards must be made by the Secretary of Labor before a grant can be finalized by HUD to an applying city.

Under the discretionary powers possessed by the Secretary of Labor he has, in effect, established the unreasonable practice of obtaining the concurrence of the International Amalgamated Transit Workers Union before any grant is approved.

The City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri applied to HUD for a grant to purchase new buses. The City Utilities is municipally owned and has been for over twenty years. Under Missouri Statute employees of municipally owned utilities may not enter into collective bargaining contracts. Therefore, since the City is prohibited by law from signing a collective bargaining contract with the Transit Workers Union, the Secretary of Labor refuses to give his ancillary approval for the grant.

This now leaves the City Utilities and the Labor Department at an impasse. It, in turn, places a burden upon the citizens of Springfield who must suffer for lack of adequate public transportation. The people of Springfield, as represented by their publicly-owned utility, have complied with all provisions of the Urban Mass Tranportation Act. To comply with the arbitrary and unreasonable demand of the Secretary of Labor, they must violate the very law that they had enacted by their representatives in the State Legislature.

It is my belief that H.J. Res. 859 should not be approved under suspension of the rules, but that a rule should be obtained which would permit amendments that would clarify the legislative intent of Section 13(C) of the basis Act relating to labor standards. I urge your support of this position when H.J. Res. 859 is considered on the House Floor Monday. Attached is an editorial from the Springfield, Missouri, Leader Press of Sunday, September 17, 1967, which calls attention to this gross injustice.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader Press, Sept. 17, 1967]

U.S. Taxpayers who do not belong to labor unions—and there still are a few of us left—will be unpleasantly surprised to learn that signature of a union contract is well on the way to becoming a prerequisite for the approval of federal grants.

This strange situation has been revealed to Springfieldians through federal nonaction on the request of City Utilities for $294,333 in federal funds to provide air-conditioned bus service on all city routes. Checking on this long-pending application, CU learned it had been referred to the U.S. Department of Labor, under a section of the Federal Aid to Transit Act which specifies that federally aided projects shall have no detrimental effect upon employees.

Since it is hard to see how the air-conditioning of the municipally owned bus fleet could in any way harm or inconvenience city bus drivers, CU officials made inquiry of the Department of Labor—and learned that the application had been referred to international offices of the Amalgamated Transit Union.

And as they mulled over this interesting bit of information, a St. Louis representative of the union arrived in Springfield bearing a "proposed agreement" between the union and City Utilities—pledging not only the preservation of all existing CU union agreements and continued "collective bargaining," but the arbitration of disputes and other procedures long forbidden to municipal government agencies under Missouri law as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

CU Manager Marvin Castleberry and Attorney John F. Carr traveled to Washington last week, spent a morning in the offices of an assistant secretary of labor—and were referred by him, to an all-afternoon conference with the legal counsel for the Amalgamated Transit Union.

Nobody, apparently, had the colossal nerve to tell the CU representative that a city must sign a union agreement to get federal tax money for this or any other project. The Department of Labor said it would continue to review the application. The union counsel said the agreement offered here was "the kind we like to get."

Mr. Castleberry brought home a set of "supplemental instructions to applicants" for transit grants suggesting that, "to assist the secretary" in his determination that projects would not result in detriment to employees, "normal procedure" would be to "negotiate agreements" to that effect with employee-representatives.

We are very thankful that this suggestion is a part of administrative procedure, and not of the Aid to Transit Act. We suggest that the Secretary of Labor in at least nine-tenths of the projects which come before him, needs nothing more than ordinary intelligence and common sense to determine that they will or will not imperil employees. If he needs any further assurance, he or his numerous assistants should secure it first-hand, from the employees and employers involved, rather than from the international offices of a labor union. As for the Springfield project, we would point out that CU does NOT propose to substitute helicopters for buses, thus throwing bus drivers out of work. It does not propose to reduce the number of buses in the fleet or speed them up so that individual drivers will be under any greater strain, or operate them by computer or electronic eye. It simply wants to air-condition them, so that passengers—and

presumably drivers also—can ride in greater comfort. Bus passengers these days include the elderly, working families for whom two automobiles are not economically feasible, students—and others whom the Federal government through a variety of programs claims that it seeks to aid. Bus service in Springfield is better and cheaper than in many other cities today, because the system is municipally owned and therefore subsidized by the more profitable departments of City Utilities. The Springfield bus system would indeed seem an ideal recipient for federal assistance.

It is true that Missouri law forbids the signature of contracts with Union employees, but City Utilities has long negotiated with the unions, for the most part peacefully, to the end that its employees enjoy a pay scale comparable to that of private industry and well above that of general city government. We are pleased that representatives of Sen. Stuart Symington and Congressman Durward Hall attended conferences of Mr. Castleberry and Mr. Carr with the Department of Labor and the Amalgamated Transit Union in Washington last week. It is just possible that these gentlemen—and other members of Congress—were unaware of the preposterous position in which the department has placed itself, and of the suspicion which must surely arise in the taxpayer's mind that the individual, unorganized citizen has hardly any rights and privileges left to him at all.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN DURWARD G. HALL, NOVEMBER 2, 1967, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON THE GRANTING OF A RULE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 859

Mr. Chairman, I come before your distinguished committee to request a special rule be granted concerning H.J. 859 which is to extend sec. 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The special rule that I am requesting would allow amendment of sec. 13(c) of the act. Now you probably ask, why amend sec. 13(c) of this act? My reply to this query can be easily found and understood in a letter of October 13, 1967, that I sent to all Members just prior to the date when the resolution was scheduled to come before the House under suspension of the rules. A copy of this letter is attached to my testimony. This letter sets forth the facts that the municipally owned utility of Springfield, Missouri is prohibited by State law to enter into a collective bargaining contract with its employees and in the absence of this contract the Secretary of Labor will not approve a grant for new buses and for air conditioning units.

Besides the Secretary of Labor making an unreasonable and inequitable interpretation of sec. 13(c), it has come to my attention that he is violating the Public Information Act of 1966, in that he has failed to publish in the Federal Register the standards and conditions of the labor standards of sec. 13(c). The details of this flagrant violation are set forth in my letter of October 17, 1967, to the Secretary of Labor and is also attached. I have received a reply from the Secretary acknowledging this letter, but in no way answering my charges of his patent violation of the Public Information Act. Does this silence constitute an admission of guilt?

Now the city utilities has tried to comply with the letter of the law and in a further effort to so do and to be reasonable, they have restated their position in a letter to the Secretary of Labor dated October 20, 1967. A copy of this letter is attached and I think it again shows the arbitrary attitude of the Department of Labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you and your distinguished committee decide to grant the special rule that I am requesting, I have but then a very simple amendment to offer. At the end of section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, I would add the following new sentence: "no provision in conflict with a State or local law or ordinance shall be included in any such arrangements." This amendment would merely allow those municipally owned utilities which are prohibited by State law from entering into a collective bargaining contract to benefit from a law whose purview they were originally to come within. Surely, it was never the intent of Congress, when this act was initially passed, that people in urban areas whose transit system is publicly owned, would suffer from a lack of cheap public transportation caused by a denial of benefits from this act. The only crime they committed was that they chose, through their constitutionally elected State Representatives, to disallow publicly owned utilities to enter into collective bargaining contracts with their employees.

Mr. Chairman, lest members of the committee think that the experience in Springfield, Missouri is an isolated case of maladministration of section 13(c) of the act, let me hasten to point out that while Springfield is probably the most flagrant example, numerous other areas have also had their encounter with the arbitrary interpretation of section 13(c) including, but not limited to, according to information conveyed to my staff, communities in Texas, Washington, the city of Chicago, and the New York Metropolitan area of New Jersey. I believe in each instance, and most certainly in Springfield, Missouri, the, Department of Labor, acting in close concert with the International Amalgamated Transit Union, is attempting to secure certain rights, privileges and benefits which did not previously exist by using a grant application to force compliance.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the problem can be reduced to the following crystallized form; shall we continue to allow an unreasonable, inequitable and illegal interpretation of sec. 13(c) of the Mass Urban Transportation Act of 1964 to continue at the expense of cheap transportation for thousands of people acting collectively through their municipally owned utility that cannot legally enter into a contract which the secretary of Labor requires? By granting a special rule, Mr. Chairman, this gross injustice, arbitrary intepretation, and unlawful action would at least have a chance to be eliminated.

CITY UTILITIES OF SPRINGFIELD,
Springfield, Mo., October 19, 1967.

Re City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri, application for Federal grant.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Urban Transportation Administration,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Mr. Pete Stowell, Transportation Representative.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Mr. Donahue, Assistant Secretary.

GENTLEMEN: You will no doubt recall that the writer and the legal counsel of City Utilities were in Washington on September 12, 1967, to discuss the above application with members of your respective Departments. The visit was precipitated by reason of our being presented with a proposed form of contract to be executed with the Amalgamated Transit Union as a requisite to our municipally owned transportation system obtaining the federal assistance applied for.

In the course of our conferences we feel that it was made clear that our Board (as is true of many other municipally owned utilities across the nation) cannot enter into any such contract with the union. Missouri law will not permit it. Perhaps not made so clear, was the fact that we do follow a policy of periodically discussing working conditions, rules, wages, hours, etc., with our employees and establishing, in written form, "Working Rules and Regulations" that govern the employer-employee relationship. Such rules, as adopted and as amended from time to time, are reflected in Board resolutions and are available to all employees. This procedure has been followed successfully for many years. There is nothing whatsoever involved in the instant project that would in any way alter our policy in this respect.

Your appreciation and consideration of our operation and limitation is particularly requested because we find it most difficult to visualize how the project here proposed could have any adverse effect upon our employees.

The sole purpose for which the grant is sought is to replace 16 existing buses of our public transportation system with new air-conditioned units and to install air conditioning equipment on six additional units now in service. This involves no reduction in the number of units operated or drivers, no change in routes, employee job classification, benefits or privileges. On the other hand, with the introduction of air conditioning equipment, it seems only reasonable to anticipate some increase in maintenance time and in the comfort of our employee-operators.

With all due respect to your Departments and your familiarity with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, may we suggest that the opening sentence of Section 13(c)—

"It shall be a condition of any assistance under Section 3 of this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, *to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance.*"

is plainly indicative of some adverse effect upon employees being logically anticipated as a precedent to making requirements for their protection.

Your instructional brochure issued October, 1964, and titled "Information for Applicants" under the Act further points up this fact in stating (page 6)—

"In cases where it is determined that employees may be expected to be adversely affected, it will be necessary to include in the loan or grant contract, provisions for fair and equitable arrangements, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the protection of the interests of the affected employees."

The language of the Act and this interpretation of its wording surely cannot be reconciled with the fact of our Board being asked to execute a contract with the Union, even if it could validly do so, under the circumstances.

Our intent to abide by the legal requirements of the Act is set forth in Exhibit I to the application. We feel that the situation of our transportation system is ideally suited to the type of assistance intended by this legislation. We sincerely solicit early action of your respective Departments approving the grant of funds sought.

CITY UTILITIES OF SPRINGFIELD, MO.,
MARVIN E. CASTLEBERRY,
General Manager.

The attached letter, jointly addressed to the Urban Transportation Adminstration and to the Department of Labor, having been reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee of the Board, is, upon Motion made, seconded and duly approved, directed to be forwarded by the General Manager in connection with the pending application of City Utilities for grant of Federal funds in aid of its public transportation system.

CERTIFICATE

H. A. Baker, Secretary of the Board of Public Utilities of the City of Springfield, Missouri, does hereby certify under his hand and the seal of the Board, that the foregoing is a true and correct excerpt from the minutes of said Board of regular meeting held on October 19, 1967, pursuant to notice duly

given and at which a quorum was present and voting throughout.

Done this 19th day of October, 1967.

H. A. BAKER,
Secretary.

OCTOBER 31, 1967.

Mr. MARVIN E. CASTLEBERRY,
General Manager,
City Utilities of Springfield,
Springfield, Mo.

DEAR MR. CASTLEBERRY: Your letter of October 19, 1967, addressed jointly to the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development raised two basic points.

First, you state that the city of Springfield is not able, under State law, to enter into a collective bargaining contract with a labor organization, although the results of discussion and negotiation with your employees, with respect to wages, hours and other conditions of employment, are reflected in resolutions of the Board of Public Utilities and made available to the employees. This matter was explained by Mr. Carr and you at the meetings held on September 12, 1967, to which you refer.

You will recall that I pointed out to you at that time that the Department of Labor recognized that there might be instances where such contracts could not be executed, and that, in such instances, some other approach could be sought which still met the requirements of Section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

Again, during the afternoon meeting, when you and Mr. Carr and Mr. Putnam of the Amalgamated Transit Union went over the union's proposal. Mr. Sacharoff of my staff emphasized this point. You will also remember that in connection with the discussions on the procedures presently followed by the Board in establishing working conditions, i.e., by adoption of a resolution, Mr. Carr was asked whether or not the city could adopt the same procedure, and, thus, provide the employee protective arrangements called for under Section 13(c). The response by Mr. Carr was that he would have to discuss this with the Board, but to date no reply has been forthcoming. Under the circumstances, I am somewhat at a loss to understand why your letter of October 19 mentions only your inability to actually sign a contract with the union, and omits any other possibility.

Should the city finally find that this procedure, or some other satisfactory alternative is possible, it seems to me that resolution of the problem would not be difficult.

Your second point is that this project would not, in your opinion, adversely affect your transit employees. Whether or not a particular project would have such an effect is not always simple to determine at the time a grant is requested. The legislative history on this law demonstrates, without question, that where there is any possibility of adverse effect on employees satisfactory protective arrangements must be made as a condition of the federal assistance. In the instant case, if is very possible that the type and amount of maintenance work will be changed when the new busses are placed into service. On this alone, although there may be additional possible adverse effects of the project which are not apparent now, the Department of Labor would have to hold that Section 13(c) protection is required.

You will recall that Mr. William Hurd of HUD called on October 27 to see if it would be possible to arrange a further meeting in Washington to resolve the current problems. I believe that the city and the union should continue their efforts and for that reason had suggested that Mr. Hurd call you to arrange such a meeting.

In order to enable the Department of Labor to explore this matter and to resolve any problems which may exist, I am arranging a meeting at my office on November 8, at 10:30 a.m. and would ask that representatives of City Utilities and of the Amalgamated Transit Union be present. If this date is inconvenient please let me hear from you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. DONAHUE.

CITY UTILITIES OF SPRINGFIELD,
Springfield, Mo., November 3, 1967.

Mr. THOMAS R. DONAHUE,
Assistant Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Castleberry has consulted with the writer about your letter of October 31, 1967 with regard to having a meeting in Washington at 10:30 A.M., November 8th, to explore and resolve problems which may still exist in connection with City Utilities' Application to HUD. Mr. Castleberry called me because Mr. John Carr of our firm who has handled this whole matter for City Utilities is ill, in the hospital. His condition is such that it would seem to be impossible for him to attend a meeting in Washington next Wednesday the 8th, and I cannot give you anything definite at this time as to when he might be available.

I have been able to discuss the matter briefly with Mr. Carr and he tells me that when he was asked at the meeting on September 12th whether or not the Board of Public Utilities could adopt a resolution to resolve the matter, he in turn asked to be furnished a draft setting forth the nature and contents of such a resolution that would be satisfactory. Mr. Castleberry confirms that Mr. Carr did so request and suggest that we be informed as to just what kind of resolution the Board should adopt that would be satisfactory and the Board have legal power to pass, saying that it would be given consideration by the Board. You were furnished complete rules and regulations governing wages, hours and conditions of the employees affected and full information for procedure for consideration and amendments of same from time to time. Information requested by Mr. Carr was never received, therefore no action was taken other than to pass the resolution requested by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

You must keep in mind, and as I understand was fully covered in a prior meeting, that the Supreme Court of Missouri has held that the acts and actions of the Board of Public Utilities are in the nature of legislative action and therefore, there could be no length of time or terms incorporated in the resolution such as are set out in contracts. Legislative acts are, because of the very nature of same, subject to amendment or repeal. Frankly, City Utilities does not know what additional assurances it can give. It was largely on this account that Mr. Carr requested that you advise as to the contents of such additional resolution as you might desire.

Yours very truly,

CITY UTILITIES OF SPRINGFIELD,
By J. WESTON MILLER,
Attorney.

NOVEMBER 9, 1967.

Mr. J. W. MILLER,
Attorney, City Utilities of Springfield,
Springfield, Mo.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This is in reply to your letter of November 3, 1967, regarding the application from the Springfield Board of Public Utilities for a grant under the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

At the meeting here on September 12, 1967, to which you refer, Mr. Carr did, of course, raise with Mr. Putnam, attorney, Amalgamated Transit Union, and Mr. Sacharoff of my staff, the question of what type of resolution the Board could adopt in order to meet the requirements of Section 13(c) of the act.

It was made clear to him at that time, and I wish to emphasize this point again, that the contents of such a resolution could best be developed through discussions between the Board and the union.

We have consistently taken the position that it is neither proper nor advisable for the Department of Labor to dictate the terms by which the employee protection required under the act is provided. Rather, we feel that the purposes of the law will be best served by encouraging those best informed on the particular circumstances and situations to work out their problems mutually.

Until the parties have attempted to resolve the issues between them or at least refined them to the point where they may be properly presented to the Secretary of Labor for his determination, we feel that it would be contrary to the Congressional intent to inject ourselves in this way.

If the parties cannot finally agree, after a reasonable effort, and an impasse truly arises, the Department will make the determination, as provided by law.

In this instance, I do not believe that purposeful negotiations have yet occurred, and it was for that reason that I suggested the November 8 meeting.

I, therefore, urge that the Board again consider the resumption of negotiations with the union in an effort to resolve this matter. As a starting point, despite the fact that it was proposed in the form of a contract which the Board feels it cannot execute, the substance of the document put forward by Mr. Putnam might be reexamined and considered as the subject for a possible resolution of the Board.

I am making this correspondence available to Congressman Hall, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Mr. Putnam for their information.

I am sorry to hear of Mr. Carr's illness. Please express to him my wishes for a speedy recovery. If you are going to act for him in this matter, I would be happy to set another date for a meeting in my office of all concerned so that we might pursue this matter, since I am aware of the importance of this project to the City of Springfield. Please advise me what dates would be most convenient for you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. DONAHUE,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 17, 1967.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For several months the City of Springfield, Missouri has been engaged in a thus far futile effort to secure a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The impasse has resulted from the refusal of the Department of Labor to certify labor standards as required by Section 13(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act. All the conditions established by HUD have been met.

The intent of Section 13(c) is to insure that no rights, benefits, etc. previously existing are lost to employees as a result of any grant made under the Mass Transit Act. Surely if the Department of Labor were to make its own investigation of the circumstances instead of relying on a representative of the Amalgamated Mass Transit Union to do its work, you could come to no other conclusion but that no *previously* existing right, benefit, etc. is threatened by this project.

Furthermore, every effort by the City to learn specifically what conditions must be complied with, have been met by a counter-offer which in effect says, "Make us an offer."

I submit that this refusal to specify the conditions and terms which the City must meet is in direct violation of 5 U.S.C. 552

(1)(D) with particular reference to the requirement that "Each agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register . . . substantive rules of general applicability adopted as authorized by law, and statements of general policy or interpretations of general applicability formulated and adopted by the agency."

It appears to me that your refusal to publish terms and conditions for grant approval under Section 13(c) is in violation of the law. This opinion is reinforced by a Department of Justice analysis entitled, *Attorney General's Memorandum on the Public Information Section of the Administrative Procedure Act.*

Since this Act further provides that ". . . On complaint, the District Court of the United States . . . has jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from withholding agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant," (5 U.S.C. 552(3)) I am making copies of this letter available to the Legislative Committees and other Executive Departments concerned, and also to the Board of City Utilities, Springfield, Missouri.

I especially call attention to a further provision of the law which says, "Except to the extent that a person has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof, a person may not in any matter be required to resort to, or be adversely affected by, a matter required to be published in the Federal Register, and not so published." (5 U.S.C. 552(1)(E)).

Since this is a matter of vital importance to the City of Springfield, and since a proposed extension of Section 5 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act has been temporarily withdrawn from the House Calendar as a result of my objections, I would appreciate your comments on this matter.

Sincerely,

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., October 31, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has asked me to reply to your letter of October 17, 1967, regarding the application of the Springfield Board of Public Utilities for a grant under the Urban Mass Transportation Act.

As I indicated to you at our meeting on September 12, the Department of Labor is sympathetic to the transit needs of the city and it is my feeling that much of the difficulty is the result of a misunderstanding of our function and responsibilities under the law.

Specifically, the department has never insisted that the city, contrary to state law, sign a collective bargaining agreement with the union. We do not do so now. Quite to the contrary, we attempted to make it clear at the meeting at my office on September 12, 1967, that what we are seeking is for the city to develop a proposal, which would meet the requirement of Section 13(c) of the UMTA and at the same time satisfy State law.

Mr. Sacharoff explored this aspect at great length at the afternoon session attended by the city and union representatives and Mr. Mosher of your staff and was informed of the procedure followed by the board in establishing conditions of employment through adoption of a resolution.

As you may know, Mr. Sacharoff asked that the city consider whether or not a similar procedure could be followed to provide the protection called for under Section 13(c) UMTA, and in the event this was not acceptable, what other proposal could be offered. Regretfully, the city has never notified us of its decision, and, so far as we can determine, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has not been contacted.

From the time of the meeting at my office which I had arranged at your request, to the time of your statement in the House a month later, we had had no communication to indicate whether or not the Springfield Board of Public Utilities had even considered this matter.

The Department of Labor endeavors to fulfill its responsibilities under the Urban Mass Transportation Act by giving the interested parties every opportunity to reach agreement between themselves on the arrangements to be made in accordance with Section 13(c), and attempts to mediate differences and to insure that the parties' agreement is adequate to the situation. Where such an agreement is not reached, the Department will, as provided in the law, make a determination of what protective terms must be met by the applicant as a condition of federal assistance.

I suggest again that it might be useful to have the parties meet again to see if any previously expressed position can be modified sufficiently to permit agreement or resolution. I am enclosing herewith for your information a copy of the letter which we received on October 25, 1967 from Mr. Marvin E. Castleberry of the City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri, along with the copy of my response.

You will note that my letter points out that there has been no refusal or rejection of the project and suggests that Mr. Castleberry or other representatives of the City Utilities of Springfield attend a meeting in my office on November 8 at 10:30 a.m. If you or Mr. Mosher would also like to attend this meeting you would of course be most welcome.

Sincerely,

THOMAS R. DONAHUE,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

DR. DONALD A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, IS 1967 WINNER OF ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues know and respect Dr. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, who is the 1967 winner of the Rockefeller Public Service Award in the field of administration. I want to add my tribute to this extraordinary civil servant. The award is richly deserved.

Don Williams has guided the Soil Conservation Service through a great metamorphosis from an erosion-control agency to a highly effective and broadly responsible agency with concern for total resource conservation, flood prevention and land-use planning. He has molded an organization whose efficiency and expertise are highly respected throughout the Government and which has broad bipartisan support in the Congress. His knowledge of conservation and how to go about it are in demand around the globe, and he has advised governments of 17 countries. He just returned from his third trip to India.

Dr. Williams began service with the SCS in 1935—the year the agency was started—and held various jobs as a conservation engineer before he came to Washington 17 years ago. Over the years he gained a masterful understanding of the technical principles of resource conservation, particularly in the area of water management.

It was good that Dr. Williams was chosen as SCS Administrator in 1953, at a time when the agency had just been named to shoulder the Agriculture Department's flood prevention and river basin activities, and the pilot watershed program authorized by the Congress was just getting underway.

Dr. Williams' leadership in molding the watershed concept into a community-wide approach—wherein the people of town and farm alike work together to solve water and land management problems, with State and Federal help—directly brought about the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. Under that act, Public Law 566, local communities carry out watershed projects to serve many purposes—flood prevention, agricultural water management, municipal and industrial water supply, fish and wildlife development, and recreation.

The program works, as attested by many of my colleagues in this Chamber, and as witnessed by the hundreds of watershed communities across the country—and especially in Oklahoma—who have a brighter outlook because of these projects.

In my State, 44 watershed projects under Public Law 566 and 51 subwatersheds of the Washita River are in operation or have been completed. They represent a total estimated Federal cost of more than $200 million, and many millions in State and local funds. Their results so far have been spectacular, even in projects only partly finished. A network of careful land use holds water where it falls, and the excess is detained by pleasant dams that help protect against flooding and create recreation space and new water supplies for many uses. Twenty-two towns and cities are participating in watershed projects to gain new municipal water supplies and recreation opportunity.

These benefits and the regular soil and water conservation district efforts have already drawn more than 700 new businesses and industries to Oklahoma, and 800 have expanded, bringing more than 5,000 new job opportunities to our citizens.

Don Williams' technical and leadership skills have helped mold the watershed program to make these community gains possible.

It is his conviction, deeply ingrained in the watershed concept, that land treatment and structural measures are inseparable—that, as demonstrated so well in Oklahoma, they must fit hand in hand to meet resource needs. They cannot be separate activities. Without dams to hold back stormflows, conservation measures on the land cannot alone stop flooding or protect the soil. Without conservation land treatment, dams must be made larger to contain larger floodflows and are likely to be short lived because

their capacity is destroyed by erosion silt. And trying to plan both types of measures independently is poor management. Dr. Williams has picked the method that can do the job and has stuck with it.

Since Dr. Williams also has insisted that local organizations take the initiative—and carry the ball—we have in the watershed program an opportunity to see a strengthening of American self-government. In an era of increasing reliance on centralized government, this is a welcome change.

Dr. Williams has been recognized before. His alma mater, South Dakota State University, conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of agriculture in 1956, the first such degree it had awarded.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts gave him its distinguished service award in 1957, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture did likewise the following year.

In spite of these laurels, or rather bolstered by the confidence of his fellow men, Dr. Williams has given another decade of service even more distinguished by excellence and creativity. It is both timely and fitting that he should be granted such a high honor as the Rockefeller Public Service Award.

As a Member of the Congress, as an Oklahoman, and as a taxpayer, I am glad that we have Donald A. Williams administering our most important resource conservation activities. I wish him every success.

SALE AND RENTAL OF EXCESS USDA GRAIN BINS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I invite your attention to an activity which has been going on all summer long on the farm front—a salutary, but largely unheralded activity. I refer to the movement and transfer by the Department of Agriculture of Commodity Credit Corporation grain bins.

CCC-owned bins are being sold and rented to farmers on an unprecedented scale to help assure orderly marketing of grain and soybeans. Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has instructed the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State committees to make full use of Government excess storage bins so that grain and soybean producers will have additional storage space for their 1967 crops. In this way farmers are afforded some measure of protection against the price-depressing effects of temporary excessive market supplies, particularly around harvest time.

Since August 1, more than 6,700 such bins have been dismantled and shipped from the Midwest where they are not needed, and where adequate commercial storage is available, to 15 east coast States where grain storage is short and farmers have no alternative but to sell their grain when it is harvested. Heavy harvest time supplies can seriously depress the local market even though total supplies for the year's crop are not excessive.

Normally, excess bins are sold in late fall and early winter. This year, however, Secretary Freeman instructed ASC State committees to expedite bin sales so farmers would be able to purchase, move, and erect bins in time for the 1967 harvest.

This kind of action should receive more public attention. The Department of Agriculture is criticized frequently in the public press and in some segments of the farm press on the contention that decisions and actions come too late to help the farmer in his immediate situation.

This bin storage program proves the contrary. And this action is not unusual. Rather it is typical of the many day-to-day actions of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on behalf of American farmers in accordance with guidelines established by the Congress.

FORCE POLITICS—U.N. STYLE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the unelected demagogs of the United Nations Organization on October 27 reiterated their hate vendetta against Rhodesia by condemning Great Britain and calling on the United Kingdom to "take all necessary measures, including the use of force" to overthrow poor little Rhodesia.

Can you imagine so-called one-world intellectuals becoming so violent and extreme as to declare Rhodesia "a threat to world peace"?

Either these great world Socialists do not read or are unaware of world affairs, or they seek to use Rhodesia—one of few peaceful and progressive governments in Africa—as a scapegoat for their shortcomings and mistakes.

Wonder why these fly-by-night emerging nations do not see any threat to world peace in Ho Chi Minh and his Communist gang, or in Castro, the Communist dictator of Cuba and a hundred other reactionaries conniving for revolutions, riots, and bloodshed.

Could it not be best summed up—the accusers have become the accused.

I insert, to follow my remarks, item 23 of the Fourth Committee, 22d session, on October 27, 1967, of the U.N. General Assembly, and a statement on the terrorist incursions from Zambia from proceedings of the Rhodesian Parliament, as follows:

[United Nations General Assembly, 22d session, Fourth Committee, agenda item 23]

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES: QUESTION OF SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Joint draft resolution by Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 containing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples,

Recalling further all the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, by the Security Council and by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, concerning the question of Southern Rhodesia,

Recalling further that the situation in Southern Rhodesia has been declared by the Security Council in resolution 232 (1966) of 16 December 1966 as constituting a threat to international peace and security,

Recalling further that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has declared, on several occasions, that the racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia is illegal, that it would not negotiate with that régime on the future of Southern Rhodesia and that it would not grant independence until majority rule is established in the Territory,

Noting that the economic sanctions applied so far have failed to bring down the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia,

Noting with profound regret that the Government of the United Kingdom has not found it possible to take the measures necessary to bring down the minority régime in Southern Rhodesia,

1. *Reaffirms* the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of Zimbabwe for the restoration of their inalienable right to freedom and independence;

2. *Condemns* the policies of oppression, racial discrimination and segregation practised in Southern Rhodesia, which constitute a crime against humanity;

3. *Reaffirms* the obligation of the administering Power to transfer power without further delay to the people of Zimbabwe on the basis of elections conducted according to the principle of "one man, one vote";

4. *Condemns* the failure and the refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in its capacity as the administering Power, to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to transfer power to the people of Zimbabwe;

5. *Affirms its conviction* that the sanctions adopted so far will not put an end to the illegal racist minority régime and that sanctions, in order to achieve their objective, will have to be comprehensive and mandatory and backed by force;

6. *Further reaffirms* that the only effective and speedy way for the administering Power to bring down the rebellion in the Territory is through the use of force;

7. *Calls once again* upon the Government of the United Kingdom to take immediately all the necessary measures, including the use of force, to put an end to the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and to ensure the immediate application of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and other relevant resolutions;

8. *Considers* that any future consultations undertaken by the administering Power to determine the future of Southern Rhodesia

must be with the representatives of all the political parties and not with the illegal régime, and calls upon the administering Power to enter immediately into consultations with the representatives of the political parties favouring majority rule;

9. *Condemns* the activities of all those States which, contrary to the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, are still trading with the illegal racist minority régime in the Territory, and calls upon such States to sever immediately all economic and other relations with that régime, in accordance with these resolutions;

10. *Condemns* the activities of those foreign financial and other interests which, by supporting and assisting the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia and their exploitation of the human and material resources of the Territory, are undermining the effective implementation of the sanctions imposed so far, and are impeding the African people of Zimbabwe from attaining freedom and independence in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and calls upon the Governments of the States concerned to take all the necessary measures to bring to an end such activities;

11. *Condemns* in the strongest terms the policies of the Governments of South Africa and Portugal of continued support for the illegal racist minority régime in blatant defiance of the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions;

12. *Further condemns* the presence of South African armed forces in Southern Rhodesia and the arms aid extended by the authorities of South Africa to the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia for the purpose of suppressing the legitimate struggle of the people of Zimbabwe to achieve their freedom and independence;

13. *Expresses grave concern* at the serious threat constituted by the forces referred to in paragraph 12 above to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of independent African States in the area;

14. *Calls upon* the administering Power to ensure the immediate expulsion of all South African armed forces from the colony of Southern Rhodesia and to prevent all armed assistance to the rebel régime;

15. *Strongly condemns* the detention and imprisonment of African nationalists in Southern Rhodesia and invites the administering Power to secure their immediate and unconditional release;

16. *Urges* all States, as a matter of urgency, to render all moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe either directly or through the Organization of African Unity;

17. *Draws the attention* of the Security Council to the necessity of applying the necessary measures envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, in view of the deterioration of the grave situation in Southern Rhodesia;

18. *Appeals* to the specialized agencies concerned and other international assistance organizations to aid and assist the refugees from Zimbabwe and those who are suffering from oppression by the illegal racist minority régime in Southern Rhodesia in consultation with the Organization of African Unity and, through it, with the national liberation movements in the colonial Territory of Southern Rhodesia;

19. *Requests* the Secretary-General to promote through the various organs and agencies of the United Nations the continuous and large-scale publicizing of the work of the United Nations concerning this question, in order that world public opinion may be sufficiently aware of the grave situation in the colonial Territory of Southern Rhodesia and of the continuing struggle for liberation waged by the people of Zimbabwe;

20. *Requests* the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to continue to keep the situation in the Territory under review and invites the Secretary-General to report to the Special Committee on the extent of the implementation by Member States of the resolutions of the United Nations relevant to the Territory;

21. *Calls upon* the administering Power to report to the Special Committee on its actions in the implementation of the present resolution;

22. *Decides* to keep the question of Southern Rhodesia on its agenda.

[In the Rhodesian Parliament]

TERRORIST INCURSIONS FROM ZAMBIA: SPEECHES BY MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION AND OTHER MEMBERS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEHANE. I wish to comment on certain activities taking place in my part of the country. I am making this comment due to the fact that the Prime Minister made a statement to this House this afternoon concerning the same matters.

I must say that sitting in this House, I represent the people of Matabeleland North, which is the area within which western Matabeleland falls. I cannot but say that I have the interests of those people at heart, and I would be failing in my duty as a member of Parliament representing that area if I did not comment on the matters that are taking place in that part of the country.

It is very well known to this House, and indeed to the country at large, that I have always stood firmly against terrorism and that I always do. I believe that what is being done by our Forces in that part of the country is worth all the praise that this House can give. Apart from the security of the whole country these dedicated men are fighting to preserve peace among the people living in western Matabeleland, people who do not take any interest in what is happening; in fact they do not know what communism is and they do not even know what these infiltrators are trying to bring about. So, for the security of the country and in particular for the security of the people in that part of the country where these minor skirmishes are taking place at this moment, I believe our Forces are worthy of the praise that can emanate from this House. Not only so; reading in the papers we find that several members of our Forces and of the Police Force have lost their lives. They have done that in the belief that Rhodesia is a country whose standards are worthy of being preserved, a country where I still believe there is a chance for all the races to come together and settle their differences.

I will never accept any foreign doctrines as a substitute for our doctrines here. I will never believe that Russian communism or communist Chinese are the people who have the solutions for our problems in this country. If I did believe in that I would just as well believe that there is peace in the Congo today and that these forces have been able to resolve or bring about peace in the countries that have been destroyed to their lowest stage of economy where people have no peace.—[Mr. Majongwe: And thousands of lives lost.]—I have sometimes said that these terrorists outside the country have done nothing to bring about peace, or indeed to improve the lot of the African in this country. All they have done is they have brought despondency. If they were really interested in the welfare of this country I challenge the hon. gentleman who signed this document as attached to come down to Rhodesia themselves and do the fighting themselves. If they do not want to expose their skills to the bullets of our Forces then they at least should come down and solve issues in Rhodesia because our issues, I believe, will have to be solved in Rhodesia or never at all.

I have said the welfare of these people in western Matabeleland is in danger and it is our Forces who are gallantly trying to preserve peace in that part of the country. I may, in short, try and bring before this House the aims of these infiltrators. First of all, I would like to know where they have had the training, where they have had the arms and the ammunition—from people who would like to see this country destroyed. It is from people who would like to impose a worse type of government in this country, a worse type of persecution of the lower races by their members because they have not got enough room in their own countries and they would like to find room in Rhodesia.—[Mr. Chigogo: In Africa as a whole.]—I say again praise to our Forces who are trying to preserve law and order, who are fighting, who are losing their lives and who are facing difficulties to try and maintain law and order in this country . . .

I speak as a family man; I have love for my family; I believe it is the same with every one of us here and apart from anything else I would love to see my children grow up happily and because I am involved in politics is no reason why my family should suffer from injustices. I believe indeed that if it is a sin that I am a politician then those sins must grossly come upon me and never upon my children because I made my choice and I will let my children grow up and make their choices. I believe it is the duty of everyone, every citizen of Rhodesia at this time when we are faced with foreign doctrines, to stand together, to forget politics and to strive never to bring politics into matters of national importance. I believe it is the duty of every citizen in this country to fight to preserve peace. It is the duty of every citizen to take up arms and defend this country from foreign infiltrators, indeed to defend this country from communism. I believe that our Forces at this moment need both moral and physical support, and this is one institution where such feelings should be voiced.

In conclusion, I would like to confirm and redirect the words of the reverend gentleman, the Dean of Bulawayo, who said that terrorism is lawless and must be condemned by all sections of this country, by all spheres, because it knows no law. We know that when these people have had the chance of infiltrating into this country they have killed at random people they had nothing against. They have killed for the sake of killing, for the sake of demonstrating that they can kill, and they have robbed not people like myself who can defend themselves but they have robbed elderly poor people, say, in the Mrewa District, elderly poor people who cannot defend themselves, and they have forced them to give them money. Why should such actions be condoned? Why should that be mistaken for politics? I believe that is not politics, it is only because a few people who are keeping themselves very safe in another country are satisfied to send their own brothers to come and die here in order that they may enjoy the fruits of life wherever they are.—[Mr. Majongwe: They will not enjoy them for long.]

Mr. RUBATIKA. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to comment on this motion on the adjournment. In fact I am bewildered at times when I see men holding responsible positions paying lip service to the principle of the maintenance of law and order in this country. When it is to their convenience they uphold law and order but when it is not to their convenience they do not uphold law and order. I have seen men some time ago who have gone almost weeping to the Minister of Law and Order asking for protection, but to-day those are the people who are giving the Minister of Law and Order a hard time because he has brought tranquillity to this country. They have one foot among the terrorists and another foot

among the decent people for fear that should the terrorists win they will be accepted as having championed their cause.

Today there are some who are being intimidated because of these people. I am surprised that some of these people are still moving around and yet some of them are being paid by Government in certain institutions of Government. Wherever we move we are told that we are the people who support—I am sorry to use unparliamentary language—"I support Smith and Lardner-Burke". We have plainly told them that as far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

I must register my strongest protest to Britain for lack of foresight. Let us say that these terrorists were given the MIGS to land in Zambia and the communists bombed our territory, what does Britain think would happen? The Rhodesian Air Force would start bombing the bases from which those MIGS came. Would this not escalate? We expect Britain, since it says it has responsibility over us up to date, to act as the Prime Minister stated, by exercising his influence on Zambia to stop terrorism and at least to register a protest on behalf of the African people whom it is stating it is championing. We do not want any loss of blood.

As far as my electoral district is concerned and all the electoral districts, all of us hate the chaos and disorder which happened some time ago. We stand in admiration of Government's stand on bringing about law and order. If by any eventuality the white man should fall we must pay the price and I am prepared to tell them to shoot me because I am dedicated to a cause and I shall live and die by it.

Mr. CHIGOGO. I must heartily thank the Hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) whose electoral district adjoins mine and, as he has said, these troubles are really taking place in his electoral district and equally the same in the Gokwe area. All I have to say here is not much, because a multitude of words is not going to help us at all. I will as the Prime Minister to ask the Prime Minister of Great Britain whether this is a trick by which Britain would like to arm itself against Rhodesia to say people are fighting and there is chaos. If not, could the Prime Minister of Great Britain tell us where these people are being trained, whether he has any alliances with those training camps where the Rhodesian people are being trained to come and disturb the lives of the innocent Tribal Trust Land people and the innocent farmers who are feeding the 4,000,000 Africans and the 200,000 Europeans in this country?

These are the only questions I would like the Prime Minister to convey to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Let us know if he is doing any good to those crying for freedom as such, whether the situation that he has been experiencing not only in the Congo, but in Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana. One needs to mention all of these. Is that what Britain would like to see? May I know again through our Prime Minister whether Great Britain is going to honour Ghana and Nigeria to sit on the Prime Minister's Conference? Those people not only took their freedom but killed their own Prime Ministers; for what reason? I would like to know these answers if the Prime Minister would convey them.

Mr. NEWINGTON. As a back-bencher, may I say how grateful we are on this side of the House to see honest courageous and determined men opposite, men who have the same purpose at heart as we do on this side of the House, and that is the safety and security of Rhodesia. I would like to give them my wholehearted congratulations and my appreciation for their courage. I feel though, at the same time, the finger should be placed firmly and fairly on the guilty and evil men.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) on bringing this matter up and the other members who have joined in this small debate on the adjournment. It is indeed very refreshing to find that in times of national emergency when we are challenged as a country, that we can have people on both sides of the House taking the stand that we have, over the last 20 minutes, witnessed.

I believe that this attitude that has been portrayed here this evening is the attitude which goes throughout the length and breadth of this country. This is, in the main, the feeling of the broad mass of Rhodesians. There are exceptions of course, as there are exceptions in this House, Mr. Speaker, and this was quite evident earlier this afternoon but I am pleased to say that this is confined to a few people. I believe the majority concur with the views that have been expressed here.

How right it was to point out, Sir, what good have these people done to anybody in Rhodesia when they have come here killing people indiscriminately, black and white. Who can they claim to be assisting? The hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) put his finger very firmly on the spot when he said these are agents of communism, and I believe particularly the yellow communist, and that they would love to have this country for themselves. If they did ever get to this stage, then, Mr. Speaker, God help all Rhodesians, not one section or another section. I go along all the way with him and the other hon. members who supported him when they said that whatever problems we have in Rhodesia can only be solved by Rhodesians. This should be a golden rule.

I have no idea what Mr. Wilson is after. I am sorry, I cannot make a constructive reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for Gokwe (Mr. Chigogo).

I have tried to get him to face up to his responsibilities on a number of occasions and he has failed to do so. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going on flogging a dead horse. Let us make up our minds that we here have got to produce the right solution for Rhodesia. Let us enjoy the system of democracy whereby we can argue and criticize one another; this is healthy. Opposition is part and parcel of our Government and we must have it. But when it comes to infiltration of people from outside, bringing in outside views and outside doctrines, this will only be to the detriment of everybody in Rhodesia because Rhodesia will be divided and people from outside, Mr. Speaker, I believe will ultimately come in and win the day and reap the benefits. There is room for all of us in Rhodesia, in this wonderful country which is the envy of so many other parts of the world. They are green with envy and this is why I believe so many of them are waging the war against us; they would love to have what we have.

So, as long as we can keep together and as long as we can have the sort of constructive debates which we have seen in this short adjournment, then I believe they will never succeed. I once again would like to compliment the responsible hon. members of the Opposition benches for their contribution.—[Hon. Members: Hear, hear.]

JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS MAKING A GOOD CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the contribution that the 94 Job Corps conservation centers are making to preserve and enhance the forests, parks, and natural resources of this Nation is an achievement that deserves recognition and praise second only to that for the recuperative impact which the Job Corps program is having on the youngsters themselves.

I would like to take this time to insert in the RECORD a sample of the many newspaper reports that have appeared recently in praise of the great work that these youngsters are doing in partial repayment for the chance and experience that the people of this Nation have afforded them.

You will note that these articles which come from six different States, describe some of the activities at eight conservation centers and reflect the positive relationships that have grown between the various centers and the neighboring communities.

I would also like to insert several letters written in thanks to the corpsmen of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps Center in Grants Pass, Oreg., for their assistance in the search for information which would lead to solving the disappearance of one of the citizens of the local community.

This is just one example of the effort—beyond duty—that the Job Corps men are making in times of emergency and disaster.

Under unanimous consent I place these items in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Montana Standard, July 30, 1967]

JOB CORPS PAYS OFF DOUBLE

(By Frank Quinn)

The Anaconda Job Corps Center on Foster Creek, 11 miles west of the Smelter City, is paying dividends. The center is now in its 17th month of operation.

The dividends are accruing not only in the field of human resources but in financial returns to Montanans living within the Deer Lodge National Forest. The bigger return, however, is to the nation in the development of productive citizens.

NEAR CAPACITY

There are now 214 men between 16 and 21 in the center program. That is within four enrollees of capacity. There are only four of the boys who were enrolled when the camp opened in March, 1966.

A good majority of the first enrollees are now in the armed forces. They completed the entire program including basic education and job training. Some who did not go into service are now employed in various parts of the country, many in their hometown districts.

Nationally, according to Mike Papich of Anaconda, program specialist for the Job Corps, the AFL–CIO is cooperating with the Office of Economic Opportunity to acquaint local labor leaders and members and others with the program. Through combined sponsorship of the AFL–CIO, the OEO and others, visits are planned at Job Corps Centers soon. The first Montana visitation will be at the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center Aug. 11. The center is located two miles south of Ronan on U.S. 93.

Steve Sherick of Butte, director for the Anaconda center, and Raymond Karr, Deer Lodge National Forest supervisor, com-

mented on the financial return to the nation in the field of human resources. They put it this way: "A 17-year-old youth who becomes a social and economic failure can cost $140,000 in public funds over his lifetime if he lives to be 57. This would be based on $3,000 a year in welfare costs and $500 a year in income taxes he would have paid if employed. The boys who completed the full course at the center are now productive citizens, either in the armed forces or in some type of industry."

The Anaconda center's work program for this fiscal year, has an approximate appraised valuation to Deer Lodge National Forest of $430,800. Because there is a Job Corps in the forest area the estimated total cost of the planned work will be $237,472.

Karr noted that the work setup includes backlog work never allocated for in forest circles. It is only through the corps that the Forest Service can do the outlined work, Karr explained.

LOW DROPOUT RATE

There are boys from all parts of the nation at the Anaconda Center and they like it. Sherick says the dropout rate at the Foster Creek center is something between 5 and 7 percent—much lower than the national average.

Most dropouts, personnel say, result from homesickness, although the extended winter, with accompanying cold, snow and the long spring rains accounted for many. Some of the southlanders yearned for the odor of magnolia blossoms.

It's a learning and earning process for the corpsmen, and they will be even more productive under the forest program outlined for this year. The most extensive program since the center was opened was prepared by Sherick and Frank Stillwell, work program director.

The projects, some already well under way, include installation of 69 units of camping facilities in the Philipsburg Bay campground area on the north shore of Georgetown Lake. About 10 of the units are completed and the other 59 will be complete before the summer is over.

Each unit includes a table, fire place, tent pad and parking area, all near water and sanitary facilities. The Corpsmen have also cleaned up considerable litter around the lakeshore.

FENCING PROJECTS

Other work includes fencing in the Skalkaho area, parts of Deer Lodge County, and in the Silver Star, Buxton and Brown's areas. This work is not only a productive assets for the Forest Service, but for farmers and ranchers.

Cross fencing and rotation of pasture land are a part of range water developments under way around Dempsey, near Deer Lodge, and in the area west of Silver Star.

Timber thinning is continuing in the Spring Creek area above Foster Creek, in the Storm Lake district and in Peterson Creek area, east of Deer Lodge. This work will make the second-growth lodgepole pine more valuable. Some of the timber cut in the thinning process is sold by the Forest Service for use in fencing, for posts of various types and in some instances for firewood.

There is some prescribed burning under way throughout much of the forest area. The clearance by control burning of slash areas and diseased timberland sections has an appraised valuation of $14,500. The estimated cost is $355.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Under road construction and improvement, the principal projects are on the Pikes Peak forest road in Granite County and the extension of the Foster Creek road west of Anaconda. The Pikes Peak road appraised valuation is $60,000. The estimated cost to the Forest Service with the Job Corps help is $31,751. The Foster Creek roadwork has an appraised valuation of $98,000 and the estimated cost to the service is $65,093. Forest trails are also being improved.

The Philipsburg Bay campground program and one at Delmoe Lake have an estimated appraised value of $72,000 with an estimated cost total under the Job Corps of $29,172.

Center projects at Foster Creek include an addition to the gymnasium and to the maintenance building.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Oct. 8, 1967]

HIKING TRAILS PROVIDE ROOM TO ROAM—WABENO AREA PROJECT HERALDS START OF CONSTRUCTION OF MAJOR SYSTEM OF TRAILS IN NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST

(By Bob Woessner)

WABENO.—The first miles of what eventually will be a major network of hiking trails are being cleared in the Nicolet National Forest.

Badger Trail, a joint venture of the United States Forest Service district at Laona and the government's Job Corps camp at Blackwell, will eventually wander through nearly 40 miles of forest country.

Work should be completed this fall and winter to allow hiking on the trail next year, according to Stanley Novak of the Laona Forest Service district.

Eventually there will be trails from the Lakewood area north to the Michigan state line, Novak explained.

The trail represents something of a departure in outdoor recreation usage. Most users of the woods in the last two decades have been fishermen and hunters.

But the boom in camping, especially family camping, has led to a need for more elaborate facilities.

Trails, hopefully, will provide part of the answer to family fun on northwoods vacations.

Novak blazed the Wabeno trail with an eye to scenery, history and nature study.

Starting at the logging museum on Highway 32 in Wabeno the main trail heads west out of Wabeno and crosses the North Branch of the Oconto River at the site of an old sawmill.

The trail, hilly through much of its length, overlooks several timber plantations, then heads northeast toward Trump Lake.

Novak has routed the hikers through a variety of terrain and across various timber stands. Trails will be marked both to provide directions for hikers and to point out items of interest.

Two campsites will provide spots for hikers who want more than a day's journey. The trail also follows Otter Creek for part of its length and skirts the Johnson spring pond.

Heading back toward Wabeno, the route passes through two Indian burial grounds with their covered graves and the sites of several old mills.

The main trail is nearly 18 miles long. It follows some of the area's old Indian paths for much of its length. Side trails will also provide 18 miles of walking and will visit such spots as the ghost town of Padus, another spring pond and campsites.

Work on the side loops will be started after the main loop is completed. Routes will be mapped out offering the hiker either a short stroll through areas of his choice or a several-day jaunt through the entire area.

Following Novak's directions, the Job Corps crews have laid out the 24-inch-wide trail, cleared brush and will make and install the needed signs.

The trails are ample for hiking, Novak explained, but are narrow enough to discourage cyclists and snowmobile operators from using them.

"Those machines can tear up a trail in pretty short order," he said.

The hiking paths now give the Nicolet visitor three types of nature study trails to follow. There are two major auto tours—the Oconto and Peshtigo River tours, and detailed nature trails at Boulder and Bear Lakes.

The project also provides an outlet for the energies and skills of the Job Corps contingent from Blackwell.

"It gives the boys something tangible to build, something that can be used by the people who visit the area," one work leader explained.

[From the Durango (Colo.) Herald, July 30, 1967]

PAGOSA JOB CORPS CENTER SEEN AS WAY OF AVOIDING CITY RIOTS

(By Martin Sollars)

PAGOSA SPRINGS.—Several Colorado labor union leaders and members of War on Poverty programs visited instructors and trainees at the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Center on Friday.

Purpose of the meeting was "to acquaint the interested group with the Pagosa Job Corps and to view first-hand what the Corps is actually doing," said Herrick S. Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council of the AFL–CIO. Roth and Mark A. Reimers, center director, presided at the programs and tour.

Authorized March 1, 1965, the center provides residential quarters for out-of-work, out-of-school young men, 16 through 21 years of age, who lack the education and skills necessary to obtain jobs. Corpsmen participate in programs of basic education, development of skill training, and constructive work experience for an average of nine months.

After graduation, corpsmen are assisted in finding jobs, returning to school, or entering the armed forces.

Approximately 45,000 young people will be enrolled in Job Corps by the end of 1967. Graduation rate is high and is about 70 percent in the Pagosa Center, according to Reimers.

The Pagosa Springs Job Corps is located seven miles northwest of Pagosa Springs and is administered by the San Juan National Forest of the U.S. Forest Service. Capacity of the center is 112 boys.

Roth said that "There is little doubt that the Pagosa Springs Job Corps Conservation Center is doing the job it was created to do; moreover, I would say that the ten AFL–CIO union leaders from eight different jurisdictions of our labor movement who visited the Center on Friday were in general agreement that the investment is worth every dollar plus some.

"The riots in Newark and Detroit are a renewed warning to all of us in America—three years after Watts—that the nation is sitting on a tinder dry powder keg. Most of the powder and tinder relate to the teenage and early 20-year olds in our rural and urban slums.

"The cost of rebuilding just the properties destroyed by the insurrection in Detroit will be the equivalent of $40,000 per youth who lives in the area; the cost of one year's Job Corps Training at Pagosa nets out to the taxpayer at around $3,000 for an entire year; the young men being trained at Pagosa come from the ghettos like the one that was literally blown up in Detroit."

Roth added, that "there is some contrast in the cost of destruction as compared with the cost of giving hope and pride to young people who can be productive citizens. At the moment, most of the like-situated youth in our nation have little reason to see hope; they are alienated from us. They intend to war upon those of us who seem so undisturbed, albeit fearful, of the who mess.

"But the young men who come to Job Corps in Pagosa cease to be warriors; cease to be antagonists. They see hope instead of despair; it's obvious that Mark Reimers and

his staff are building confidence, literacy and skills into the fabric of each of the individuals who manage to get there.

"We would have to conclude many things from our day at Pagosa, Roth emphasized. Two of the prime ones are: (1) Our Colorado AFL–CIO needs to give more vigorous support than ever before to major funding of the Job Corps program of the Office of Economic Opportunity; in fact, we realize that Colorado could provide the setting for 100 centers like Pagosa; and (2) the U.S. Forest Service, as a contracting agent with Job Corps—OEO, has learned in these past two years not only how to do the job, but it is doing it as probably no other comparable agency, public or private, could do it with dedication and skill.

"Every citizen of any affluence or influence or both in our state ought to be speaking out, for the Pagosas may be the saviors of the great urban centers of our nation—and this could induce our own Colorado urbanites—Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo."

The group toured departments within the Center consisting of basic education skills, basic work vocational skills, and social development. All buildings and facilities at the center were open to the group including dormitories, educational buildings, supply buildings, the office, and the shop.

General areas the corpsmen are trained in include clerical, culinary, conservation, construction, maintenance, medical, and auto mechanics. On the job training is emphasized in the facilities at the center. Learning by doing is the main theme at the center's program, according to the 32-member staff.

[From the Missoulian, Sept. 10, 1967]

TRAPPER CREEK JOB CORPS: MONTANA'S FIRST JOB CORPS CENTER—A PROGRESS REPORT

(By Bob Olson)

DARBY.—The Trapper Creek Job Corps Conservation Center, located South of Darby, in the southern end of the Bitter Root Valley, has been in operation for just over a year and a half.

At the end of that time, Robert Steiner, corps director, said that the program is going well. With a potential capacity of 216, the center now has 200 boys between the ages of 16 and 21, representing about 30 of the states, including Montana and Alaska.

There are 52 staff members including two clerks, two cooks and a nurse. As the first center in Montana, Trapper Creek opened on Jan. 1, 1966, and the first corpsman arrived on Jan. 12.

BIGGEST PROBLEM

Director Steiner said that the biggest single problem at the center is the lack of social life for the corpsmen. However, recently instituted trips to the Moses Lake, Wash., Women's Job Corps Center has improved the attitude of the local corpsmen greatly.

The activities at the Trapper Creek Center take three directions: education, work and vocations.

In the education department basic skills such as reading, math and writing are stressed, as some of the corpsmen arrive at the center unable to read, write or do simple arithmetic. Other areas of instruction are typing, history, arts and crafts and vocations.

VARIETY OF WORK

One instructor was especially enthusiastic about a course called the "world of work." Here, the corpsmen are exposed to a variety of different jobs and are shown what is expected of one who is employed in specific jobs. Reading and math are taught with programmed materials, allowing each student to work at his own level of accomplishment while the instructor works with individuals or small groups.

In the work program, the center is attempting to do the kinds of projects that will both provide basic on-the-job training for the corpsmen and benefit the community as well. When the work program supervisor was asked if corpsmen were doing jobs that would reduce the employment opportunities for local workers, he answered, "Definitely not. The boys are doing projects that would not be done, either for lack of finances or time, if they were not doing them."

NUMEROUS PROJECTS

Some of the projects which corpsmen have done or are now doing include: three miles of reconstruction and cleaning on the White Cap Trail; spring flood control work on the Nez Perce Road, the East Fork Road and the Bitter Root River; improved three miles of road on Bear Creek west of Victor; thinned five acres of pine on Lick Creek; cleared a mile of road right-of-way on Vapor Creek; constructed 1¼ miles of fence and put in four cattle guards on Guide Creek; built 22 fireplace grates for Forest Service campground fireplaces; constructed 18 double-pit prefab toilets for Forest Service campgrounds, as well as a number of small projects including cleanup of Riverview Cemetery in Hamilton. This does not include work done at the center itself.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The corpsmen are currently engaged in constructing a new ranger station at Sula, 16 miles south of the center. About 10 boys are working with staff carpenters and electricians doing the basic construction of the station which will house the ranger's offices, radio room and rest rooms. While at Sula, the boys live in a spike camp, returning to the center on the weekend.

The work program and the education program operate concurrently, with each corpsman alternating one week of work and one week in the classroom.

THIRD PHASE

The third phase of the program, vocational education, or as the director calls it, "residential living," is important because it prepares the boy to return to his own community as a contributing citizen, at least partially equipped to earn his own way.

In this phase, the young men are introduced to a variety of vocations and are given basic instruction in them. The areas of work include carpentry, welding, electrical wiring, building maintenance, service station attendant, cooking, body and fender work, auto mechanics and laundry work.

After satisfactorily completing the Trapper Creek program, a corpsman may attend an urban center and receive specialized training in a selected field.

LONGRUN SAVINGS

A spokesman for the program said that, while per pupil costs are quite high at the center, it should be a saving in the long run because a boy should be able to return to his home area as a wage earner rather than a recipient of welfare.

The corpsmen are housed in dormitories which accommodate 54 boys each. They are fed in a dining room cafeteria. All janitor work in the buildings is done by corpsmen as a part of their training program.

Everything is furnished to corpsman, and he receives $30 per month for spending money. Social security and income taxes are deducted from his allowance. After a month at the center a corpsman is eligible for a $75 clothing allowance. Also, by earning points for working or for progress in education, a corpsman may become eligible for four $5 raises during his stay at the center.

STRICT DISCIPLINE

Trapper Creek operates under strict rules of discipline, with counsellors on duty 24 hours a day. Steiner said that about 25 per cent of the enrollees leave before their program is completed for a variety of reasons including parental requests for their return or homesickness. A few have left and then asked to be allowed to return.

Optimistic about the future of the center, Steiner said, "We just aren't having many problems now."

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
JOSEPHINE COUNTY, OREG.,
Grants Pass, Oreg., August 1, 1967.

Mr. JAMES STOOP,
Director, Fort Vannoy Job Corps Camp,
Grants Pass, Oreg.

DEAR MR. STOOP: The Josephine County Board of Commissioners wish to express our appreciation to your staff and particularly your young men who participated in Lake County in the search for information which would lead to the solving the disappearance of one of our local citizens, Mr. Cy Bernet.

Commissioner Ringuette commented that your men had one of the most difficult portions of the search inasmuch as they covered areas by foot under hot and dry conditions which could not be searched by jeep or on horseback.

This was a public spirited act on the part of the Job Corps over and beyond the regular line of duty. We hope you will inform all those involved in the search how much their efforts are appreciated.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. MCGREGOR,
Chairman.

STATE OF OREGON,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,
Medford, August 3, 1967.

Mr. JAMES STOOP,
Center Director, Fort Vannoy Job Corps Center, Grants Pass, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our appreciation for the assistance rendered by members of the Fort Vannoy Job Corps on July 28, 29 and 30, 1967 in Lake County.

The Job Corps members were not only energetic in the search for missing hunter Cy Bernet, but followed directives promptly and enthusiastically. Their courteous attitude toward supervisors and search directors was favorably noticed and commented upon.

Please convey our thanks to supervisors Leroy Palm, Edgar Hite and Donald Howell as well as participating members of Fort Vannoy.

Very truly yours,

HOLLY V. HOLCOMB,
Superintendent.
By E. W. TICHENOR,
Captain.

[From the Grants Pass Daily Courier, Aug. 8, 1967]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: SEARCHERS THANKED

DEAR SIR: I would like to make known my gratitude to the members of the Josephine County Sheriff's Posse, who traveled at their own expense to partake in the search of July 28–30. They spent the greater part of Saturday under the desert sun and they covered large areas with little personal reward other than their collective blisters and calluses.

In addition, one can but praise the Job Corps for the manner in which they performed the arduous task they were called upon to undertake. Friday afternoon, the entirety of Saturday, and Sunday morning they walked mile after mile about that sun-raked earth. Keeping horseplay at a minimum, they searched acre upon acre and wore out a state policeman or two. Those who came in contact with the Job Corpsmen enjoyed that contact as they proved to be an exceeding amiable group. As one who also trudged the same parcel of inferno, I can appreciate their endeavors.

Once again, I would like to thank every one who participated in the search for Cy Bernet.

TOM C. BERNET.

LAKE COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,
Lakeview, Oreg., August 8, 1967.

GENTLEMEN: It was a pleasure to have your Job Corps assistance in the recent Lake County search for Mr. Cy Burnett of the Grants Pass area.

These Boys, under the supervisors Palm, Hite, and Howell, not only did a thorough job in the area assigned to them, but were extremely easy to work with. They are a credit to the Job Corps movement.

Again thanking you for the participation, I am,

Very sincerely,

E. L. MCKINNEY,
Director.

[Speed message]

GRANTS PASS SPORTING GOODS AND WESTERN WEAR,
Grants Pass, Oreg., August 2, 1967.

JIM STOOP,
Fort Vannoy Job Corps.

DEAR MR. STOOP: Please accept and give my thanks and appreciation to the boys who aided in the search for my husband this past weekend. From all reports they acted and did a magnificent job and felt truly sorry they were unable to find any clues.

Our son, Tom, Sgt. Gardner, and all others have talked with have nothing but praise for these boys.

It was a hard, long and unrewarding job but they did no griping.

If possible I should like to thank, personally, each boy. Again my sincerest thanks to you and your group.

Sincerely,

MRS. CY BERNET.

[From the North Dakota Union Farmer, September 1967]

KIDS ESCAPE GHETTOS OF CITY, GHETTOS OF MIND

The Dickinson Job Corps Center has a mimeographed newspaper called the Hilltop news. It's pretty largely devoted to ballgames, with an occasional reflection on what the Job Corps experience is all about. One of these is "A Poem of Hope" by Franklin Scott:

"He like the bird, who
Halting in his flight
On limb too slight
Feels it give way beneath him.
Yet sings
Knowing he has wings."

Now that is a pretty fair expression for a young man who is just learning to handle the language. Really a lot better tribute to the program than all the reams written by politicians, bureaucrats and sociologists. There are a great many limbs too slight for perching, and a fellow needs the best pair of wings he can get. It's the business of the Job Corps to provide flight training.

The urban and rural slums that Corpsmen come from might—with great determination and expense—be eliminated in 20 or in 30 years. Meanwhile there must be escape routes for those who are young enough and brave enough to take them.

One such route is the Corps, a voluntary residential training program for young men and women 16 through 21. Most of them are out of school, unemployed or underemployed. Many are illiterate and untrained. Some have minor police records. Not all of them make it, but an impressive number do—going on to college or specialized training or good jobs or military service.

North Dakota has two of the 93 Job Corps conservation centers—at Dickinson and Bismarck. There are also 10 urban centers for men, 18 for women, and two special centers. As of August 21, there were 19,196 youths enrolled. The program, including capital outlays and other costs is financed by $303,400,681 in obligated federal funds in fiscal 1966, $205,037,270 in fiscal 1967.

The Corps is an agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity and is a part of its so-called War on Poverty. OEO Director Sargent Shriver recently described his war aims for a House committee in this way:

"I want to say a word about ghettos. Right away we think of a city slum. But there is another kind of ghetto—an interior ghetto of the mind where we seal off parts of democracy that don't suit us, where we box off our obligations to justice and shut out our commitments to fairness. This ghetto of the mind is no less stinking and rotten than the ghetto of the city. Right now, all of us have ghettos to get out of. The sooner we begin, the sooner this country can become what its founders meant it to be. In truth, the War on Poverty is not being fought for the poor. It is for all Americans—because all Americans stand to gain by it. Not just with peace in our cities, but also peace in our hearts."

But of course this war for peace costs money, and OEO's armies are much sniped at by pennywise Congressmen. Job Corps Director William P. Kelly has admitted "our share of failure," but claims that 70 percent of his 75,000 graduates are employed or in school or military service. And he says these grads will save the country a lot of cash.

Mr. Kelly told a Senate committee that a youth of 17 who becomes a social and economic failure can cost $140,000 in public funds over his lifetime if he lives to age 57—based on $3,000 a year in welfare costs and $500 a year in income taxes he would have paid if employed.

If just 2,100 youths were turned into productive citizens, said Mr. Kelly, it could offset the $295 million the Corps wanted for this fiscal year, and he said if the Corps reached its goal of 56,000 successful graduates this year, it would be doing about 25 times better than that.

The dropout rate is admittedly high, but has dropped from 65 percent to 40 percent. The program is after all a voluntary one, and Mr. Kelly points out that enrollees are "the hardest core of the hard-core poor." Four of 10 Corpsmen are from families on relief; 3 of 10 can't read or write; 6 of 10 are from broken homes, and 8 of 10 haven't seen a doctor or a dentist in the past 10 years.

Conservation centers, like the type in North Dakota, are for boys with less than an eighth-grade reading level. They concentrate on basic reading and math, and work skills like carpentry, welding, auto mechanics and cooking. Each Corpsmen proceeds at his own speed, and the basic hitch varies from 90 days to two years. They produce things like fuel and water tanks, cattle guards and small buildings, and work on fences, roads and dams on Forest Service and National Park lands. Directors say the skills themselves are less important than the development of good work habits and attitudes. Basic graduates can get more specialized training at the urban centers.

Corpsmen are paid $30 a month, with merit raises to $50, plus board and room, some clothing, medical and dental care. They get two days of home leave for each month served. Discipline is enforced by fines, extra duty, or restriction of passes. Ted Butler, education director at Dickinson, says "just plain talking to" is usually enough.

Most of Dickinson's 200-odd Corpsmen live in supervised dormitories. For the couple of dozen top students there is an honor dorm where the boys elect their own government and operate their own credit union.

There are intramural sports and matches with town teams and other nearby Corps centers, occasional trips, and work periods in other Forest Service areas.

The Dickinson center recently observed its second anniversary with a well-attended open house. It was activated June 15, 1965, and occupies a former Air Force radar camp on a windy hill north of the city. Relationships with townspeople have been fairly good, barring a few expected minor incidents, and a Community Council meets with the Job Corps staff once a month.

The advanced urban centers are run by corporations under contract with OEO. One of these, International Telephone and Telegraph, is sponsoring an ad in 65 newspapers and magazines. The ad shows a Corpsman reading a Sax Rohmer paperback, "The Insidious Dr. Fu Manchu." The caption says "He's not exactly reading Shakespeare. But at least he's reading. Hamlet just won't turn him on. Dr. Fu Manchu will. And to a guy who never read a book in his life—any book—it's a start.

"He's a Corpsman at the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey and like most other Corpsmen, he's a school dropout. The problem: how to get these boys to start reading and writing so that their mental skills match the job skills they're learning."

Recently, ITT set up an experiment based on the work of Dr. Daniel N. Fader. "Thousands of paperbacks of all kinds were made available, and now boys who have never read a book before are reading two or more a week.

"As a boy's reading improves and he learns sentence structure and punctuation, his sophistication in books grows.

"When many of these boys come to Kilmer, they find it almost impossible to express themselves. Now when they leave, they've found an exciting new way: with words."

And some of them, like the poet of The Hilltop News, have found exciting new ideas to express.

[From the Placerville (Calif.) Mountain Democrat & Times, Sept. 7, 1967]

JOB CORPSMEN AIDING IN CONSTRUCTION OF LAKE TAHOE STREAM PROFILE CHAMBER

(By Laura Sealy)

SLY PARK.—The construction of a unique addition to the Eldorado national forest's Lake Tahoe Visitor center is receiving a significant boost by the participation of corpsmen from the Sly Park job corps center.

DIVERTING CREEK

The corpsmen, under the direction of their instructors, Earl Sealy, work leader, and Marvin Brown, carpenter, are in the process of diverting Taylor creek through the new Stream Profile Chamber and back into its natural channel.

The Profile Chamber, the only of its kind built specifically for public use, is one of three in the world. In Sweden there is a small chamber for beavers and there is also one, the Sage Hen chamber, at Truckee, both of which are designed primarily for research purposes.

The Taylor creek chamber is scheduled for completion Nov. 1, 1968 and is designed to give forest visitors a broad understanding of what goes on in a trout stream.

Exhibits and displays inside the Profile Chamber will be done by Sly Park jobs corps center exhibit specialist John Jenott, who will interpret the graphic story of the Fallen Leaf lake watershed.

The oblique architectural form of the building will afford Jenott many areas for telling the story of the Taylor creek fishery, four seasons of the year and activities in the stream bed.

BELOW GROUND CHAMBER

A path from the Visitor Center leads to the Profile Chamber which is entered by gradually descending ramps to six feet below ground level. Visitors will pass through the building with 33 feet of window showing a view of the pool where fish will seek cover and move out to feed. A typical spawning bed in a stream will be shown, and at certain seasons of the year visitors will actually see fish from Lake Tahoe spawn. A white water riffle area in the stream where

aquatic stream insects live to provide food for the fish will also be in view.

Three types of fish to be seen will be the Kokanee, spawning season, November; Rainbow trout, spawning season, April-May; German Brown, spawning season, October.

According to Robert K. Morris, forest naturalist for the Eldorado national forest, the Visitor Center now contains an amphitheater plus the center building. It serves the interpretive needs of three national forests in the Tahoe Basin Eldorado national forest Stream Profile Chamber. Corpsmen participating in this phase of the construction are Norman Seymore, Dave Courtney, Otis Sanders.

INTEREST INCREASING

Morris states 71,000 people took part in various aspects of the USFS recreation and visitor information program in 1966. The use in 1967 is up approximately 60% over last year. The center is staffed by four seasonal naturalists in the summer and two on a year around basis.

In the fall, college students and schools participate in conducted tours of the spawning streams. Taylor creek is the most important spawning tributary of Lake Tahoe and the fish story here is important to anyone interested in fish and fish research. Winter activities at the Visitor Center include ski tours throughout the area.

With the new Stream Profile Chamber added to the Visitor Center, there will be opportunities for scientific fishery research to aid and improve fishing in mountain streams and lakes and also production in hatcheries.

The California State Fish and Game department is participating in the development and future use of the chamber.

[From the Klamath Falls (Oreg.) paper, July 23, 1967]

CAMP DIRECTOR SPEAKS: TRIALS, TRIBULATIONS AND SUCCESSES OF JOB CORPS OUTLINED FOR ROTARIANS

When the Job Corps was first introduced several years ago people in some communities, including Klamath Falls—pushed the panic-button, cried in anguish and widely announced they deplored the whole, miserable idea.

Grants Pass, where Fort Vannoy Conservation Center is located, was no exception.

This was indicated Friday when the director of that camp, James H. Stoops, addressed the Rotary Club. "Eighty to 90 per cent of the people in the Grants Pass area favor the camp. But one person can make a noise you can hear all the way across the nation.

"I found out they still have a Ku Klux Klan group in Grants Pass—small but active. And we have the John Birchers.

"At the beginning 3,300 people signed a petition opposing the center; 3,300 out of a population of about 11,000. But it's all working out well now," he said. "Economically the program means $650,000 a year to Grants Pass."

Stoops, a forestry graduate of Oregon State University in 1935 and himself a product of the old Civilian Conservation Corps, cited some of the work the young men in the Job Corps have done since the camp was begun two years ago.

"We work basically for the Bureau of Land Management. Some of our work is with the Forest Service. Last summer, for instance, our corpsmen fought 17 fires. They did reforestation work, made stream improvements and built 16 fish screens for the State Game Commission which saved an estimated 800,000 salmon and steelhead.

"These kids have never had a chance to do anything for anyone," he stated. When they know their efforts are appreciated, "they bust their buttons."

He noted that work was done at the Girl Scout camp at Lake of the Woods and that a unit of his group is now working on a project at Lincoln on the Green Springs Highway.

Seven teachers are on the staff at Camp Vannoy. The boys, 16–21, go to school one week and work the next. The two groups alternate, he said. "Sixty-two percent of the young people who have gone through the camp have been rehabilitated successfully," he said.

Unlike the old CCC, he said, the Job Corps goes further than being a poverty program. "These boys have been school dropouts. Some have a prison record. Most of them have never been out of a city. Thirty two of our first 80 corpsmen couldn't read or write."

Stoops praised three VISTA volunteers, average age 70, who have been invaluable in aiding the lads to learn reading and writing. "Their accomplishment has been amazing."

Stoops said that in classes, the boys are taught to read, do math and learn something of the world at work. "We try to teach them to get and hold a job. Many of these kids are exceptionally good with their hands and that through testing they have found that their IQs jump 50 points over a short period of time. "IQ tests don't mean much if you're miserable," he told the Rotarians.

"Some of these kids don't make it. They can't adjust. They get homesick even if they do come from a poor environment. But they're not allowed to resign."

The Job Corps program, Stoops explained, "costs $1,500 before he even arrives in camp." He added that it takes $5,800 a year for each corpsman. "But a welfare recipient gets $4,800, I'm told. If we save 10 per cent of them, the program will have paid for itself."

He said the Job Corps creates some problems in the local community. But, generally, the program has been a success. Many of the youths, when they arrive, are in poor health besides being deficient mentally. Through work, training, school, sports and a feeling of being wanted, great progress is obvious.

In the field of athletics, incidentally, one youth, "who never had on a pair of track shoes," may be competing nationally. He finished six inches behind another youngster in a recent state AAU meet in the 100-yard dash. The winner ran it in .09.9.

JOB CORPS IN BISMARCK: A YEAR'S EVALUATION

(By James Conmy)

On August 19 it will be Job Corps plus one—one year since Job Corps trainees have been in Bismarck.

So how do Bismarck and the Job Corps Center stand now, after almost a year of operation by the center?

"Great!" said Bismarck Mayor E. V. Lahr. "The center is a part of our community. If it weren't, it would cause a lot of problems."

What problems do exist, Lahr said, are mainly operational and administrative, like negotiating a Bismarck city fire protection contract for the Job Corps center, which is a federal reservation.

"The fact of the matter is there've been so few problems we wouldn't even know the boys were there," Lahr said.

Bismarck police commissioner Ernest Fleck agreed.

"From a police angle, we've had neither a large number of incidents nor any serious ones," Fleck said. "There's been some fighting—usually among Job Corps trainees themselves—a little vandalism and a few drinking incidents, but nothing we haven't ever experienced from local boys."

Fleck also wished to make clear that Job Corps trainees don't receive any special handling.

"We treat them like anyone else—no favoritism and no harassment."

Bismarck police handle all incidents within the city limits, but if no complaints are filed against offenders the police do little but report the incident.

One incident came to public attention last week when two Job Corps enrollees complained that they had been abused verbally and shoved around physically by a couple of Bismarck youths. The latter were charged with assault and battery and will appear in Police Magistrate David Milhollan's court for trial next Tuesday.

Police inspector Mel Felch's noted that incidents, among the trainees themselves, are normally handled by authorities at the center.

"They keep everything pretty much in the family," Felchle said.

Of the two earlier incidents involving juvenile Job Corps trainees that had come to her attention, said Mrs. Nora Meland, police juvenile officer, both had been referred back to the center.

So Bismarck police say that because of generally good behavior on the part of trainees, police contact with the center is minimal. As a matter of fact, all of Bismarck's contact seems to be limited to several basic channels.

One is the regular passes issued to the boys for trips to town.

"We give out passes Friday nights, Saturday afternoons and Saturday nights," said James Fine, Center director, "but each boy is limited to two passes a weekend."

According to some trainees, there isn't much to do once they get to town, though.

"We walk around," one trainee said. "Sometimes we take in a movie. Sometimes we do some serious drinking. But mostly we just walk around."

Another said that he and his buddies usually check out the Teen Club in Bismarck and often walk out to a local drive-in for hamburgers.

"There isn't that much to do in Bismarck," one other remarked. "But I didn't expect there would be."

Morris Thiele, manager of the Teen Club, reported that the number of Job Corpsmen in the club varies from week to week, but that the boys are always well behaved and had never caused trouble.

"They come in, look around, and if we're having a dance they usually stay awhile. Sometimes they play pool or pinball machines," Thiele continued, "but they stay pretty much to themselves, not even associating with the girls very often."

A second way Bismarckers come in contact with Corpsmen is through the trips the boys make to purchase clothing and for medical attention.

"Lewis and Clark Job Corps Conservation Center has contracts with both St. Alexius and Bismarck Hospital," said Fine. "We also have doctors on call from Capital City Clinic, and Dr. Charles Arneson makes a weekly visit to the center."

Fine said that for dental care the boys go to whichever dentist they choose and can make an appointment with, noting that for many of the youths it is their first time in a dentist's office.

After they have been here for 60 days, corpsmen receive a clothing allowance of $40, part of a total $75 allotment. If they drop out of the program before completing at least three months, this money and whatever clothing they have purchased revert back to the center.

Bismarck merchant Evan Shark said he did a fairly large volume of clothing business with Job Corps trainees.

A third channel of contact between Bismarckers and corpsmen is Sunday church services and the "family welcome plan," sponsored through the Bismarck Ministerial Association.

The Rev. Arnold Spain, pastor of St. Anne's Parish, who was on the original committee to set up a family welcome plan said the visits had "sort of died." He said that when the Ministerial Association meets again this

fall, the program is supposed to be "resurrected."

One problem the priest mentioned was that there wasn't always cooperation from the Job Corps end of the plan last year, which situation he felt wouldn't exist this fall. Some families have continued to receive the boys as guests throughout the summer, according to Fr. Spain.

"With all the recreational facilities and organized athletics for the boys in the summer, some of these projects don't get too much stress until winter when the boys are more cooped up," Fine said.

The dozens of projects the Job Corps had completed in the Bismarck area have made Bismarck but not Bismarckers familiar to trainees.

A Job Corps baseball team competes with local amateur teams, and the center has a softball team in the Bismarck church league. Occasionally corpsmen aid in local social events as they did when they worked as drivers for the old timers picnic July 26.

A Job Corps chorus sang at a recent Lions Club meeting and the center's drum and bugle corps has played for festivities in area towns.

But that's it. Not too much more personal contact with Bismarck.

At present the center has just under 200 enrollees with approximately 60 from the North Dakota area. Non-local youths come from the southeast region of the U.S. or from New York and Washington, D.C.

"How long the trainees remain in Bismarck depends upon the vocational training they receive. Usually they're at the center here for about six months," Fine said.

Milan Christianson, public relations director for the center, said boys have been taken on bus trips to Minot and one was planned to Minneapolis until the rioting broke out there. The boys must use their own money for the trips, Christianson added.

When plans for the Job Corps here were first announced, lack of opportunity in Bismarck for Negro corpsmen to associate socially with members of their own race was cited as an objection to a Bismarck location. There was a heated but short-lived controversy which brought national—and unpleasant—publicity to Bismarck.

Center officials said then that corpsmen would be bussed to other cities, such as Minot and the Twin Cities, in order to enjoy social contacts with people of the same race.

But the Center was established and controversy quickly died down.

Christianson also said almost every night he and several trainee volunteers spend a couple hours fixing and cleaning up the Custer amphitheater south of Mandan where he hopes the corpsmen, in cooperation with local people, can present several dramatic productions sometime in August.

Authorities at both Bismarck and St. Alexius Hospital have scotched rumors about Negro babies being born to local girls in local hospitals. According to hospital authorities, the rumors just aren't true.

Impersonal contact with the Job Corps, especially that which can be counted in dollars and cents, is more clearly defined. The corps uses local facilities, buys many of its supplies in Bismarck, including the lumber and fixtures used in conservation projects, and its staff members add to Bismarck's economy.

Before next spring, 100 Job Corps-built picnic tables will be distributed in Bismarck parks. Trainees have planted trees in Riverside Park and pruned trees, pulled stumps and cleaned up every local park. They've salvaged lumber for the Boy Scouts, rebuilt the historical marker by the water plant and done extensive work in Ft. Lincoln State Park and Museum.

But there's not much personal contact.

And perhaps that's why Job Corps center director James Fine can say, "This is the best facility with the best cooperation from local people of any facility in the nation."

[From the Lebanon (Oreg.) Express, Oct. 20, 1967]

JOB CORPS CREW BEGINS TRAIL, PARKS PROJECTS

(By Josephine Sommer)

"There's a long, long trail a winding"—or at least there will be when a Job Corps task force working under Bureau of Land Management guidance completes a job started last week.

In fact, there are two recreation projects in progress in the Green Peter Reservoir area presently under the alternate supervision of Bill Eastham, LeRoy MacDonald and John Friede of the Tillamook Job Corps Center. They have 19 youths working on an expansion project at the Yellowbottom park and on a foot trail which will eventually open up the peninsula area around the lake for recreation purposes.

The Job Corps task force moved into the forest service camp at the Quartzville Guard Station about three weeks ago according to Bill Eastham, a supervisor from the Tillamook Job Corps Center. The Eastham family moved to Lebanon about the same time and their sons, Terry and Michael, are already deeply engrossed in studies and sports at Lebanon Union High School. Terry is fast becoming the school's top track star and Mike, a senior, is a member of the football squad.

His awareness of the recreational projects they will be constructing under BLM and Fish and Game Commission assignments in the next few years, caused Eastham to make inquiries and personal observation to determine where the family would settle at least until the boys complete high school. He had high praise for Lebanon area schools and the friendly atmosphere in both school and community.

The Job Corps supervisor also praised BLM supervisors, the forest service and local people who have made their work easier.

CAMPED AT QUARTZVILLE

"Among other things, the forest service has provided their camp at Quartzville for our use while we are working in this area," Eastham added. "One service station owner at Sweet Home volunteered to take telephone messages—since we don't have an on the job communication. This is the kind of help we find everywhere we turn."

Before climbing the trail to interview Eastham, we talked with BLM's supervisor, "Hank" Blessing, his assistant, John Gundren, and MacDonald, the Job Corps supervisor on the Yellowbottom Park job.

"These men and their Job Corps task force cleaned up Fisherman's Bend Park (after the wind storm) prior to moving onto these jobs," Blessing said. "MacDonald and his crew will build trails to new picnic areas here on the south side of the (Quartzville) highway—across from the main section of Yellowbottom Park. They will also dig pits for pit toilets and make picnic table pads."

MacDonald explained that a Tillamook Job Corps Center masonry class will do some of the construction work at the park. Thus the job assignments provided by BLM gives the youth a chance for on the job application of vocational training being given at the center.

The work supervisors explained that the center schedules alternate weeks of classroom studies (at the center) and on the job experience such as the boys are receiving in the Green Peter area currently.

MacDonald—who started this type of work in the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)—said they are preparing locations for 11 new picnic tables on the south section of the park. Two units were in use last summer. Blessing explained that the parking area is planned for 22 cars and the roads throughout the main park will be oiled this season. The latter job will be done either by Bureau of Public Roads crews or on contract.

TRAIL OUTLINED

By outlining on a map BLM's trail plans, Blessing showed how the peninsula area between the Middle Santiam and the Quartzville area would open up the Green Peter Reservoir area. Seven miles of trail will probably be completed this season. The task force began its trail work at the end of the access road which heads east then south from Rocky Top bridge (ten miles east of Green Peter Dam).

"The trail will swing back to the lake's edge just beyond Fool's canyon," Blessing said, "then will follow the water line around the edge of the peninsula on the north shore. A foot bridge will span Quartzville Creek in this section. A five year agreement with the U.S. Corps of Engineers facilitates this work and will probably be extended as needed."

Enlarging on the kinds of opportunities given "our Job Corps boys" by the various agencies, Eastham said they have supplied crews for fishways, timber stand improvement jobs, parks and campground cleanup and expansion projects, access trails, road improvement, tree planting and fire fighting.

"With the completion of the dams here in this area, crews such as we train at the Tillamook Center will be in demand," Eastham added. "I understand around ten miles of horse trails are to be built along the lake area and inland from Quartzville Creek."

Blessing had said earlier that the BLM staff receives many letters from saddle clubs asking for such trails through BLM wilderness areas.

Included in the instruction being given by the Job Corps supervisors, was the care and use of such equipment as axes and chain saws. The trail work combines training and application. Some of the boys on the job were previously on fire fighting crews in Idaho, Montana and here in Oregon during the summer.

"You hear considerable criticism of the Job Corps," Eastham concluded, "but the centers of my experience are doing a terrific training job. If these boys are kept occupied, they not only like the corps but also appreciate what it is contributing toward their future independence. I'll welcome a chance to sell anyone on the corps contributions to society. Your state agencies deserve a great deal of credit for their contributions to our success."

IN SUPPORT OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a year long, in-depth analysis of the Baltimore Community Action Agency by the Strategic Planning Corp. of Baltimore disclosed that the poverty program has been very effective. According to Blair Simon, president of the Strategic Planning Corp., more than 60 percent of the residents of the target area, or about 120,000 people, have been reached with services and assistance.

To quote Mr. Simon:

The poverty program has done an amazing job in many areas.

When asked about the reaction of the people to the community action agency, Mr. Simon declared that it was very favorable. He added:

We were somewhat surprised by the lack of negative comment. Almost everyone interviewed (approximately 600 families), had a favorable response to the program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit, particularly, of those who believe that poverty funds are wasted on the "undeserving" poor, I would like to quote one more statement of Mr. Simon:

Our findings indicate that the *entire* Baltimore community—*rich and poor*—have benefited at least indirectly from this effort. We have *more* than gotten our money's worth.

Under unanimous consent at this point I insert in the RECORD a "Question and Answer Spotlight" which recently appeared in the Baltimore News American:

QUESTION AND ANSWER SPOTLIGHT: REORGANIZATION NEEDED IN CITY'S POVERTY WAR

Millions of federal, state and city tax dollars are spent each year in the War on Poverty. Just how effective this fight has been has never adequately been determined.

Last year, the Baltimore Community Action Agency ordered an indepth analysis of 10 parts of its anti-poverty program.

The study, undertaken by Strategic Planning Corporation of Baltimore has recently been completed and submitted to the agency. Its contents have not yet been released to the public.

This week for Spotlight Q and A. The News American interviewed Blair Simon, president of the Strategic Planning and staff consultant Roger M. Windsor on their findings. The study took one year and was performed at a cost of $60,000.

NEWS AMERICAN. You have recently completed an in-depth analysis of the Poverty Program in Baltimore. Is this just going to be another one of the many, many studies that are simply filed on the shelf and nothing is ever done about it?

SIMON. I hope not. Certainly there is every indication that the findings are going to be used. The commission has actually directed the study and we have had several seminar meetings with them and they have already taken action on several of our recommendations. In addition, the Community Action Agency's full-time staff is developing plans to take full advantage of the recommendations made.

Also, many of the Third Party Contractors evaluated have asked their boards or advisory council members to study and come up with revisions and changes to take advantage of these recommendations.

NEWS AMERICAN. How effective has the Poverty Program in Baltimore been? Is it successfully solving the problems of the poor?

SIMON. There is very good evidence that it is effective. Interviews with the residents indicate that slightly more than 60 percent of the people have been reached either by receiving services of a component of the Poverty Program or having been contacted at home.

If we assume that there are approximately 200,000 residents of the Action Area, this would mean that 120,000 people have been served and reached by the Poverty Program in Baltimore.

Our findings also show that the Poverty Program has done an amazing job in many areas starting from almost ground zero two years ago and today they have a whole family of operating programs, numerous Neighborhood Centers throughout the Action Area, and indeed appear to be providing a great deal of meaningful services. At the same time, we found that there are many possibilities for improvement.

NEWS AMERICAN. What specific aspects of the Poverty Program did your study go into?

WINDSOR. We evaluated ten Third Party Contractors. These are organizations outside of the Community Action Agency who have a contract to provide services for a given program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Were you satisfied with the degree of cooperation you received from the Third Party Contractors during your evaluation?

SIMON. Yes, the cooperation we received from each of the contractors was outstanding almost without exception. Our concern here has been that there is a weakness in the amount of cooperation and coordination between contractors and the cooperation between the contractors and the parent organization, the Community Action Agency.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you mean that there is a lack of referral between the various Third Party Contractors?

WINDSOR. Yes there is, and there are opportunities for a great deal more referrals. It is not an easy problem and there are reasons for this, but we feel the point has been reached where this must be improved.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found any antipathy between the various Third Party Contractors and the CAA and the other city or state agencies?

SIMON. I think there is always some rivalry amongst the city agencies and this has been a problem that plagues the city—we can't get concerted action on behalf of the city government. Many of our departments act independently.

The result was some apprehension or antipathy when the CAA got into the picture.

Many agencies were wondering to what extent the CAA would intrude on their ground. It has been demonstrated, I think, that there is an opportunity for all to cooperate more effectively and, therefore, provide better service for the citizens.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you feel there is need for a consolidation of all the different agencies involved in the fight of poverty?

SIMON. That is a difficult question. On the one hand we find the poverty program moving toward a de-centralization that allows for a greater citizen involvement. By centralizing, we have a benefit maybe of better cooperation, but it may become bureaucratic, more arbitrary, and further removed from the people and their wants. How we can get the benefits of both is probably the greatest challenge the Poverty Program faces.

NEWS AMERICAN. What has the reaction been of the people in the Action Area to the Poverty Program?

SIMON. Very favorable. We were somewhat surprised by the lack of negative comment. Almost everyone interviewed (we interviewed approximately 600 families in the Action Area) had a favorable response to the program.

NEWS AMERICAN. What are the people in the Action Area most concerned with? What do they want to see done?

WINDSOR. We asked this question of the residents that were interviewed and among their greatest concerns were poor housing conditions and their expression of need for the landlords to correct these conditions. Also, they were very much concerned with what they felt was inadequate law enforcement in their neighborhood areas. Also, they were very concerned about the conditions related to sanitation, garbage collection, street cleaning, and a lack of adequate numbers of play areas for their children.

NEWS AMERICAN. Were you able to determine if the people in the Action Area are receiving adequate law protection?

SIMON. We can't really give you an answer on that. It is important to recognize that the local anti-poverty program does not have the resources to eliminate poverty.

Their resources amount to approximately $35 per year for each resident of the Action Area. University of Pennsylvania economists have estimated that the CAA controls only 4 percent of Baltimore anti-poverty industry. This study was concerned with that segment only.

The really interesting thing would be to look at the other 96 percent and find out how effective that is in serving the poor citizens of Baltimore City.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do you feel that the Community Action Agency has done enough as far as publicity goes for the various Poverty Programs that are available?

SIMON. There is never enough information. We pointed out earlier the amount of referrals and cooperation between the programs depends on the knowledge of other programs.

There is a lack of knowledge about many of the programs. Some people that have been served by one know about no other programs also available to them.

I suspect that a very effective public relations program and information program would be most helpful. But the residents of the poverty area have been reached best so far by personal contact.

NEWS AMERICAN. Do the people in the Action Area know where to go when they have problems such as sanitation, law enforcement, etc.?

WINDSOR. Interestingly our survey shows that more and more people are pointing to their Neighborhood CAA Centers as the place to go for all problems and there they find that someone will be interested in them and direct them to the proper source.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found race to be a problem with the Poverty Program in the Neighborhood Centers? Are the races mixing well or are they separated? Do you find the poor whites are in one area and the poor Negroes in another area? And where they live together, do they work together to make better communities?

SIMON. Perhaps we should go back to understanding the setup here in Baltimore. The Poverty Program had decided in the beginning to concentrate its resources on a certain geographical area called the Action Area. This area includes approximately one half of the so-called impoverished people in the city.

They have selected those areas with the poorest income criteria and the greatest degree of incidence of other indications of poverty. It happens that most of these areas are Negro dominated.

There are some white people that live in the Action Area and the Target Area and this might amount to 10 percent. Actually the whites and Negroes are separated usually in neighborhood groups.

There is an integration of whites and Negroes in the program and in the staffing of the Neighborhood Centers. Race doesn't appear to be a problem.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found the staff to be a major problem of the Poverty Program? Are they getting highly qualified, competent people and is there a high terminal rate?

SIMON. Staffing is a problem. Today it is very hard to find trained social workers. There has been an emergence of many social programs and there are inadequate numbers of people formally trained for social action programs.

The Poverty Program is trying something interesting. They are deliberately trying to use indigenous people to provide professional type services. This means that there may be some sacrifice in the backgrounds and immediate capabilities of the people, especially at the beginning.

What they hope to get in turn is a sensitivity, a warmth, a responsiveness that has been missing in some of the bureaucratic

problems and services that have not served the need of the poor people. In addition, there is the constant problem in Baltimore City of Civil Service classification and recruitment. The Poverty Program has claimed that inadequate Civil Service criteria, testing, and promptness of response has greatly inhibited their staffing.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that by concentrating on indigenous personnel that this works to the detriment of the Poverty Program?

WINDSOR. There is a tradeoff here. We get something if we give something. In most cases the indigenous people have been outstanding for their ability to relate to other poor people.

NEWS AMERICAN. Is there a need for a large step-up in salaries of the poverty workers? Would this attract the kind of people really needed?

SIMON. There is a need for some re-evaluation of this and there is a comprehensive study now underway in the city.

NEWS AMERICAN. In your survey, have you found that these programs which are allegedly self-help programs, have begun to drift into subsidies rather than self-help?

SIMON. There is a very difficult problem because the Poverty Program is by its very nature multiple-goal oriented. It must satisfy a number of things. Income is one form of deprivation. Most of the poor people have been judged to be deprived primarily of adequate income, but in addition to this there is the deprivation through the lack of services and amenities—housing, poor sanitation services, etc.

Generally it is felt that the poor people get less than their share of the city services due them. In addition there is the deprivation of organization or power. In order to have self help, we must have some form of organization.

We recognize that there must be a combination of all these things. We are urging, however, that CAA move more towards self-help and away from the caretaking.

NEWS AMERICAN. What sort of problems did you find in the operation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

WINDSOR. I am not quite sure that we ought to concentrate and focus on problems because there is a definite benefit gained through enrollment in the program.

As far as operation of the program itself, we feel that one of the major limitations or drawbacks in the program is the lack of an adequate followup system that determines what happens to the youth once he leaves the program. I might add that this is not just limited to our own local situation but nationally this inadequacy exists as well.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that the inner-city schools contribute in any way to the lack of education of these people so that they would drop out?

SIMON. Schooling is a problem but our evaluation really does not define the problems of the school system. The parents indicate a great interest and concern about their children's education. The fact that the dropout rates are high is a reflection of the problem.

Among the suggestions we have made to the Community Action Commission is that they take advantage of their experience with the needs of the poor people and articulate suggestions for improvement of the inner-city schools particularly. This is appropriate because the Community Action Commission should be an advocate for the poor citizens in all facets of city decision making.

NEWS AMERICAN: Have the people who have participated in the Neighborhood Youth Corps gone back to school?

SIMON: No, generally they have not. This was one of the original thrusts of the NYC—to encourage the dropouts to go back to school.

On the average, those dropouts are below a ninth grade education. That means that he has approximately four more years to go. This is not a very attractive alternative.

Actually, our findings show that most of the youths in the NYC are going to full-time work and we have every reason to believe that they are better prepared. They have established work habits, they have references, they have worked at jobs, they have demonstrated a capability to perform.

This theory has not, however, been proven yet, for as Mr. Windsor pointed out, NYC simply doesn't have adequate follow-up on what happens afterwards. If we don't have follow-up and find out what happens over the longer term, we won't know how to revise and correct our program inadequacies.

NEWS AMERICAN: Are these jobs that are being given now merely menial type jobs?

WINDSOR: For the most part we find that they are. This is, in part, due to the fact that there are not enough adequate jobs above that task level with which to provide these youths.

We have recommended that improvement in the quality and assortment of jobs would have great benefit in making the NYC even more effective than it is today.

NEWS AMERICAN. Is there a possibility of some cooperative effort between the NYC and various segments of the business community to train these people for better jobs and get them out of the ghetto?

SIMON. Yes, but NYC may be the wrong program. One of the potential weaknesses of the NYC program is that it is limited to work habits orientation—not job training. They are not trained for any particular job.

NEWS AMERICAN. Could you tell as a little about the Small Business Development Center? What are its main aims? Is this one of the programs you studied?

SIMON. Yes, the SBDC has as its task the providing of services to residents of the Action Area in acquiring loans through the Small Business Administration. These loans are directed at establishing new businesses or allowing existing businesses to expand or continue in operation.

NEWS AMERICAN. Why is there a need for an organization such as the SBDC when this function is already performed by the Small Business Administration itself?

WINDSOR. The SBA is not equipped to relate and provide special detailed services to the poor resident. In this city the Director of the SBA has worked very effectively with those in the SBDC and together have done an excellent job in getting something like 44 firms with a loan in the first year of operation.

The real reason for why it is needed is that the banking institutions and other conventional sources are not providing capital to the poor people and especially the Negro community. Nobody can get one of these Equal Opportunity Loans unless they have been formally rejected by the conventional financial sources.

SIMON. Our findings on this program indicate that it is one of the most successful of the anti-poverty programs in the city and the reasons are that it has taken people off welfare, it has taken people off unemployment, and has put them to work in the private enterprise sector.

It is truly a self-help program and it is interesting that it is one of three programs in which we went further than the basic evaluation requirements and performed a cost-benefit analysis.

This program stands out as an effective poverty eliminating program in that it returns a great deal more in benefits to both the poor community and to the entire state than it costs.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found that these people are good risks for these loans?

WINDSOR. Yes, interestingly enough, our study shows that in the first year of operation, not one of the firms failed. This is an amazing standard in that even the best risk type business firms have a high failure rate.

NEWS AMERICAN. What are the problems with the present Day Care Program?

SIMON. The Day Care Center Program is another one that we submitted to this vigorous cost-benefit analysis and our findings are somewhat controversial. An attempt was made to probe the strategy and purpose of an anti-poverty service program. There is an unquestioned need for better child Day Care in Baltimore.

The problem that they have is one of ill-defined goals and objectives and policies and sometimes individual decisions tend to work against each other and reduce program effectiveness.

The national guidelines are sometimes fuzzy and sometimes they don't exactly fit the local need. It is up to the local agency however, to make it as effective as possible within the limits of their choice.

The question can be asked if Day Care is an effective poverty eliminating program. It does not appear to be as effective as others and theoretically it is appropriate to consider shifting the very scarce anti-poverty funds to other uses. However, under the present law, you either use these funds for the designated program or get nothing.

NEWS AMERICAN. I understand that the Street Club Worker Program of the Poverty Program works closely with the Department of Recreation. Do you feel that they work closely enough or is there some antipathy between them?

SIMON. No, we don't feel they work closely enough. Actually the Street Club Worker Program started long before Baltimore had a Community Action Agency or an anti-poverty program.

This is an example of where there are opportunities but currently failings in the Community Action Program. We mentioned earlier that the CAA has only a small portion of the total resources to provide services to the poor.

What they must do is to mobilize all the agencies in the city to do a more effective job in preventing and eliminating poverty. That is an important section in the local ordinance and in the federal law—that is to mobilize all city agencies.

NEWS AMERICAN. You haven't found then that the Department of Recreation has taken to heart what it has learned from the Street Club Worker Program?

SIMON. The lessons are not total and we must be careful about sweeping criticism of the Recreation Department.

We do find that this program is operated as a separate independent section of the Department of Recreation—they do not appear to be looking for lessons and they do not appear to be utilizing the lessons learned here in their other recreational efforts.

NEWS AMERICAN. It has been charged that the Board of Directors of the Legal Services program is composed of people who are opponents of the Legal Aid system itself. Have you found that to be a problem and have you found that it hampers Legal Services?

WINDSOR. The Board of Directors of the Legal Services Program is not packed with opponents of the program. There are people on the Board who did oppose the program at its inception.

As far as it hampering the operation of the program, I would say no, it is not generally hampering the operation. Certainly the staff of the program, because of the difference of opinion among the Board, is not able to institute all of the programs that they would like to operate in the Action Area.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you noticed with the Legal Services that you get young, inexperienced lawyers who use Legal Services as a training ground and then leave, which necessitates the Legal Services going through another period of adjustment by bringing an-

other new lawyer in, training him, only to see him leave later on?

WINDSOR. I think this has been one of the criticisms leveled at Legal Aid programs not only here in Baltimore but across the nation. The Legal Services Program operating under the War-on-Poverty in Baltimore has only been operating for slightly less than a year.

There is no clear indication that this situation is occurring in the Baltimore program. There are some young attorneys on the staff of the Legal Services Program, however, this is counterbalanced by some well experienced attorneys. I can't say that definitely young attorneys are using Legal Services as a training ground for their own ambitions.

What is the issue, however, is could they possibly do more. Presently the program services are directed solely to attention on individual civil cases when possibly the most relevant and the most pressing concerns are for criminal case assistance and group activities—problems that bother all the poor such as the alleged excessive licensing of liquor outlets in the poverty areas, alleged propensity towards giving a poor youth a criminal record compared to those from the more affluent areas.

We should get the Legal Aid Program out on the table and again look at it in terms of what ways can we do the most for the poor as opposed to what the lawyers want to do.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found it a problem to get Negro lawyers for Legal Aid?

WINDSOR. This has been pointed out by the operating staff of the Legal Services Program as one of their problems. They indicated that it is very difficult to attract a Negro attorney to the staff because he can fare as well, if not better economically, in private practice than he can in joining the Legal Services Program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Have you found a lack of enthusiasm or a lack of spirit across the board of the Poverty Program among the staff members on the lower levels?

SIMON. No, on the contrary, we have found a great deal of spirit and commitment. People are in there basically not for pay but because they feel they are doing something worthwhile. This was most evident in the early times and the problem will be to keep it up—to keep the innovative, the new view, the freshness, the ability to criticize one's self as part of the Poverty Program.

NEWS AMERICAN. Millions of dollars are spent each year in the Baltimore anti-poverty effort. There has been a great deal of criticism about whether it is used correctly. Has your study found that is is being used correctly?

SIMON. Correctly is a very difficult conclusion to reach because it is very obvious that there are a number of different viewpoints as to what is correct. We have found that in Baltimore a very effective job has been done in a short period of time with limited funds.

Our findings indicate that the entire Baltimore community—rich and poor—have benefited at least indirectly from the effort. We have more than gotten our money's worth.

What we are suggesting at this point, however. is that it is time ot shift gears. Phase one has passed. The Poverty Program has established a bridge to the poor community. They have an organization, knowledge, and program where there was little before.

There doesn't appear to be more resources available to continue to expand the program at this time. Therefore, it is time to capitalize on the lessons learned. It is time to eliminate or redirect programs, also to help mobilize all available community resources to do a more effective job for all citizens.

NEWS AMERICAN. What is it going to cost to implement your suggestions?

SIMON. Our suggestions have been basically tuned to the original guidelines given us by the Commission which are to assume a constant level of funding rather than an increase in funding.

We have found ways and suggestions to improve the efficiency, to get more effectiveness and results for each dollar, and secondly perhaps to make some program revisions.

Although each of these programs are effective and aimed at satisfying real needs, some of them seem to be more effective than others; therefore, it may be more desirable to allocate funds towards those which seem to get the most results.

What is essential now is that the Commission sharpen up its objectives and policies. A consultant cannot properly formulate the objectives. What we can do is to help define the issues and to point out how to get maximum benefit from the available resources once the objectives have been determined.

It is time to re-assess the services that this city in total is applying in eliminating poverty, in serving the poor people, in helping them to help themselves.

IN SUPPORT OF THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as a stanch supporter of the war on poverty since its inception, I would like to share with my colleagues today a number of recent editorials from the Baltimore Sun in defense of the program as well as a New York Times editorial entitled "No Spin Off."

I know that these programs have enabled many people to attempt to solve their problems and improve their lives. You may be interested to know what the various OEO programs have done in my own State of Maryland: 16,323 youngsters participated in summer Headstart; 68,903 Marylanders of all ages have participated in community action programs which operate in 21 of the 23 counties in my State at a cost of $17,004,000; 8,607 young people and their families have benefited from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs; 11,317 trainees have profited from the work experience program; and 5,604 adults have participated in the adult basic education program.

As you all remember, when the economic opportunity programs first started, some individual projects were slow in getting off the ground, but now that most of them are well organized and beginning to show results, it is certainly not the time to cut them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we appropriated $1,678,500,000 for OEO in fiscal 1967 and appropriated $128,752,450,419 for the entire budget for fiscal 1967. We are spending approximately 1.3 percent of our budget to rehabilitate the poor and disadvantaged—a small amount, indeed, to raise these individuals from tax consumers—welfare and so forth—to taxpayers.

It is my firm conviction that cuts should not be made at the expense of those least able to help themselves.

At this point, I insert the editorials in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun]

JUST TOO MUCH

Sargent Shriver has threatened to quit as head of the Office of Economic Opportunity if Congress doesn't give him the funds to really fight poverty. He is understandably alarmed and angry. Members of the House of Representatives are seriously thinking of cutting the Administration's anti-poverty appropriation request almost in half, from $2.06 billion to $1.2 billion.

It is fairly clear that not much could be done with that kind of money. As Mr. Shriver put it. ". . . it would be a delusion of the poor. It will be a deception to the general public, and, therefore, I don't think it would be advisable to continue a fraud." Even as he spoke, reports came in that, owing to a lack of funds, anti-poverty projects are closing down all over the country. Funds are already becoming scarce here in Baltimore and in six Maryland counties. VISTA workers will go unpaid. Job-training programs are being curtailed, community action assistance to poor rural families is being held up.

Mr. Shriver seems adamant. He is arguing that, in this case, a half a loaf is worse than none at all, that giving it would be a gesture designed only to appease the conscience of the affluent without its actually alleviating the suffering of the poor. And Defense Secretary McNamara yesterday joined the debate by questioning America's will to see the poverty program through. He rejected the thesis that national resources are insufficient to fulfill our international commitments, while at the same time meeting domestic needs.

President Johnson committed this country to a protracted war on poverty, and now Congress, through procrastination and threats to cut deep into anti-poverty funds, seems bent on avoiding that commitment. Perhaps some reduction in these funds is necessary in the interest of fiscal stability, but half the requested appropriation is just too much.

FIGHT FOR POVERTY FUNDS VOWED

WASHINGTON, November 6.—Defenders of the Administration's war on poverty reacted sharply today to forecasts that the program would be cut back below last year's spending levels.

Representative Perkins (D., Ky.) chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee which drafted the $2,060,000,000 bill now before the House, said, "we should be getting more than we asked rather than being cut back. I will fight these cuts."

Perkins spoke in reply to a statement by Representative Mahon (D., Texas), chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which had said the committee would not allow more than the $1,600,000,000 spent during the 1967 fiscal year.

HINTS LOWER FIGURE

"In fact, there are strong indications that the figure approved by the Appropriations Committee for the entire antipoverty program may be less than $1,600,000,000," Mahon said. He did not disclose what the new figure would be, however.

Actual debate on the bill to authorize funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity was delayed by floor debate on a number of minor bills, but Perkins released a lengthy speech, saying six community action agencies—including one in his own district in Appalachia—are without funds.

"Unless we act by November 23—just 17 days from now—35 other local community action programs will have to close down their operations," he warned. "This involves $42,000,000 worth of community action projects and affects the lives of some 500,000 people."

These agencies are in sixteen states, including Maryland, Perkins added.

OEO, which administers the anti-poverty program, was cut off without funds October 23 when a stop-gap resolution to allow it to spend at 1967 levels was bottled up by a squabble between the House and Senate over economy.

"You can well imagine the anxiety and the frustration that this lack of funding is creating in the hearts and minds of poor people throughout this country," Perkins declared.

The delay in beginning formal debate on the bill was another in the series of blows at OEO taken by the House. It delays at least for one more day the passage of some sort of program. The Senate has already approved a $2,200,000,000 program which will be subject to negotiations with the House version.

Earlier, Representative Ayres (R., Ohio), senior Republican member of the House Education Committee, had suggested that the House abandon the bill, and instead pass a continuing resolution that would set the spending level at $1,200,000,000.

OEO has said Ayres' resolution would force the closing of 60 Job Corps centers serving 20,000 young people, 250 community action programs, half the VISTA programs and end job training for 120,000 adults.

Perkins described it as "completely unrealistic and completely irresponsible. Make no mistake, the impetus for a continuing resolution approach is coming from those who want to see the emergency opportunity programs severely crippled.

During a television interview today, Sargent Shriver, head of OEO, said he would resign if the agency were cut to the $1,200,000,000 figure. It was the first time he has publicly threatened to resign although there has been speculation he would step down to run for Senator from Illinois next year.

NEW VERSION OFFERED

". . . It would be a delusion to the poor and a deception of the public and therefore I don't think it would be advisable to continue," he was quoted as saying.

At the same time, Representatives Quie (R., Minn.) and Goodell (R., N.Y.) offered a new version of an earlier "opportunity crusade" which would be substituted for the existing anti-poverty program.

While the committee bill was amended to turn over control of funds to local officials rather than to the community action programs, themselves, in a move to get support of southern Democrats against Republican attempts to dismantle OEO, the Goodell-Quie proposal would retain present procedures.

VISTA FUNDS PROMISED FROM PRIVATE SOURCE

NEW YORK, November 6.—Twenty-five New York corporations were reported today to have agreed to bankroll the domestic peace corps with $100,000 in hopes Congress eventually will restore anti-poverty funds.

The funds were cut October 23 and 230 New York corps workers, members of Volunteers in Service to America, found themselves without money for food and lodging.

Encouraging VISTA workers to stay on the job, William H. Crook, the director, said he hoped Congress will restore the funds retroactive to October 24.

The corporation heads pledged $54,000 needed to maintain New York workers for a month. The remaining $46,000 was made available to VISTA workers elsewhere in the nation.

HOUSE GOP DENIES SUPPORT TO DEEP CUT IN POVERTY AID

WASHINGTON, November 8.—House Republicans declined today to support a proposal to cut funds for the anti-poverty program to a level the Administration says would end the program's usefulness.

At a strategy meeting held in connection with the anti-poverty bill now before the House, a majority of the GOP members indicated they preferred to try to change specific programs rather than vote for an across-the-board cut in spending.

The result of the meeting is believed to have improved the chances for House passage of a bill that would leave intact most of the programs now administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

No decisions were reached at the GOP meeting, but participants said sentiment was strong against a proposal by Representative Ayres (R., Ohio), to cut OEO spending to $1,200,000,000. It is now funded at $1,600,000,000 and President Johnson has asked for $2,600,000,000 for fiscal 1968.

Supporters of the bill indicate they expect to see the House put the figure at around $1,600,000,000.

The Senate has passed a bill authorizing $2,200,000,000 and a final compromise figure in the neighborhood of $1,800,000,000 is considered likely.

The House is proceeding slowly on the bill because of other legislative business and the absence tomorrow of a number of members who will attend the funeral in Texas of John Nance Garner, former Vice President and Speaker of the House. Final action is not expected until next week.

POLITICALLY UNWISE

Democrats favoring the bill said the lack of support for Ayres's proposal indicated the Republicans feel it would be politically unwise for them to back a drastic cut.

"They're finding out this program is not as unpopular back home as they thought," Representative Carey (D., N.Y.) said. "They're hearing from their mayors and other officials who want it continued."

POOR, SUPPORTERS RALLY FOR FUNDS: TYDINGS, MCKELDIN JOIN ANTIPOVERTY OFFICIALS IN DECRYING LOSS OF FEDERAL MONEY

(By Stephen J. Lynton)

With scores of placards bobbing up and down, with drums and bugles resounding and cheers rising in the cold night air, a throng of Maryland's impoverished and their advocates gathered in Hopkins place last night to shout its demands that Congress rejuvenate the nation's financially ailing war on poverty.

The rally, which had been organized by city anti-poverty officials, looked like an outdoor version of an election-eve convention. But political candidates in today's election were not permitted to speak.

"LET LIVELY SPEAK"

As the hour-and-fifteen-minute gathering before the new Federal building drew near an end at 8.15 P.M., cries of "Let Lively speak. Let Lively speak" broke from the crowd. But Walter H. Lively, the Republican City Council candidate from the Second district, did not speak.

Crowd estimates varied widely. Anti-poverty officials claimed 3,000 to 4,500. A police estimate was 1,500 to 1,800. Some newsmen guessed even fewer.

Senator Tydings (D., Md.) drew a roar from the crowd just by naming President John F. Kennedy. "I can't believe that Congress is going to turn its back on a program which our beloved President [Kennedy] began," he said.

Mayor McKeldin termed "horrifying" the prospect that Congress might end the national anti-poverty program.

Parren J. Mitchell, the city anti-poverty director, put the crowd—including delegations from Montgomery, Calvert, Harford and other counties—on notice that they might be called upon to demonstrate anew next weekend, apparently in Washington.

Representatives Friedel (D., 7th) and Long (D. 2d) also produced roars in the crowd by voicing support for anti-poverty programs.

The crowd displayed signs saying "Indian Givers," "No More Broken Promises" and "To C.A.A. (Community Action Agency) With Love." One placard bore a skull and crossbones and the words, "Don't Mess with Poor People."

City anti-poverty officials had organized the demonstration against what they considered to be a grim background of increasing fiscal emergencies. Money difficulties have already disrupted anti-poverty programs in Baltimore city and at least six Maryland counties.

PROGRAMS HURT

One Eastern Shore community action program was halted last week. A Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Baltimore ran out of money last Friday and has received emergency city funds to last out the current week. Members of the Volunteers in Service to America program face a payless payday. And programs in Montgomery, Prince Georges and Harford counties confront the possibility of imminent doom.

The difficulties are among the results of Congress's failure so far to approve new funds for the national war on poverty or to enact a continuing resolution which would permit Federal agencies to keep spending money. Federal agencies have been told not to pay for new non-defense programs unless they had already been authorized by midnight October 23.

Peter B. Davis, deputy regional director of VISTA, says that 108 VISTA workers in Maryland—94 of them assigned to health, housing, education, recreation, poverty and social work projects in Baltimore—will not receive their two-week's salaries, an average of $95 for rent, food and personal expenses, when payday comes November 14, unless Congress takes action.

VOLUNTEERS UNPAID

Michael A. Toth, director of the VISTA training center in Baltimore, says that 46 new volunteers have not received their normal $1-a-day expense allowances since they began their studies October 26.

Richard W. Bateman, an associate city anti-poverty director, said that a city Neighborhood Youth Corps program, which employs 40 staff members and provides job training for 500 high school drop-outs, discovered that its newly approved six-month grant of about $800,000 "suddenly terminated" last week.

William F. Moran, deputy director of the metropolitan Washington area's Neighborhood Youth Corps, says that a job program for 60 high school students in Montgomery county, and two programs for 110 students and dropouts in Prince Georges county will end Saturday, unless Congress authorizes new spending.

SPECIAL TRANSFER

S. Edward Smith, director of the Maryland Office of Economic Opportunity, says that a community action program assisting 1,200 poor families in Kent, Queen Annes and Talbot counties halted most of its normal operations last Wednesday, Thursday and Friday when a five-month grant expired.

Mr. Smith adds, however, that a special transfer of $3,700 to $4,000 in regional anti-poverty funds had been tentatively approved. That amount would be enough for a month's operations, he said.

The Eastern Shore program had returned to regular activities yesterday. But Mr. Smith notes that its nine paid employees "will miss a payday and maybe two."

A Harford county community action program, intended to assist 12,368 poor people, will also run aground between now and November 25, Mr. Smith says, unless Congress appropriates new money.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1967]

NO SPIN-OFF

The Republican substitute for the anti-poverty authorization bill now pending in

the House of Representatives would transfer several of the more successful and less controversial programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to various regular departments. This reorganization would leave O.E.O. with nothing but the much-disputed community action program.

Under the G.O.P. plan, sponsored by Representatives Goodell of New York and Quie of Minnesota, Head Start and its follow-up program, Upward Bound, would be shifted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, which consists of two programs, in-school and out-of-school, would be split. The in-school program would be assigned to HEW and the out-of-school program to the Department of Labor. Finally, the Republicans would phase out the residential Job Corps centers and rely on the state-administered vocational education programs.

No administrative arrangement is sacrosanct. What counts is how a program functions and whether it is run in the simplest, most responsive fashion. On paper, it may sound logical to consolidate educational programs in HEW and manpower programs in the Department of Labor. But experience does not bear out so plausible a theory.

The state-run vocational education programs have not done the job of reaching Negro youths in the slums and preparing them for jobs; if the states had been succeeding, the Job Corps would never have been necessary in the first place. Local school systems are cooperating in many instances in running Head Start and the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, but in other instances they have proved to be rigid and unresponsive bureaucracies. Settlement houses and community centers are often more willing to innovate and to make flexible arrangements, and there is no reason to freeze them out of Head Start and Upward Bound.

Flexibility and experimentation are at the heart of the antipoverty effort. More experience is needed before a decision is made to spin off these new ventures to the old-line agencies. Two dissenting Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee—Representatives Reid of New York and Bell of California—gave their party sound advice when they declared in their separate minority report: "This is not a time to cut back or restructure the antipoverty program."

A LONELY MAN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter from Mrs. Charles T. Jandik, Sr., of 5806 Park Avenue, West New York, N.J., in which she was kind enough to enclose a poem written by her son, Sp4c. Charles Jandik, Jr., who is serving in Vietnam.

I think that Specialist Jandik has very eloquently put into words the feeling of the average GI fighting in Vietnam. I include his very fine poem following my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of this Nation have a great obligation to our fighting sons in Vietnam who have proven themselves the equal of any other men who have worn the uniform of the armed services in any earlier war. I hope that all Members of this House and all Americans who read this RECORD will heed the words of this gifted young New Jerseyan.

Specialist Jandik's poem follows:

A LONELY MAN

A GI is lonely man.
Fighting for freedom in a far away land.
Not knowing what the next day brings.
If he will live or die, or anything.
He sleeps at night with his trusty gun,
And wonders what will come when the night is done.
If Charlie will try to attack and kill,
Or if he'll have to fight on one more hill.
He eats food prepared in a can,
And imagines it is vittles straight from the pan.
He daydreams of home and the ones so dear,
And wishes he could be there with them so near.
When the mail call comes, he waits for some,
Only to find out that he has none.
Feeling lonely and blue, he continues to fight,
Fighting for things we know are so right.
Fighting like a man who seems obsessed,
But fighting for the things he knows are best.
We all know what these things are,
And will keep them ahead of everything far.
We are here to keep America free,
So worship and thank God for your liberty,
And don't forget to put a word in for the GI,
For he is the one who is fighting and might die.

NAVIGATION AND THE NATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 10, it was my privilege to join with other Members, Senators, and interested citizens who share our concern for the future of the Nation's waterways, at a joint luncheon sponsored by the National Waterways Conference and the Propeller Club of the Port of Chicago. The featured speaker for the luncheon was Senator FRED R. HARRIS, of Oklahoma, and I am confident that every Member of this great body will be interested in what he had to say:

NAVIGATION AND THE NATION

I am honored to be with you at this closing session of your annual meeting, the theme of which is "The Meaning of Water to Modern America." Our country is deeply indebted to this group and to each of you participating in this conference for the magnificent progress this nation has made toward the maximum conservation, development and use of its great water resources. A sense of dedication, past and present, pervades this meeting.

In Washington, too, I am reminded almost daily of the debt we all owe to past and present water resources development leaders. A stroll through the Senate reception room, which is off the Senate floor, serves to dramatically illustrate how central to this nation's domestic policy water resource development has always been.

When the reception room was constructed about the time of the Civil War, the architect provided for five blank spaces on the walls of the room which he said were ". . . reserved for the portraits of distinguished Americans." Later, in 1874, a member of the Senate suggested that those spaces be used for the portraits of the five most outstanding men who had served in the Senate. With the characteristic deliberateness of the Senate, this idea was eventually adopted, upon the motion of the then Senate Majority Leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, in 1954.

When Senator Johnson was incapacitated by a heart attack, on his suggestion, the then Senator from Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, was named as the chairman of the Senate committee to choose the five greatest senators of all time. After the polling of all living past Presidents, of all Senators and most of the distinguished historians and political scientists of the country—and a great deal of rather heated debate and discussion—the committee selected as history's five greatest senators: Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, Robert M. LaFollette, and Robert A. Taft.

It should not be surprising to this group that all five of these "most honored" Senators were strong supporters, in their day, of a progressive federal waterways policy; the vast majority of congressional leaders throughout our history have been. The publication earlier this year by our sponsoring organization of the excellent book by William J. and Robert W. Hull on the origin and development of the waterways policy of the United States highlighted this strong congressional support throughout the years.

So each time I enter the Senate chamber through the reception room, and each time I talk with visitors there, I am reminded of the strong fight each of these senators made for waterways legislation in his time and how important this fight has been to the strength of our nation.

The Great Triumvirate—Webster, Clay and Calhoun—assumed positions of congressional leadership as common champions of a strong federal program for internal improvements, featuring canals and improved waterways. They had come to Congress as young war hawks in the period just before the War of 1812, but they became leaders in the period soon after the war, when the debate on internal improvements called them again to join battle for a common cause.

Daniel Webster was a senatorial leader who, throughout his lengthy congressional career, used every opportunity to voice his strong belief that improvement of the nation's waterways should come from the Federal Government or, as he said, "in the nature of things they could not come at all."

John C. Calhoun, especially in the decade following the War of 1812, before sectional issues claimed the major portion of his attention, was an equally strong proponent. In the debate on internal improvements in 1817 he said, "Let us then bind the Republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals."

But Mr. Internal Improvements himself was Henry Clay. It was primarily through his efforts that the phrase, "The American System," became so popular that it found its way—along with adjacent pictures of the Erie Canal and navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers—into most of America's history books covering the period before the Civil War. Sometimes I feel that, if the present proponents of continued national waterways development could just come up with as good a name for our program as did Henry Clay for his, our task would be immeasurably easier.

Clay said many things well worth remembering today about improved waterways. Perhaps as typical and forceful as any was the argument he used in the Senate debate in 1824, when he said, "There are some improvements emphatically national, which neither the policy, the power nor the interest of any State would induce it to accomplish, and which could only be effected by the application of the resources of the nation. The improvement of the navigation of the

Mississippi would furnish a striking example."

The other "honor senators"—La Follette and Taft—were from later periods, but they were also supporters of the kind of water policy which we are, still today, trying to get implemented.

Senator Taft's long standing interest in water pollution control, for example, is well memorialized today by a major research facility, working in this field, which bears his name, the Taft Research Center in Cincinnati. And, as is well known to all, the innovative Senator from Wisconsin, Senator La Follette, fought vigorously for the full development for the public of our great public water resources.

Recalling the words and deeds of these earlier leaders in the cause of a forward-looking national water policy helps us recapture the sense of dedication which we continue to need today.

To this list each of us could add the names of additional heroes, including my distinguished predecessor in the Senate from Oklahoma, the late Robert S. Kerr. From them all—from their lives and their records—there are lessons to be learned, important lessons of this nation's past and for its future.

On November 20, in the Department of Commerce Building in Washington, a ceremony near an instrument known as "the census clock" will commemorate the fact that America has become a nation of 200 million people, a fantastic growth in our population.

And, the "clock" will not stop on that day; it will continue to run, marking the fact that each day there are 6,400 additional Americans. Even with present declining birth, all the experts agree that in just 33 short years—by the year 2000—our population in America will be in excess of 300 million.

This explosion of population means that the economy of America, our gross national product, must also continue to expand accordingly if these greatly increased numbers of additional Americans are to find private jobs. Our economy cannot expand rapidly enough except by maximum conservation development and use of our greatest natural resources—water.

Our economy cannot grow rapidly enough except by continued growth in our national transportation network, and it is obvious that automobile, air, and rail transportation cannot grow fast enough to carry the increased load.

It almost seems that each of us in America drives two cars simultaneously when you consider the fact that last year we killed 52,000 people on our highways, or the fact that the Interstate Highway Program, the most visionary public works undertaking since the days of Rome, only authorized approximately one-half the four-lane highway mileage traffic experts say is needed.

These facts are true—and, most significantly, they are true in a nation which today has 100 million automobiles, a figure which is going to increase to 200 million within the next 33 years. Expanded navigation, as well as stronger multipurpose national water policies, encompassing solutions for the problems of municipal and industrial water supply, pollution, flood control, recreation, and power, looms even larger as domestic policy requirements.

As a member of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, I am particularly concerned with the enormous and growing problems of American cities, which must be attacked head-on and immediately. But for the long pull, we cannot solve these problems unless we take steps to slow down or reverse the rural to urban shift of our population, which has magnified these problems tremendously in recent years. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, 11 million Americans moved from rural areas and small towns to larger cities. And, they are still coming at a rate of 500,000 to 600,000 each year.

I was a staunch supporter of regional economic development and multipurpose water resources development programs long before becoming a member of the President's Commission, but, now, I am an even more dedicated disciple. Through such programs as the Arkansas River Navigation Program to be completed in Oklahoma and Arkansas in 1970, these underdeveloped regions of America can become in-migration areas, help to give people a chance and a choice of living where they want to, where there is opportunity for good jobs in a developing economy.

Navigable waterways are a major contributor to regional economic development in the United States because they extend the advantages of ocean ports some 9000 miles through interior America. The promise and potential of navigable waterways offer hope and meaningful alternatives to residents of rural and smaller urban areas in river valleys across the nation. Without the resources and opportunities created by navigable waterways, the population migrations and manpower drains from the country to the city in recent decades undoubtedly would have been far larger, resulting in even more insurmountable problems than the nation's largest metropolitan areas face today. In region after region the extension and improvement of navigable waterways have led to the creation of thousands of new private jobs—good jobs—and each new project which is completed adds to the possibilities for population diffusion.

The development of navigable waterways has created highly attractive new industrial sites where such waterways converge with vital rail and highway routes—flood-free, with a plentiful water supply. Each year there are announcements of hundreds of new plants to be located on waterfront sites along the nation's navigable waterways.

The availability of transportation via these waterways has made it possible for certain types of industries to locate at great distances from their principal sources of supply or markets. Low-cost barge transportation has made it economically feasible, for example, for the chemicals and primary metals industries, the foundation building blocks of the nation's economy, to be dispersed along the waterways, rather than concentrated in the largest metropolitan areas.

The impact of a navigable waterway on the economic development of a region is illustrated by the Tennessee River experience, which was reported by TVA to the President about a year ago in a booklet entitled, *Navigation and Economic Growth*. When the development of this navigable waterway was begun in 1933, the Tennessee River stretched 650 miles through three states; it was a great flexed arm without the muscle for development. The river was undisciplined, uncontrolled, and alternated between ravaging floods and low water. Nine main river dams and dams on tributaries brought the river under control—its muscle has been harnessed for development. When construction of the navigation channel was started, the Tennessee Valley and river waterfront were undeveloped industrially. The Valley was characterized by agriculture and extractive activities providing raw material for processing in other regions of the nation. The construction of the waterway created new development resources.

Industries which use or produce bulk cargoes have sought out the least-cost locations on waterfront industrial sites created by the waterway. Many of these basic industries have spawned satellites producing inputs or consuming outputs adjacent to or near the basics, which together have resulted in the development of new economic growth centers.

During the 25-year period from 1940 to 1965, private industry invested about $1.3 billion in 190 waterfront plants and terminals. In 1965, nearly one-half billion dollars in value added was generated by the waterfront manufacturing plants which employed over 30,000 persons.

Based on the relationship between new manufacturing jobs and new trades and services found to exist in Tennessee River waterfront counties, TVA has estimated that the growth of jobs in waterfront manufacturing plants has led to the creation of at least an equal number of jobs in trades and services employment. The report suggests that in addition to this estimate, there is the nonwaterfront satellite-forming ability of the basic waterfront plants which is so prominently displayed by the growth center referred to above and others on the waterway. If this effect could be traced and totaled and the resultant increases in trade and service jobs were added, the overall estimate might well double the 60,000 figure. The economic impact of these jobs is spread over a wide area away from the waterway.

This impressive economic result is associated with only one 650-mile segment of the inland waterways system. Even more famous for industrial growth is the Ohio River. The reports of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association leave no doubt that the special growth-fostering effect of navigation has been at work there. The quarterly reports of the American Waterways Operators, listing new and expanded waterfront industries, not only reads like the blue book of industry, it tells the story of growth in jobs and income for people in the interior heartland of America.

The economic impact of a navigable waterway in the broadest geographic setting can be seen by a comparison of development in waterfront and non-waterfront counties in the 20 states served by the inland waterways system. Analysis of manufacturing activity in 1958 in these counties reveals that averages of value added by manufacture, number of manufacturing employees, and new capital expenditures in manufacturing facilities in waterfront counties were over twice those for nonwaterfront counties.

The number of new or expanded plants and the resultant estimated increased employment in just four industries along the inland waterway system of America during the fourteen years ending in 1966 is quite remarkable. Almost 100 chemical and allied products plants have added 172,308 jobs. Primary metal industries have added 274 plants and almost 85,000 new jobs. Some 65 transportation equipment plants brought almost 35,700 new positions, and 157 new petroleum and coal products plants added 33,441 persons to their payrolls.

As I indicated earlier, the most conservative estimates of future transportation demands are almost overwhelming. Per capita demand has grown from about 5000 ton-miles of freight in 1940 to 9000 ton-miles today. This trend, coupled with the projected population increase, indicates a demand for double the present volume within the lifetime of most people alive today. Viewed in this context, it is reasonable to suggest that the appropriate question is *not* "Can this nation afford to develop waterways?" but rather "Can this nation afford *not* to develop waterways?"

But, of course, the proper policy is not one of developing any and every stream to have a 9-foot channel. It is necessary to have standards to judge the desirability of development and to measure the benefits of the improvements against the cost. While few will quarrel with this kind of a statement, when it comes down to decisions of how to implement the policy, differences of viewpoint come into the open. How is "desirability" determined? What are the "benefits" to be measured? How are the costs to be calculated? Who are the beneficiaries? Generally speaking, the answers to these questions will determine what is going to

be accomplished. Agreement on these issues is at least as important as agreement on a general statement of policy. And, when it appears that answers to these questions are being fashioned which may well frustrate the purpose of the policy, it is the responsibility of the policy-making body—the Congress—to give unequivocal direction on how to implement its stated policy.

Thus, last year, after changes in the manner in which navigation benefits historically had been calculated, and navigation development was thereby slowed down, Congress had the clear responsibility to act. I was proud to be a member of the conference committee which discharged that responsibility in section 7 of the act creating the Department of Transportation, restoring the vitality of national navigation policy.

The development of navigation is not a "numbers" game. What can be measured, should be; but the whole answer is not obtained this way. Improvement of navigation can open whole new areas of resources to industrial development. This has been seen time and time again; and the full impact has yet to be measured, *before the fact*, by accountant, engineer, or economist.

There is a diversity of opinions about navigation. There is a view which pictures navigation simply as another way of moving freight from one point to another. There is another view which sees navigation investments as part of a broader spectrum of water resource development, offering industries increased opportunities for geographical diversification and providing America's people expanded opportunities for more effective use of their talents. The founders of this nation had the broad vision. Many of our leaders today do also.

This broader vision was clearly indicated exactly a year ago by Congressman Wilbur Mills as he spoke to you about being asked to have the Committee on Ways and Means consider user fees or taxes on inland waterways. Chairman Mills observed, "It may be significant to you that the Committee has neither held hearings on this subject nor considered it in executive session."

He brought this matter up-to-date last month in a telegram read to a meeting in Little Rock in which, in part, he said: "The proposal has just recently been sent to us again. My position has not changed. So far as I am aware the Committee on Ways and Means will have no schedule for its consideration any time in the future."

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, let me add my observation that our committee also has no plans to consider such a proposal, and I trust it will not develop any such plans.

The national water resource development policy championed by the five outstanding Senators of all time is as valid today as it was when one of these great men, Robert M. La Follette, said: "I hope to see the day when . . . all of the people can enjoy a share of the lower transportation charges which our great waterways can secure to us when improved."

I can only add the hope that America will continue onward toward the full realization of that dream.

PROFILES IN THE NEW MORALITY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard about the new math. Herewith read profiles in the new morality for moralticians.

Item No. 1—The New York Times on September 20 ran an article datelined Washington, September 19, concerning statements Barry Goldwater made on September 18 when he and 1964 running mate William E. Miller appeared on a 1-hour national educational television network program called, "That Was the Election That Was." Goldwater, in reminiscing about the 1964 Republican National Convention in San Francisco, was reported in the article to have said on television:

> I will not reveal the names of people responsible, but we had every cable of every television company and every radio company marked up in the loft of the Cow Palace.
>
> If anybody got a little too obnoxious to our—us—they could always have cable trouble.
>
> These are little things that you do. It is perfectly fair in love and war. We had all kinds of things planned.

Interviewed September 19 on "ABC Reports," Goldwater was quoted as stating in the same New York Times article of September 20:

> There never was any thought of cutting lines.

Then he was kidding, he was asked.

> Well, yes, this was a kidding program.

Later in the article it was stated:

> Told that the New York Times, in a page one article today had treated the cable-cutting plan as a "serious remark," Mr. Goldwater said:
>
> "The New York Times will say anything, so I disregard anything they come up with."

Item No. 2—On October 18 aboard the SS *Independence*, Governor Reagan released the text of a radiogram from Marvin Watson to Price Daniel which mysteriously found itself into Reagan's hands.

In an article in the Washington Post on October 19, it was stated:

> Reagan told reporters the Watson radiogram had been delivered to him by mistake and that he had used it at the Republican caucus to solidify opposition to the resolution (supporting the President's Vietnam policy) being urged by Democratic governors.
>
> Governor George Romney of Michigan said he had urged Reagan to make the radiogram public.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO COMMENDS PETE STANIEC AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF CHICAGO DOWNTOWN SOCIAL SECURITY DISTRICT OFFICE

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has already passed the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, and the other body will begin consideration of these amendments tomorrow. Because of this, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a significant factor that has made it more readily feasible for Congress over the years to improve and expand the social security program as desired by the people of our Nation.

During the three decades since 1935 when the Social Security Act was first passed, and in the ensuing series of periodic amendments which have expanded and improved the social security protection now reaching virtually all of the Nation's 200 million people, this steady growth, acceptance, and success of the program was in a large measure attained because of the loyal, dedicated, and selfless thousands of competent social security employees throughout the country, such as the ones I have witnessed in my own Seventh Illinois Congressional District at the Chicago downtown social security district office, 22 West Madison Street.

Heading the office is district manager Marjan "Pete" Staniec, a career service employee of more than 25 years of outstanding administrative public service, who has also distinguished himself by voluntary service on numerous civic projects serving the youth, aged and the less fortunate. He and his well-trained loyal staff of employees are known to have always strived to faithfully and diligently provide excellence in their service to the public—the kind of service, the concern in people, and the interested treatment that has instilled in the people and the Congress a confidence that the social security program is in competent administrative hands.

On December 1, 1967, the Chicago downtown office will hold a public ceremony of employees rededication, which will be attended by several hundred leading representatives of Chicago's business, labor, industry, and other community activities. All these employees will repledge themselves to the highest ideals and excellence of public service, in a ceremony at which Hon. John S. Hastings, chief judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh U.S. Circuit, will officiate.

It is my privilege to commend Pete Staniec and thousands upon thousands of loyal and able civil servants like him, who are serving the people of America with real dedication. I am proud of the great contribution which has been made to our social security program by the employees of the Social Security Administration, and I congratulate Commissioner Robert M. Ball under whose leadership this esprit de corps and record of fine service have been established.

On this occasion, I want to express the hope that the other body will take speedy and favorable action on the Social Security Amendments of 1967 so that people all over America will benefit from the added improvements in the social security program.

ONE APPROACH TO THE AUTO THEFT PROBLEM

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, law-enforcement officials throughout the Nation are increasingly concerned over the drastic rise in automobile thefts during recent years. Last year, there were 557,000 car thefts reported, compared with 493,000 in 1965. A car was stolen in the United States every 57 seconds. At the rate car thefts have been increasing, 1970 will see more than a million thefts, or one every 30 seconds.

Since 1960, this crime has risen steadily and the total increase for that 7-year period is 71 percent. It cannot be validly stated that there are more thefts just because there are more cars, since the percentage of increase in auto theft is more than double the percentage increase in automobile registrations. It is particularly disturbing to me, as the Representative of western Westchester County and Putnam County, N.Y., that our Nation's suburban areas registered a 14-percent increase in auto theft last year, while in large cities this crime was up 10 percent and rural areas showed an 8-percent increase.

The economic aspects of auto theft are as serious as the purely criminal considerations. The National Automobile Theft Bureau told the Senate that although nearly nine out of 10 stolen cars are recovered, auto theft continues to cost the public and the insurance industry more than half a billion dollars each year.

One aspect of this problem which has come to my attention concerns the easy availability of motor vehicle master keys. I understand that mail order firms in such States as Maryland, Florida, California, and Pennsylvania advertise motor vehicle master keys by direct mail and through advertisements in publications that are mailed throughout the United States. They apparently fill these mail orders without even the most cursory investigation to ascertain the nature of the recipient. It seems to me that law enforcement officials have enough problems preventing car thefts without giving the thief the additional advantage of being able to purchase a master key to any American car through the mails.

I am today introducing legislation which will put a stop to this deplorable and dangerous practice and am pleased to announce that the Department of Justice shares my view that a legislative remedy is needed. The Attorney General is, in fact, considering submitting a similar bill to the Congress.

I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from Public Safety Commissioner Daniel F. McMahon of Yonkers, N.Y., my correspondence with the Justice Department, and the text of my bill to end the indiscriminate sale and advertising of master automobile keys in interstate commerce:

CITY OF YONKERS, N.Y.,
October 27, 1967.

Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Post Office Building, Yonkers, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: An interested citizen, Mr. Barton Chapin, Jr., has sent me the attached advertisement offering the sale of master keys for all major automobiles on the market.

While this ad purportedly is addressed to interested agencies, it is indeed an open invitation to car thieves. It is little wonder that the F.B.I. has reported spiralling automobile thefts across our nation.

Since this is an inter-state operation (it is mailed from Saint Petersburg, Florida), it is requested that you look into this subject to see if there is an appropriate federal action that would be helpful to police agencies on this vexing problem.

Thank you for your anticipated prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

DANIEL F. MCMAHON,
Commissioner of Public Safety.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The attached advertisement for the sale of master keys for major American automobiles recently came to my attention. In my view, this is a deplorable practice and should not be permitted. I know you are concerned about recent FBI reports of spiraling auto thefts throughout the nation, and this could well be a factor.

I would appreciate your advising me whether there is any Federal law or regulation which could prevent or control such sales. In the event there is not, I would be grateful for your opinion with respect to the advisability of such legislation and your thoughts on what might be the most feasible approach.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 8, 1967.

Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in response to your letter of November 2, 1967 concerning companies which sell master keys for automobiles to the general public.

The Justice Department is currently considering the submission of legislation to Congress which would outlaw the movement in interstate commerce or through the mails of so-called motor vehicle master keys. We are in complete agreement with you in objecting to the indiscriminate sale of such keys, which are definitely a factor in the severe auto theft problem now confronting the country.

As always, it is a pleasure to be of assistance.

Sincerely,

FRED M. VINSON, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General.

H.R. 14003

A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2319. Introduction, sale, distribution, or advertisement for sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys

"(a) Whoever knowingly introduces, or manufactures for introduction, into interstate commerce or transports or distributes in interstate commerce any motor vehicle master key shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever knowingly disseminates or knowingly causes to be disseminated by means of the United States mails, or in interstate commerce by any means, any advertisement of sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) the introduction, manufacture for introduction, transportation, distribution, sale, or possession in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys for use in the ordinary course of business by any bona fide locksmith, common carrier, contract carrier, new or used car dealer, rental car agency, automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof, or any department, agency, or instrumentality of (A) the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United Sates, or (B) any political subdivision of any such entity; or

"(2) the shipment, transportation, or delivery for shipment in interstate commerce of motor vehicle master keys in the ordinary course of business by any common carrier or contract carrier.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'motor vehicle master key' means a key which will operate all of the ignition locks of two or more motor vehicles each of which can be operated by a key which will not operate the ignition locks of other such vehicles."

(2) by adding at the end of the chapter analysis of such chapter the following:

"2319. Introduction, sale, distribution, or advertisement for sale to the public of motor vehicle master keys."

(b) Section 1716 of such title is amended by inserting immediately after the seventh paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"All keys adapted to fit the ignition of two or more motor vehicles the ignition switches of which are designed to be operated with different keys are nonmailable and shall not be deposited in or carried by the mails or delivered by any postmaster, letter carrier, or other person in the postal service. Such keys may be conveyed in the mails, under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe—

"(1) to any bona fide locksmith, new or used car dealer, officer or employee of a common carrier or contract carrier, or officer or employee of any rental car agency for use in their business;

"(2) to any officer or employee of any automobile club or association operating in more than one State or an affiliate thereof for use in connection with the activities of such club or association; and

"(3) to supply or procurement personnel of (A) any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or (B) any political subdivision of any such entity, for use in connection with the activities of such department, agency, or instrumentality.

The Postmaster General may require, as a condition of conveying any such key in the mails, that any person proposing to mail such key explain in writing to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that the mailing of such key will not be in violation of this section."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

[News release from Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Nov. 14, 1967]

OTTINGER HITS CAR THEFT PROBLEM; BILL LIMITS MASTER KEY SALES

WASHINGTON.—Predicting that a car will be stolen in the United States every 30 seconds

by 1970 if the current trend continues, Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, D-N.Y., introduced legislation today to eliminate one factor in the recent car theft wave—the indiscriminate advertising and sale of automobile master keys.

At the same time Mr. Ottinger made public a letter from Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr., disclosing that the Justice Department is considering sending a similar bill to Capitol Hill. The November 8 letter to Congressman Ottinger stated: "The Justice Department is currently considering the submission of legislation to Congress which would outlaw the movement in interstate commerce or through the mails of so-called motor vehicle master keys. We are in complete agreement with you in objecting to the indiscriminate sale of such keys, which are definitely a factor in the severe auto theft problem now confronting the country."

In introducing his bill, Congressman Ottinger pointed out that in 1966, a car was stolen in the U.S. every 57 seconds, but that the rate has risen 20 per cent in the last two years. "If that continues," he asserted, "more than a million cars will be stolen in 1970—one every half minute."

Mail-order sale or advertising of automobile master keys would be punished by prison terms of up to five years and fines up to $10,000 under the Ottinger bill. Locksmiths, car dealers, rental agencies and automobile clubs are exempt from the bill's provisions.

Congressman Ottinger, in a House speech today, pointed out that although nearly nine out of every ten stolen cars are eventually recovered, auto theft costs the public and the insurance industry about half a billion dollars yearly. Mail order firms in such states as Florida, Pennsylvania, Maryland and California freely advertise motor vehicle master keys and are totally indiscriminate in filling orders, he said. Only four states—Texas, Oregon, Massachusetts and Michigan—have laws limiting such sales but they are powerless to stop mail-order operations.

FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VIGORITO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, as we debate and vote upon the Office of Economic Opportunity bill today, I would like to say a few words relating to statistics recently made public on the amount of domestic Federal aid to State and local governments.

An article in the November 9 issue of the Washington Post said that the Federal Government spent a record $17.8 billion on grants-in-aid and related payments to State and local governments and individuals in fiscal 1966.

It was encouraging to see that due primarily to the passage of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act by the 89th Congress, we are now helping our Nation's children by contributing $2.248 billion in aid to education programs. It is also significant that we are working toward a better life for all citizens by assisting public health programs to the tune of $1.1 billion.

What disturbs me is that we shelled out to States and local agencies $3.5 billion in fiscal 1966 to various public assistance programs while giving them only $892.3 million for the war on poverty.

One of the finest features of the war on poverty is its various self-help programs. By educating and training our underprivileged children and men and women, we are giving them skills to make them productive members of our society. I feel that if we were to fund the OEO program as the administration requests, we would in the years to come be able to take a large number of persons off our public assistance rolls.

Let us not fool ourselves. There are many people now receiving public welfare payments who could be out working. If these persons were trained in certain job skills by OEO and other programs, they could help themselves by earning a living for their families and take themselves off a public welfare dole.

Let us, therefore, recognize the extreme good the war on poverty has done and give it sufficient funds to carry on its many worthwhile programs.

WE NEED A TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL THIS YEAR

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the rush for adjournment the dismal prospect of postponing needed and meaningful truth-in-lending legislation looms large. This ugly prospect is galling and regrettable; particularly so since we are now so close to putting a decently strong statute on the law books.

In these closing days of the first session every effort must be bent toward getting the truth-in-lending bill through the multiple hurdles still before it. I believe many of the obstacles now combining to make passage of the bill this year almost impossible, could be short circuited if the House Banking and Currency Committee quickly reports a measure framed around the compromises unanimously adopted in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it took 7 years for the U.S. Senate to pass a truth-in-lending bill. While the Senate bill leaves much to be desired, it still represents a meaningful beginning in providing the consumer with accurate comparative credit information.

Our responsibility in the House must be, in these waning days, to do all we can to insure that the work started in the Senate is completed this year. I believe we can do this if we are willing to turn our attention to strengthening the Senate-passed measure in the areas which will be most meaningful to the consumer, while at the same time facilitating the road the legislation must take through conference.

In September I introduced legislation which substantially improved the Senate bill. My measure adds a truth-in-credit advertising provision to the language of the Senate legislation, as well as tightening up the $10 credit exemption. The strengthened sections my bill adds to the Senate version, especially the truth-in-advertising provisions, provides the consumer with the kind of useful information now not available. However, these additional provisions will not jeopardize the passage of truth-in-lending legislation this year.

There are some now giving the impression that the Senate bill, even with the improvements provided in my bill will provide the consumer with little, if any protection. This is obviously untrue. My bill—and even the Senate bill—provide for detailed disclosure of credit charges. While I believe my measure substantially improves upon the Senate version, both bills offer the consumer significant protections. In these last days of the first session the best service Congress can perform for the consumer is to put a statute on the books. We can do this, and do it meaningfully if we pay attention to the work done in the Senate, and strengthen that body's measure in a way which will be of the most use to the consumer as soon as possible.

Over the next few days I will put in the RECORD a number of representative editorials from major newspapers around the Nation which help put the truth-in-lending issue into perspective. All the editorials point to the need for legislation now, and suggest the House use the Senate-unanimously-passed measure as a basis for expeditious consideration. I commend these editorials to the Members, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, July 17, 1967]

MORE HELP FOR CONSUMERS

In spite of its catchy nickname, the "truth-in-lending" bill was stalled for seven years in the Senate. It has now passed by a remarkable 92-to-0 vote, partly because Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), who took over the bill's management after the defeat of its original sponsor, Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), was willing to make compromises Douglas was not.

The concessions by Proxmire do not, in our opinion, weaken the bill unduly. They lie in an area where understanding was foggy and enforcement uncertain in any case. Bypassing this area achieves the main purpose of the bill, which is to give the consumer better protection against the gougers on fringe of the legitimate credit business.

There has never been serious objection to this basic purpose, either in the Senate or in the responsible business community. It is merely good business to make sure that the buyer knows in advance how much interest he will pay on a loan and how much the carrying charge will add to the total bill when he buys on long-term credit.

The obstacles arose in trying to formulate a law to require that "true" interest rates be shown. This requirement, seemingly so simple, proved to be anything but that. So many different ways of figuring interest were paraded before the senators at hearings on the bill that at times it seemed arithmetic had abdicated as an exact science.

This year the Treasury Department came up with a book of standardized tables to cover most credit transactions. With the help of these tables, the interest problem may be overcome, though it is bound to be confusing for a time to clerks and customers alike if the House concurs and the bill be-

comes law. To cite one of the simplest examples, a standard 6 per cent bank loan paid off in 12 installments on a declining balance will have to be restated as 11 per cent "true" interest.

The Senate gave up on revolving credit accounts offered by many department stores and bank credit card plans, and exempted them from the "true interest" requirement. Also exempted were first mortgages, margin accounts with stockbrokers, and other commercial credit transactions.

In its final form, however, the bill approved by the Senate should mark a long step toward acquainting the consumer with the true cost of the product he is buying—a cost often overlooked in the attraction of an easy-monthly-payment contract.

Coupled with the credit-reform package passed this year by the Illinois Legislature, the federal measure promises better protection for the consumer than he has yet known. We hope the House joins with the Senate in putting the law on the books.

[From Newsday, July 19, 1967]

TRUTH IN LENDING

The "Truth in Lending" bill was first introduced in Congress seven years ago by Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D-Ill.), who has since retired. At long last, under the sponsorship of Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.), and with the firm backing of the President, it has passed the Senate 92–0 and has been sent to the House. High time, and let's see affirmative action quickly.

Under the bill, merchants and loan agencies extending credit will, in all but a few cases, be required to disclose the total cash price of the article or service purchased, all service and financing charges, and the total amount to be paid, expressed in dollars and cents and as a simple annual interest rate percentage. Too many consumers have been gulled by inflated charges; too few have been able to figure out what they actually pay.

The bill therefore should be passed by the House and sent to the President at the earliest possible date. It is a valuable protection for the millions of Americans who rely so heavily on credit to finance their purchases or to pay their bills.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, July 13, 1967]

TRUTH IN LENDING: WELCOME VICTORY

The seven-year campaign by ex-Sen. Paul Douglas, D-Ill., and Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., for truth-in-lending legislation has succeeded in the Senate. It is a welcome sign for consumers.

The prospect in Washington is for favorable House action late this year and a quick signature by President Johnson, who has sought this kind of legislation since 1964.

If that happens, installment lenders will be required by federal law to furnish borrowers with full, accurate statements of interest and finance charges. Only two states (not including Colorado) now require this type of disclosure.

What will it mean to the consumer? When he signs a note to buy a car or a television set he will be told how much he is being charged for credit. It will mean he has a better chance to decide intelligently where and how to borrow money.

Without a truth-in-lending law, about all the borrower knows is how much he is paying every month and how many months he must continue to pay. With a truth-in-lending law, he also will know the annual interest rate he is paying and the total amount of finance charges, stated in dollars and cents.

What will it mean to the lender? He will certainly have to be more frank with his customers and probably more competitive with his rivals. We do not believe for a moment, though, that the bill will "disrupt or destroy the system of extending credit," as one frantic lobbyist told Congress.

Senator Proxmire deserves credit for pressing on with a crusade that seemed to have little hope early this year. Some observers said then the main battle would be fought in a Senate banking subcommittee, where bills sponsored by Senator Douglas had been buried so many times before. Proxmire got his bill through that subcommittee and then the full Banking Committee last month.

The unanimous Senate vote Wednesday was still surprising. It could not have been foreseen a few weeks ago.

One major amendment seems to have eased the way considerably. The amendment, accepted by Proxmire, gives a partial exemption to ordinary, short-term, revolving credit accounts.

Department stores and other lenders extending this short-term unsecured credit will not, under the bill, have to quote to customers an annual rate of interest—which they say they can't do anyway. But they will have to tell customers their monthly interest rate (usually 1.5 percent) and their monthly finance charges in dollars and cents.

We do not think the Proxmire bill was seriously hurt by this compromise. We do not think the major abuse of credit occurs in this type of account. And, anyway, the customer will still have a pretty clear idea of his credit costs.

We do not expect the Proxmire bill to cure all the ills of the credit industry. It will not make all borrowers prudent. Many will go right ahead borrowing up to the hilt, without thinking about interest rates, so long as they think they can meet all the monthly payments.

But the bill will give thinking consumers an opportunity to bargain effectively for credit in the same way they now bargain for merchandise. We think that's fair, and in the long run, it's good for business, too.

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times, July 27, 1967]

FEDERAL TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

The Connecticut legislature earlier this year adopted a truth-in-lending bill designed to make consumers aware of what they are paying in finance charges.

Congress is now taking similar action, although the bill is somewhat weaker than the Connecticut law.

The Senate has sent to the House a bill which, among other things, provides:

1—That the annual percentage rate be made known to a customer before credit is extended.

2—That the seller make clear the cash price of an item, minus any down payment, plus all other charges included in the total amount to be financed; also the amount of the finance charges, expressed in dollars and as a percentage rate.

3—Disclosure of all charges to be included in the total amount financed by a lender, the amount of the finance charge, in dollars and a percentage rate, to be paid on the declining balance, and details on payments and penalties.

Disclosure of finance charges for open end retail credit is also required.

If adopted by the House, this bill will not affect or annul state truth-in-lending laws. In fact, if a state has a law as strong as or stronger than the federal law, credit transactions in that state will be exempt from the federal statute.

The Senate bill is a good one. It should be adopted by the House.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, July 15, 1967]

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL MEETS NEED

A recent radio commercial for a finance company declared that borrowing money was like any other transaction for the rental of someone else's property. The borrower, or renter, would be expected to return the property and pay a fee for its use.

It stands to reason, then, that the borrower, or renter, should be informed in advance what he is paying for the use of this property.

That is what the Truth in Lending Bill, adopted unanimously by the United States Senate the other day, is all about. If the House of Representatives approves this bill (and it is expected to do so quickly), federal law will require that a lender inform the borrower how much a loan is costing him, both in interest rates and in dollar costs.

Reputable lending institutions have never actually tried to deceive borrowers. But it has been long-standing business practice to state interest or credit fees as a rate or percentage of the money borrowed. Thus, loan rates were stated as "six per cent a year" or "one per cent a month on the unpaid balance." Frequently, interest was compounded, making it much more difficult for the borrower to understand exactly what a loan was costing him in dollars.

Most states, like Wisconsin, have usury laws, but they merely set a ceiling on the interest rate that can legally be charged. Borrowers do not always know that, when they pay interest on a monthly basis, they are actually being charged up to 12 per cent a year, which is near the usual legal limit.

Under the new Truth in Lending Bill, the borrower will know exactly, and in terms of dollars, what he is paying for a loan.

The bill exempts three classes of loans from the prior information requirements: first mortgages, revolving credit plans used by retail stores, and small credit contracts where the debt service would be less than $10.

Revolving credit plans are exempted because it is often impossible to state, in advance, what interest charges will be; it depends upon how the creditor uses the plan. Small contracts are exempted for the obvious reason that they are small. Mortgages are a different kind of credit, secured by real property and stated in rates; the mortgagee is informed, as he repays the debt, how much is being credited to interest and how much to principal.

The Senate's unanimous acceptance of the Truth in Lending Bill, considered the major piece of consumer protection legislation in this session of Congress, is a tribute to the energy of Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin, who held the final hearings and steered the bill to passage. But Proxmire gives credit to former Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois, who fought for seven years for the idea of truth in lending.

There is credit enough for both senators. They have scored a victory for one of the few pieces of important bread-and-butter legislation to come from this session.

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD following my remarks a speech given by John E. Horne, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, before the 75th annual convention of the U.S. Savings and Loan League, in San Francisco, Calif., yesterday.

In the speech, Mr. Horne states the goal that the Board hopes to achieve,

that is, to enable the great savings and loan industry to continue to serve to the maximum the public welfare.

He tells of some things that the Board has already accomplished and of plans for the future. He likewise stresses the importance of the legislative programs submitted by the Board, part of which the Congress passed last year in the form of the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966.

The other two parts of the legislative program recommended by the Board are the Federal savings institutions bill and the savings and loan holding company bill now before Congress.

I commend Mr. Horne's speech to each of you. I particularly urge that all Members particularly read that part of the speech that explains the great urgency for the enactment in this session of the Congress of a savings and loan holding company bill. Such a measure has already passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. It is now before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a Member. The chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has advised members of the committee that the bill is to be taken up on November 27 to 29. As one member of that committee, I am impressed by Mr. Horne's explanation and I shall work to the best of my ability to obtain committee approval and House passage of an adequate and sound Holding Company Act.

The speech referred to follows:

CURRENT ISSUES AND POLICIES

(Address by Hon. John E. Horne)

There are those who poke fun at conventions and other group meetings. In my view they overlook the opportunity that such gatherings provide for understanding, exchange of ideas, and even the social enjoyment derived from being with one another. Thus, while I do not endorse the views of Marshall McLuhan that the printed word is becoming less important, I do not believe that the printed word alone or any one medium by itself can serve all of our communication needs.

I have said before, and I repeat today, that there are few if any Government regulatory agencies that meet with or otherwise communicate with those they regulate as frequently and as freely as does the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Stockholders' meetings, regional conventions, State League conventions, industry group meetings on special problems or interests, several meetings each year with the Advisory Council, conferences with industry representatives by request, hundreds of letters from leagues and individuals either voluntarily or in response to Board proposals—all these are among the media that make it possible for you and the Board to be at least reasonably well apprised of and to benefit from one another's thoughts.

Even so, there is still lack of understanding at times among us. We at the Board cannot always know and appreciate your individual problems—even though in addition to the above-mentioned media we keep in close touch with the District Bank Presidents and field personnel. And you in individual associations cannot possibly be aware of all the considerations with which the Board has to be concerned in its deliberations and decisions.

The Board is a part of, not apart from, the Federal Government. This great industry is a part of, not apart from, the total national economy. It is extremely important that we all understand this fact because it cannot—and developments in very recent years have forced the issue to the point that it will not—be disregarded in the future as it sometimes was prior to the decade of the 1960's.

So for the reasons stated and implied in my remarks thus far, and for reasons I shall elaborate on as I proceed, I want to stress that the Board and its staff welcome the opportunity to attend and participate in the proceedings of your annual conventions. It affords the opportunity of face-to-face discussion with a larger part of the industry, and thus is a better medium, than any other occasion.

Suspecting that your President, Otto Preisler, would speak in some depth about the savings inflow of 1967 and the condition of the housing market generally, I decided to make only brief reference to those subjects. I do want to recall with you, though, that just a year ago, the industry was still trying to recover from the severe conditions of 1966. At that time I hesitated to say that we thought the recovery in savings flow would be substantial. Perhaps you will forgive me if I now lay claim to some foresight since my colleagues and I did feel late last year and so stated, that the results of 1967 would be far more favorable than those of 1966.

However, it is not enough to take pride in predictions no matter how closely they are realized. We have to look at what has been done with the opportunities that have resulted. In this connection, I should like to congratulate you on a number of grounds. First, the overwhelming majority of you have used the opportunities our regulations offer for attracting funds successfully and judiciously. This has meant learning to handle new instruments, avoiding the pitfalls of a too avid pursuit of one type of account as against another, and gauging the needs of your market. Second, you have contributed to an improvement in housing starts which, despite the severe pressures of recent months, has so far been well maintained. Yet, at the same time most of you have kept commitments in reasonable relationship to your flows. Third, most of you have improved your liquidity position. In doing so, you have not only improved your own position, but are in a far better position to continue support of the mortgage market. For each of these steps you deserve recognition and I am pleased to extend the Board's commendation.

Even more heavily than in 1967 and the immediately preceding years, I believe that in 1968 the savings and loan industry will be called on to serve as the main supplier of mortgage funds. This will place on you a grave responsibility, and likewise a wonderful opportunity to choose wisely the investment of funds you do have available.

And as to 1968, I believe that many if not all of you are aware that in anticipation you may need our help, the Board and Bank Presidents have been carrying within the System approximately $2 billion of liquid funds.

The major point, however, that I want to communicate to you today is the deep desire of the Board to help build a climate and condition under which your industry can continue to grow in size, to improve in soundness of operations, and to become increasingly more capable of meeting the housing needs of the future and of serving the public.

We want this industry ever to be proud of its service to the public; and we want the public to be proud of this industry.

It is easy to state this goal, but I can assure you from experience that it is difficult to achieve it. You have my promise, though, that so long as I serve on this Board that will be my aim.

Already in very recent years some steps directed toward achieving this goal have been taken within the Board and through legislation.

Examinations and Supervision have been consolidated in the Washington office and more closely coordinated in the Districts. I won't take the time to elaborate on the improvements made in this area, but discussions with the staff, improvements that otherwise I have noticed personally, and letters from many of you convince me that substantial progress has been made. Larry Walters and his staff have indeed done a conscientious and good job and deserve your commendations.

Bob Rand is spending a great part of his time in Examinations and Supervision, and with his industry experience in sound management and lending techniques and the experience and knowledge we all are acquiring, I am confident we can and will make further improvements. Just recently Bob discussed with Mike Greenebaum and me some good suggestions which I hope we can soon implement.

Another office that has been modernized in operations and is vital to the well-being of this industry is the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Without the creativity and ingenuity shown by Jerry Worthy and his staff in arranging supervisory mergers and financial assistance for troubled associations, you can be sure that the Corporation would have paid out far more to savers and would be much more deeply involved in the liquidating of assets than is presently the case.

A similar compliment should be paid Clarence Smith and the Office of Applications for their streamlining improvements in the handling of applications for new charters, branches, insurance of accounts, mergers, and a myriad of other types of requests. The number of items handled has grown far in excess of the increase of employees.

The Board could not function intelligently under today's conditions without the kind of information supplied by Harry Schwartz and his staff in the Office of Research and Home Finance.

And in my opinion one of the greatest contributions made to enabling this industry to serve the nation's needs is the clarification of what accounts are insured, and the parity officially established between your insurance of accounts and that of commercial banks.

This accomplishment is a credit to Ken Scott. There are many other very meaningful ways in which Ken Scott and his staff have assisted the Board and the industry, and I particularly want to stress this in Ken's case since, as I am sure most if not all of you know, he will be leaving the Board later on this year to join the law faculty of Stanford University.

With the exception of the Office of Bank Operations which is directed exceptionally well by Bob Day, I have mentioned only those offices of the Board in which the steps taken to strengthen your capacity to serve the public would be of direct concern to you. For the record, though, I want to emphasize that other offices of the Board have acted similarly. And I also stress that on the whole I do not believe any agency of Government or any private company has a more dedicated group of employees than the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the twelve District Banks.

But much more than improvement of Board procedures is required "to help build a climate and conditions under which your industry can continue to grow in size, to improve in soundness of operations, and to become increasingly more capable of meeting the housing needs of the future and of serving the public."

Legislation was and is necessary.

The Supervisory Act of 1966 is part of this legislative program. It was necessary to provide greater flexibility on the part of the Board and also on the part of the bank regulatory agencies to deal with problem institu-

tions. With the new flexibility the Act affords, we can often restrain or correct practices before they cause serious difficulties. We can cope with unsound practices before they proceed to the point where they damage the reputation of all institutions. It is only a very small segment of the industry which engages in unsound practices, but there is necessity for this type of tool to protect the reputation of the vast majority which operates soundly. In fact, even the institution which needs to be corrected benefits from this procedure. Its problem is brought to its attention early, and the correction which results can prevent it from becoming a serious case.

In administering the Supervisory Act, three broad principles encompass almost all of the areas that give rise to supervisory concern over individual associations. These areas are: (1) the soundness of assets and their structure; (2) satisfactory expense ratios; and (3) the reserve position of institutions.

In essence, these three characteristics paint a vivid picture of an institution's performance. They afford a guide to how well an association is complying with statutory provisions and intent. Initially, we try education and persuasion to obtain improved performance. Only if it is apparent that informative comments or persuasion will not do the job will a cease-and-desist order be issued. The authority contained in the Supervisory Act thus provides for reasonable procedures at a stage of development which permits correction of practices before they continue to damage an institution. The Supervisory Act protects the many against the few; and serves also to protect the few.

This vitally important legislative accomplishment could not have been achieved without the support of an enlightened organization such as yours, and I want to express the gratitude of the Board to the League and to the vast majority of its members whose support helped to make this possible.

The most important parts of the Board's current legislative program are:

(a) The Federal Savngs Institutions Bill; and

(b) The Savings and Loan Holding Company Bill.

The Federal Savings Institutions Bill is designed primarily to comply with recommendations that have been made for many years that the investing and lending authority of savings and loan associations be broadened and that Federal charters should be provided for mutual savings banks.

The Commission on Money and Credit, a privately sponsored body, endorsed these proposals in 1961. Similar recommendations were made in 1963 by the Committee on Financial Institutions appointed by President Kennedy. These proposals are based on the recognition that there is a need for more diversification of lending and investing authority for your institutions. They are also based on the desirability of unifying thrift institutions, combining the best features of mutual savings banks and Federal savings and loan associations. The broader lending and investing authority contained in the bill recognizes two needs.

First, since this industry has reached very substantial size, it is apparent that there are periods when the mortgage market, on which you depend almost entirely, does not absorb on a sound basis the funds you generate. Diversification would preclude the need for having to reach out for unsound assets or the equally unpalatable alternative of shrinking your operation. Second, it is apparent that a limited, narrow asset structure imposes more of an earnings restraint on your associations than is desirable. With a more diversified portfolio, including more short-term assets, you could adjust your earnings to market conditions more readily than is now possible. Properly utilized, diversification would improve your operations, your competitive position and, in particular, your ability to attract savings in a tight money period.

This last point, the ability to attract savings in a tight money period, is crucial. While there is some merit to the point that, with diversification, you might be inclined to put a somewhat lower proportion of your funds into the mortgage market, it is clearly better to put 60 percent or more of a good flow into that market than 100 percent of a very poor flow.

The Federal Savings Institutions Bill, therefore, embodies ideas that are an essential forward step for you and the economy. Though considerable discussion of that bill is still underway, I would strongly recommend that you study what has been published. Your support of the major principles in the Bill would advance its prospect of passage, a result in which you have more at stake than anyone else.

And in weighing your decision, let me urge that you concentrate on the positive gains you would obtain rather than on some relatively insignificant supervisory feature or other such item you might not desire. Without such a measure, I frankly think it will require a decade or more for you to obtain the advantages that the measure introduced as H.R. 13118 would, if enacted, grant you overnight.

The last legislative proposal I want to mention today and one which in my opinion is as important—perhaps even more so—as any measure proposed during this decade is the Savings and Loan Holding Company Bill.

For several reasons, which will be obvious to you as I proceed, I hope you will listen carefully to what I have to say. Believe me, if this Bill is not passed, you will be adversely affected both directly and indirectly. The Senate passed a reasonably good Bill on June 26 of this year without a dissenting vote. But in the House no Bill has been recommended as yet by the Banking and Currency Committee.

First let me state that by no means are all holding company associations in difficulty, but taken as a group or in comparison with non-holding company associations there are enough in difficulty to cause the Board and the industry grave concern.

Secondly, in support of the need for the legislation, I want to quote from information placed in the November 2 issue of the Congressional Record by the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, a Member of Congress from Missouri and a Member of the Committee handling the Bill:

"Mr. Speaker, several large savings and loan holding companies in the Far West are in trouble. These companies overextended themselves by borrowing large sums of money with which to finance speculative real estate developments. As long as demand exceeded supply and ample mortgage funds were available at reasonable rates of interest, things looked good. However, subsequent events have demonstrated the speculative nature of these holding company operations, and, today's high interest rates and tight money have made it exceedingly difficult—if not impossible—to develop and sell their properties.

"As a result, these holding companies have been hard pressed to pay interest and principal required by their top-heavy debt structure, and they have exerted pressure upon their savings and loan subsidiary associations for funds.

"The unfortunate result has been the milking of Federally insured savings and loan associations to meet debt service demands made upon the parent holding company. Moreover, the holding companies have caused their subsidiary insured associations to make risky high-yield loans to generate maximum income. Now, many of these otherwise healthy savings and loan associations find themselves with substandard assets. This situation is detrimental to the entire savings and loan industry as well as to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

"A letter I recently received from the Honorable John E. Horne, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, spells out this situation with great clarity, and I strongly recommend that Mr. Horne's remarks be carefully considered by all Members.

"The public interest in a sound and solvent insurance corporation absolutely requires that the Congress enact a strong holding company bill in this session. Agency authorization to prevent excess holding company debt is a vital necessity.

"Mr. Horne's letter follows."

And now I want to quote Congresswoman Sullivan quoting Chairman John E. Horne:

"DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: This letter is intended to summarize for the Committee some of the consequences and risks of savings and loan holding company operations. It is also to state that neither under the existing statute nor the bill as reported by the Subcommittee can the Board prevent or correct holding company problems that threaten both the public interest and the welfare of the $140,000,000,000 savings and loan industry.

"1. Holding companies control one-eighth (⅛) of the savings and loan industry but account for five-eights (⅝) of the institutions in most serious financial jeopardy. (Both figures relate to total assets.)

"2. The tendency toward higher risks operations of associations controlled by holding companies far exceeds that of the remainder of the industry. For example, holding company associations:

"a. have a foreclosure rate over three times as high as the rest of the industry.

"b. have a level of substandard assets almost three times the rest of the industry.

"The result is a level of capitalization in relation to risk that is far below the rest of the industry and that correspondingly increases the exposure of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC).

"3. Nearly 10% of holding company associations (and also 10% of holding company association's assets) are in the serious problem case category. But as regards mutual associations (which comprise about 78% of the savings and loan business) only 8/10 of 1% of associations (and only 6/10 of 1% of association assets) are in the serious problem book.

"4. The assets of serious problem associations ($1.6 billion) controlled by holding companies just about equal the liquid assets ($1.7 billion) of the Insurance Corporation. This poses an unwarranted risk to the safety of the insurance system.

"It is argued that thus far there has been little loss incurred by the Insurance Corporation on holding company operations. The significant points to consider are the disturbing trends already shown by this relatively new development of holding companies in the savings and loan industry and the precarious condition into which some holding company operations have gotten their savings and loan subsidiaries.

"5. For every dollar of problem mutual association assets, the mutual association sector has contributed to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation nearly $3.00 in premiums and earnings thereon. But for every dollar of assets in holding company associations, the corresponding contribution by the holding company sector has been less than 20%. In effect, the risks of holding company operations are being underwritten by mutual associations throughout the country.

"6. It is argued by opponents of the legislation that holding companies can provide financial strength to their associations. The contrary has been true in nearly every instance. And in 1966, the worst year in two

decades for the savings and loan business, holding companies put a mere $1.8 million into subsidiary associations as capital contributions but took out $17.1 million in dividends and fees.

"7. Holding companies exist in eleven states . . ., with 83% of the assets of their associations being in California. Why should the industry in the non-holding company states, and indeed the non-holding company associations throughout the entire country, have to bear the burdens created by holding company operations?

"8. The vast majority of the total industry—the mutuals, some of the independent stock associations, and some of the holding companies—support a measure at least as strong as the Senate version. Moreover, the Board and its staff, the twelve District Bank Presidents and their staffs, and the National Association of State Savings and Loan Supervisors—the authorities responsible for examining and supervising the savings and loan industry—have strongly urged the passage of legislation at least as strong as S. 1542.

"It seems illogical and unfair that the self-interest of a few should be served at the expense of many others who conduct their affairs in a sound and reasonable manner."

Let me stress that for those who have savings accounts in holding company associations, their money is just as safe as in other insured associations. This safety, of course, is made possible by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation through premiums from your associations. But the safety of savings in associations controlled by holding companies does not justify holding companies being free of supervisory authority any more than it would justify any other insured association from being free of supervision.

The Senate Bill is itself a reduction in what the Board recommended as necessary to provide maximum protection to non-holding company associations—and indeed to the entire industry. The Senate adopted what it thought was a reasonable compromise and one that would receive broad support.

The Board has made clear in public testimony and in letters to Members of the Committee that it considers the Senate Bill to be a reasonably good measure. Moreover, the Board agreed to accept two amendments urged by your League, primarily to comply with requests of independent stock associations.

The Senate Bill has the overwhelming support of the industry. In fact, with but scattered exceptions, the opposition stems from holding companies located largely in California. I should add that I do not regard this as a California problem but as a holding company problem. The associations in California outside the holding companies have a better record than the holding company associations. And opposition to the Bill does not come from all the California savings and loan industry, but only from certain segments.

Holding company spokesmen have literally lived in Washington since the Senate began consideration of the Bill last spring. Seemingly what they want is what the Board warned against in testimony before both the Senate and House Committees; that is, no Bill at all or one that would grant them broad expansion rights but with few or no strings attached.

Let me give you three or four arguments opponents use against the Bill, and tell you in a sentence or two the truth about each:

1. Opponents say it is a case of the Board seeking too much authority.

Answer: The truth is that the Board is asking for less authority over holding company operations than it has always had over Federal associations and for less authority than it was granted last year, with your help, over state-chartered, Federally-insured independent associations.

2. Opponents say that the Supervisory Act last year gives the Board adequate authority to cope with holding company problems.

Answer: The truth is that under existing law the Board cannot reach the source of the problem, the holding company itself; the Board has always explained that separate legislation is necessary. For example, present law does not give the Board any control over the debt structure of holding companies. Yet top-heavy debt is the primary cause for those in control of holding companies to direct their subsidiary associations into high-risk undertakings in an effort to support the debt of the parent company. In fact, when the first holding company act (the Spence Act) was passed in 1959, Congress itself acknowledged that it was a stopgap; that further legislation would be required, and asked the Board to make its recommendations.

3. Opponents say that holding companies can be a source of strength to their subsidiary associations.

Answer: Perhaps, in theory, they could be; but as my letter to Congresswoman Sullivan explains, the contrary has been true in fact. To repeat, in 1966, the worst year in two decades for the savings and loan business, holding companies put a mere $1.8 million into subsidiary associations as capital contributions but took out $17.7 million in dividends and fees.

4. Spokesmen for holding companies, in an effort to gain support from independent stock associations, say that stock marketability would be adversely affected.

Answer: The truth is that the marketability of independent associations would be enhanced, by virtue of the fact that the definition of holding company control would be increased from 10% to 25%. As to the Board having the right to screen a prospective buyer, it seems elementary that it is to the industry's interest to prevent a company with incompetent or dishonest management or in a weak financial condition from buying an association. Moreover, the Board screens applicants for new charters or insurance of accounts, and the principle of protection for the public and the industry is the same.

Let me assure all independent stock associations that the Board has worked with spokesmen of your sector of the industry and with Senate leaders to assure you that marketability will not be lost in the event you want to sell. And let me urge that you not be drawn into opposing legislation imperative to your protection by those who would use your voice to obscure their own motives.

I would make the same plea to those holding companies whose associations are soundly managed.

The public is not sufficiently sophisticated to know the difference between holding company and non-holding company associations. And there is a limit to the risk that the corporation should be required to take; a limit to the time the Board and staff should be required to devote; and a limit to the cost the rest of you should have to pay through potential loss of public confidence and premiums paid to the Corporation for unsound and unrestrained holding company operations.

I am pleased that your President, Otto Preisler, makes clear in his remarks that the U.S. League stands firm in support of this needed legislation. I am also gratified that President Johnson requested the legislation and that no Democrat or Republican voted against the Senate Bill.

I am hopeful and—in spite of what has transpired so far—I remain confident that bi-partisan action in the House Committee and the House itself will result in legislation at least similar in strength to that passed in the Senate.

In conclusion, let me state the Board's pleasure that there have been other occasions since I have been on this Board that you and we have labored together in pursuit of the goal I expressed earlier of "building a climate and conditions under which this (your) industry can continue to grow in size, to improve in soundness of operations, and to become increasingly more capable of meeting the housing needs of the future and of serving the public."

The passage of strong and adequate holding company legislation would be one more essential rung on the way to the top of that important ladder.

THE THOMAS EAKINS "AMERICAN PAINTING" COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 2 I had the privilege of attending the first-day-of-issue ceremony for the Thomas Eakins "American Painting" commemorative stamp which was held at the National Gallery of Art.

The Assistant Postmaster General for Finance and Administration, Ralph W. Nicholson, delivered the principal address at this impressive ceremony, which I wish to append to my remarks.

With permission, I also include the comments of a recognized authority on Thomas Eakins, Mr. Seymour Adelman of Philadelphia, Pa., who covered some interesting highlights of this great American painter's life.

The remarks follow:

FIVE-CENT THOMAS EAKINS "AMERICAN PAINTING" COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

(Address by Assistant Postmaster General Ralph W. Nicholson, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., November 2, 1967)

It is always nice to return to the Gallery for a stamp ceremony. These occasions, I might add, are becoming pleasantly repetitious.

In the past five years, the Post Office Department has been indebted to The National Gallery of Art for nine postage stamps. A few days from now, our new Christmas stamp will be issued. The original hangs here in the Gallery. Early next year, another Gallery property will be converted into a stamp.

To use the language of commerce, this makes the Gallery our leading source of supply. If this degree of collaboration is to continue—and I hope it does—perhaps the time is ripe for John Walker and Postmaster General O'Brien to start talking about a merger.

When we announced that the 1967 addition to the American Painting Series of stamps would be "The Biglin Brothers Racing" by Thomas Eakins, we began to receive letters from the Biglin family, from Brooklyn to Florida. These descendants told us we were misspelling the family name. It was B-I-G-L-I-N. Not L-E-N. They had family records to back up the claims. So we corrected the error, which probably was first made nearly 100 years ago in an art catalog and had been faithfully misspelled thereafter by museums.

Without appearing boastful, and with due

deference to the Gallery and to the Metropolitan, which owns a Biglin watercolor by Eakins, I think we can say that now, at last, we are showing the Biglin Brothers racing under their correct name.

Newspaper publicity about the stamp also brought us another letter, which, I must confess, we side-stepped as diplomatically as possible. This letter was from an admirer of Josh Ward, a professional sculler of the last century, from Newburg, New York. Josh Ward and his brothers could beat the living daylights out of the Biglins in a race, we were told. It was suggested that if we did not remove the Biglins from the stamp and substitute Josh Ward we would be guilty of an unpardonable faux pas. According to a story that appeared in the Sing Sing, New York, Republican, September 28, 1865, the Biglins finished a poor second to the Wards in a five mile race on the Hudson for a purse of $2,000, so perhaps there was some merit in the proposal.

A moment ago, I mentioned facetiously the possibility of a merger between the Gallery and the Post Office Department. If this is seriously entertained by the Gallery people, I thought in all fairness we ought to tell the story of Josh Ward as a reminder that we do not operate our business in an ivory tower, but are constantly on the firing line when new stamps are proposed.

Our postage stamp being dedicated today obviously is not a tribute to the athletic prowess of the Biglins, but rather to the lately-discovered genius of Thomas Eakins.

In honoring him now we are reversing the judgment of his generation, which condemned him to obscurity.

When young Tom Eakins was studying art in Paris, he wrote these encouraging words to his father in Philadelphia: "I could even now earn a respectable living in America, I think, painting heads."

How wrong he was.

When Eakins died at 71 in 1916, his widow estimated that forty years of painting had brought him only about $10,000. Eakins painted some 300 pictures, a few of which he was able to sell. His friends—and he had many—sometimes accepted portraits as gifts, but frequently these were hidden away from sight.

The pictures he did sell were at bargain basement prices, while lesser artists were being paid ten times as much for their commissions. Sometimes he had to haggle genteelly in order to receive payment at all.

When Eakins was old and disillusioned, he painted a self-portrait—and he painted a twinkle in his eye. I think that twinkle is quite self-revelatory. For it seems to say, "I have done my work well. Someday it will be recognized."

The paradox of Thomas Eakins is that he handled the tools of his trade so well, and yet went virtually unnoticed.

No artist of the day knew more about anatomy, which he studied at Jefferson Medical College, in Philadelphia. He was equally adept in perspective. To sharpen this ability, he read books on mathematics. As a result, his paintings have a three-dimensional effect that certainly many other artists envied.

And he was not an artist who lived at the wrong time in the wrong place. Interest in art was at a high point. This was the period in the late 19th century that Mark Twain ironically called "The Gilded Age." Men had made fortunes and they were building great mansions to prove this. Consequently art was fetching good prices. This was a bull market for the artist.

Further, Eakins as a young artist was attacking new themes with a vigor that the critics were watching with interest. He was painting America—not in the veneered Romanticism of contemporary European artists, but with Realism. Winslow Homer was doing the same thing at the same time, and he pulled it off. Today, when this developing school of American Realism is discussed, Eakins is mentioned in the same breath with Homer.

It would not be difficult to build up a case that Eakins' failure in his day was the result of some rather ridiculous slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.

His ill-fated portrait of President Rutherford B. Hayes is a good example of that. In 1877, the Union League Club of Philadelphia gave Eakins his first important commission, suggesting that he paint the President from a photograph. Eakins told the Club gently that this wouldn't work out very well. Instead, Eakins came to Washington where the President sat for him. It was a hot summer and the President's face was flushed. Eakins painted the flush.

The Union League Club accepted the portrait reluctantly, then shortly removed it from display. The story is that some of the more sensitive Club members believed that the flush on the President's face might be misinterpreted. President Hayes was well known for his total abstinence from alcohol, and the flush on his face, it was thought, might indicate that the President was nipping a bit of brandy on the sly.

So Eakins' portrait of the President was replaced by a more satisfactory one executed by a W. Gail Brown. I asked our research people for more information on Mr. Brown. They ran into a dead end. Apparently the Hayes portrait is Mr. Brown's only claim to fame. There is no record of what happened to Eakins' painting of the President, but presumably it was destroyed.

This type of treatment nettled and bedeviled Thomas Eakins again and again. Such as the time he was discharged as instructor in art at the Pennsylvania Academy because he used nude models in his class. And the public scorn he suffered when one of his greatest paintings, "The Gross Clinic" was displayed. This depicted a surgical operation, and people objected to the blood on the surgeon's hands.

Fourteen years later, Eakins executed another controversial surgical painting, "The Agnew Clinic" which was rejected for exhibition by the Society of American Artists and by the Pennsylvania Academy. This painting was viewed by hundreds of thousands of people this year when it was exhibited at EXPO '67 in Montreal.

Eakins was a down to earth man who enjoyed down to earth people. He painted prize fights and baseball players and boat races. He completed at least seven paintings of the Biglins racing on the Schuylkill River and he also liked to scull. Almost all of the final phase of his career was devoted to painting portraits, and some of his best work was his last work.

I think it is characteristic of the man that he called himself a "painter," not an "artist." And that the place he painted was his "workshop," not his "studio." Nor did he wear a velvet smock as did the fashionable artists of the day. He liked to paint in his undershirt.

Eakins was a born teacher, and it is said that his students idolized him. He was born in Philadelphia in 1844 and died there in 1916. With the exception of his student days in Paris, he spent his life in Philadelphia.

Upon his death, the tide began to turn in his favor. An Eakins' exhibit was held in the Pennsylvania Academy in 1916, and a Philadelphia newspaper said: "This is a Philadelphian whom Philadelphians have never thought it worthwhile to honor."

The Metropolitan Museum began to buy his paintings, and other galleries followed suit. This new interest in, and appreciation of, Eakins was climaxed in 1961 when an Eakins' retrospective of 103 paintings was displayed here in the National Gallery and in Chicago and in Philadelphia. His place as a great American painter was now undisputed.

The handsome stamp we are issuing today marks a departure from production methods formerly used. Instead of being printed by intaglio, this stamp has been produced by five-color lithography. This is an experiment for us, so we are anxiously awaiting public reaction.

"The Biglin Brothers Racing" by Thomas Eakins is the seventh in the "American Painting" series. Previous stamps have honored Frederic Remington, Winslow Homer, John James Audubon, Charles M. Russell, John Singleton Copley and Mary Cassatt. Each of these stamps won acclaim, not merely from stamp collectors, but from almost everyone who wanted a stamp with which to mail a letter.

I am confident that this stamp will enjoy similar popularity. It certainly is my hope that 120 million reproductions of the painting will serve to reaffirm in the eyes of the world, the greatness of Thomas Eakins.

Thank you.

SPEECH BY SEYMOUR ADELMAN AT FIRST-DAY-OF-ISSUE CEREMONY FOR THE THOMAS EAKINS "AMERICAN PAINTING" COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, NOVEMBER 2, 1967

I am honored by your invitation to speak here today. And it is always a happy moment for me to renew acquaintance with John and Barney Biglin. Years ago, around 1930, I often saw this great painting on the living-room wall of the house in which Thomas Eakins painted it.

It was a thrill just to walk into the living-room of 1729 Mt. Vernon Street, in Philadelphia. I can see it now. Over the mantelpiece, there was 'Max Schmitt in a Single Scull'. On the wall opposite, this very picture of the 'Biglin Brothers Racing'.

And I recall an occasion when I had this painting all to myself, so to speak. That moment came when I happened to mention to Mrs. Eakins, one day, that I was driving up to New York the next morning. She asked me if I would mind taking the Biglin picture along with me to a 57th Street gallery.

Of course I didn't mind—but I do remember that I drove to New York very, very carefully, with an almost religious devotion to every traffic light. For I was pretty sure, even in those distant days, that what I had in the back of the car was not just a painting, but a national treasure. And I think the mere fact that I delivered it safely entitles *me* to a small but secure place in the history of American art.

So it is really a happy moment to see this old friend again, in all its glory here in Washington. Eakins himself always had a warm spot in his heart for Washington. He often sent pictures to the Corcoran Gallery shows. I wish he could know that many of his best canvases are now located here permanently.

Perhaps no other artist of comparable stature was ever so cruelly neglected during his lifetime as Thomas Eakins. There is the incredible fact that Eakins, in all his 71 years, never had even *one* magazine article written about his work. He never had a one-man show in New York. No dealer ever represented him. No art group ever gave a reception, or a tea, or a party, or anything else in his honor.

In his home town—Philadelphia—it is true that he did have, on a single, solitary occasion, a one-man show. That is, if you can call sharing a gallery with a display of hand-decorated china, by a gifted local lady, a one-man show.

So it is no wonder that when Eakins died in 1916, his Mt. Vernon Street house was literally filled with unsold pictures. Moreover, they remained unsold long after his death. Among them were the many portraits which Eakins had offered in vain as a *gift* to

the sitters. Sitters who never had bothered to take their portraits home. Sitters whose present-day descendants, whenever they think about the matter, doubtless have one thing in common—high blood pressure.

Even the great rowing pictures suffered almost total neglect throughout Eakins' life. He painted about a dozen in all. They are the finest sporting scenes ever done in America, possibly anywhere. And yet, of all that splendid dozen, only one was sold while Eakins was alive. He received eighty dollars for it.

But of course this picture was just a moderate-size water-color, showing only John Biglin. The larger oil-paintings, which included *both* John and Barney Biglin, were naturally priced much higher, perhaps unreasonably so. You can judge for yourself. Here are Eakins' original prices: For the 'Biglin Brothers Turning the Stake-Boat'—now in the Cleveland Museum—$250. For the 'Pair-Oared Shell'—that marvelous view of the Biglin brothers passing under a bridge, now in the Philadelphia Museum—$150.

I am willing to hazard a guess that they would probably bring somewhat higher sums today. I often wonder what John and Barney Biglin might have thought about all this—about being the subject of a United States stamp, and being enshrined in such world-famous museums as this National Gallery.

I suspect they would have mixed feelings on the subject. Proud and pleased, surely. But I think their pleasure would be tempered with the regret that one always feels for a friend who has frittered away his life. For John and Barney Biglin always insisted that Tom Eakins had missed his true calling—he was so good at sculling that he might have become a professional champion himself

But it occurs to me that the Biglin brothers *also* may have missed *their* true calling. Perhaps *they* should have given up sculling and turned to a more intellectual pursuit. For it is at last clear: that in permitting themselves to be painted by Thomas Eakins, away back in the 1870s, the Biglin brothers proved—then and there—that they were America's most perceptive art critics.

For that reason alone they deserve to have their name spelled correctly—and I am glad this point was cleared up before the stamp was issued. Nevertheless, I still feel a bit nostaligic about the old familiar spelling. Eakins himself always spelled Biglin B-i-g-l-e-n—that was how he wrote the name whenever he sent the pictures to exhibitions. And when one considers that the name owes its immortality entirely to Eakins, I don't think the Biglin family really holds the error against him.

Personally, I would rather have my name spelled wrong by Thomas Eakins than right by anyone else.

We honor in Eakins not only a great artist but a great human being. The two are not often found in the same individual. But there is no doubt whatever about Eakins the man. When I first became interested in his work, forty years ago, many people who knew him personally were still alive. I often talked with them about Eakins. They were people in all walks of life, from Samuel Murray, his closest friend and associate, to "Turkey Point" Billy Smith, the tough little featherweight who posed for the great boxing pictures.

Never once, from any of them, did I hear a derogatory word about Eakins. From every account, he was a *really* admirable person—warm-hearted, modest, understanding. He had a sense of responsibility. You could depend on Eakins. When he promised to meet you at three o'clock Monday afternoon, he would arrive on the dot.

There was not a trace of the eccentricities and the tantrums that so often make genius hard to live with. In fact, Eakins' disposition was so mild, so forgiving, that his friends sometimes despaired of him. No matter how outrageous the provocation, it was almost impossible to get Eakins to retaliate. No one could remember *ever* hearing Eakins raise his voice in anger.

Indeed, Samuel Murray said it was always hard to tell when Eakins *was* angry: the only sign he gave was to whistle, very softly, one of the more familiar hymns. "Abide With Me" and "Rock of Ages" were the two usually called into service on these occasions.

What a wonderful friend he must have been! A man who studied under Eakins told me about a fellow-student who had painted a picture which he wanted to send to an exhibition. But he lacked the money to buy a frame. The next morning he was presented with a frame by Eakins, who had stayed up half the night to make it. A characteristic act of kindness. And also, I suspect, the one instance in art history when the only touch of genius in a painting was its frame.

One last word. If there are any autograph collectors in this audience, they know that Eakins' autograph is very rare. In fact, his letters are even scarcer than his paintings, because he always hated to write.

So I wish more than ever that today's stamp could have been issued during Eakins' own lifetime. For in that event, he surely would have written many more letters, if only for the sheer satisfaction of affixing this particular stamp to the envelopes.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRITICS SHOULD KNOW WHAT THEY WOULD BE MISSING IF—

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, that perceptive analyst, Howard K. Smith, has come to the heart of the matter concerning President Johnson and the critics.

Mr. Smith notes that if President Johnson was merely concerned about his place in history above all other things, then he should not run again—for his place in history as a strong President is already assured.

Nobody, not even FDR, has passed so much landmark social legislation as Johnson has.

Mr. Smith writes. And he adds that if the President left the scene, it is easy to envision today's crop of outraged liberals attacking his successors with the opening line: "At least you could say this about Lyndon Johnson."

I have visions—

Mr. Smith writes—

of a silver-haired Lyndon Johnson appearing as the main guest speaker at a future ADA convention and being cheered to the rafters.

And those Negro leaders who have been often critical of the President will find themselves more and more harkening back to the days of Lyndon B. for examples of the great things a real leader can do: Integration was multiplied by six; more Negroes rose to middle incomes than ever before, Negroes won the right to vote in the South, and Negroes appointed to high places rose from zero to an impressive legion.

How right you are, Mr. Smith. Perhaps it is the fate of strong and great Presidents to be appreciated only after they leave office. But those of us who know and appreciate all that Lyndon Johnson has accomplished, can only hope that many of his irresponsible critics would open their eyes long enough to see that they would lose a valued friend if President Johnson ever decided to step down.

I believe the majority of the American people realize this fact. And that is why President Johnson will be returned to office in 1968.

I commend Mr. Smith's provocative column, entitled "What Makes Johnson Run?" to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Nov. 12, 1967]

WHAT MAKES JOHNSON RUN?
(By Howard K. Smith)

This is the bleak wintry season in the President's career. Congress is killing much of his program and passing just enough fragments of the rest to guarantee that they will be ineffective.

His own party is cutting him up worse than the Republicans are, and polls show that any Republican contender could beat him as of this week. This is the season which raises the old, old question—why are all those handsome and eager Republicans so anxious to get his job? When you think about it, an even stranger old question arises—why does Mr. Johnson want to keep the job?

If it is his place in history that the President is concerned about, one of the best things he could do is to take the nearest exit when it shows up in 1968. It is hard to think of an issue troubling our much troubled time that is not almost certain eventually to go his way and make him look like a prophet and a path-breaker.

I can be wrong but I am convinced that the most divisive issue of today will prove in the perspective of time to have been the most one-sided—the President's Vietnam policy. The alternatives being offered constitute a vast wasteland of pernickety notions trying to resemble ideas. Why not leave it to a Republican successor to have to prove the harsh truth?

Nobody, not even FDR, has passed so much landmark social legislation as Johnson has. Why not leave the scene before crotchety Congresses knock out the wedges he has so arduously hammered into doors leading to the future?

If he left the scene, the future is easy to envision. One can hear the outraged liberals attacking his successors with the opening line, "At least you could say this about Lyndon Johnson. . . ." followed by praise for the things they are criticizing him about today. I have visions of a silver-haired Johnson appearing as the main guest speaker at a future ADA convention and being cheered to the rafters.

Negro leaders of the future, the self-righteous ones like Dr. King and the savage ephemeral young radicals alike, will pour bile on that buffoon (Nixon, Romney, Reagan, Rockefeller or whomever) in the White House. And they will harken back to the days of Lyndon B. for examples of the great things a real leader can do: Integration was multiplied by six, more Negroes rose to middle incomes than ever before, Negroes won the right to vote in the South, and Negroes appointed to high places rose from zero to an impressive legion.

There would seem to be every incentive for Mr. J. to ride off into the sunset. In awhile, Peter Hurd's portrait may become the conventional image: The big cowman with eyes scrunched tight to suggest both his far-sighted vision of distant frontiers and his resolve to explore them.

Altogether the prospect is so attractive that

one can predict a wholly different reaction on Johnson's part from the one outlined here: He will probably be consumed with the wish to get another crack at the job to see if he may not be the man to break the jinx on a President whose honeymoon is past.

1968 is going to be quite a year. Everybody involved is behaving with the normal irrationality which Presidential fever induces, and all the eligible prospects are scrambling for a chance at the desk where the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune stop. This will be the tensest political year since 1912 with nothing but fight, fight, fight, down to the final bell.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES GREETS A STANCH ALLY—THE PRIME MINISTER OF JAPAN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, and through him the American people bid a cordial welcome to the Prime Minister of Japan who represents one of our stanchest allies in Asia.

Japan and America are allies in trade. We are allies in aid through the Asian Development Bank. And we are allies in the cause of freedom and liberty in Asia.

The friendship between Japan and the United States is a bulwark for freedom in Asia and Southeast Asia. Indeed Prime Minister Sato did not utter idle words when he said in response to President Johnson's greeting that—

> It will not be our two countries alone, but all of Asia I am sure, who will benefit from close relations of mutual trust between Japan and the United States.

The mutual trust between Japan and the United States has been strengthened in the last 4 years by the excellent trade and foreign policies of President Johnson.

Asian nations such as Japan know why we support the mutual security of Asia through treaties, men, and materials.

The visit of Prime Minister Sato and his words of encouragement for American policies reaffirm what we all knew before.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in inserting in the RECORD the meaningful exchange of greetings between President Johnson and Prime Minister Sato of Japan:

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER EISAKU SATO OF JAPAN

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Prime Minister and Mrs. Sato, Mr. Secretary of State, Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. Prime Minister, Mrs. Johnson and I are delighted to be able to welcome you here today to the garden of the White House to express to you our great pleasure that you have been able to come and visit with us. We appreciate very much the cooperation that has been extended by your government and your people to our country, and the very close manner in which we have worked together for the last several years.

We have great pride in the fact that our Cabinet has paid periodic visits to your country and they have always been received with a very warm welcome. They feel that the visits have been quite productive.

The channels between us have always been open. The dialogue has been continuous. We, I think, both recognize the very great responsibilities that our governments have to the people of Asia. We have joined together in a good many enterprises for this general betterment.

I think the objectives of the American people and the Japanese people are very much the same.

First of all, we want peace in all the world, and particularly in that troubled part of the world where we do not have it now.

We want education of our children, health for our people, a small amount of recreation that can make us enjoy the good things of life, and by working closely together, we have moved in that direction.

You have been playing a major role in the new regional organizations in that part of the world that we think will bring Asia forward. We have reference particularly to the Asian Development Bank. We have great hopes for that enterprise.

We meet this morning as the spokesmen for two quite powerful nations in the world, but I hope two very responsible nations.

I believe that our destinies are very closely linked together by geography, by national interests, and by humanitarian concern.

We are glad we have good weather for you. We trust that it will last during our discussions.

We believe those discussions have much to recommend. We hope they will be productive. We know this: that we will certainly profit from your observations concerning your views of your own country in that part of the world in matters of mutual interests.

We hope you enjoy your stay here. We want it to be a happy one.

Prime Minister SATO. Mr. President, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Secretary of State, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

I recall it was just three years ago that you greeted us most warmly here at the White House. I have come again to Washington, this time with my wife. We are most grateful for the cordial welcome you have accorded us today.

As on my previous visit I have come again to your country representing the government and people of Japan, an ally closely bound by ties of friendship with the United States.

I look forward to having frank talks with you, Mr. President, on matters of common concern with our two countries.

I wish to express my deep respect to you, Mr. President, for the great efforts being made by the United States under your able leadership to bring peace and stability to the world, particularly in Asia at this moment.

The basic purposes of our foreign policy are the safeguarding of freedom and a dedication to peace.

There have been many developments in Asia since my previous visit there three years ago. Some have been desirable and encouraging while others have been causing deep concern.

But I am firmly convinced that as long as we face these changes with wisdom and courage, with the common objective of safeguarding freedom and peace, the road to stability and prosperity in Asia will be opened before us.

The need for cooperation between our two countries based on mutual trust and understanding has never been greater than it is today for the future of Asia and indeed for the entire world. Therefore, Mr. President, I look forward to frank discussions with you on problems between our two countries with the view to seeking an adjustment and expansion of our basic national interests.

It will not be our two countries alone, but all of Asia I am sure, who will benefit from close relations of mutual trust between Japan and the United States.

Thank you.

TRAINING CONFERENCES TO PREVENT AND CONTROL CIVIL DISTURBANCES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has recently set into motion a far-reaching effort to reduce the chances of violence and riots recurring in our cities.

The President directed the Department of Justice to conduct a series of training conferences for city officials this winter on the prevention and control of civil disorders. Dates and locations for these conferences will be worked out at a planning session in Washington on November 17.

This endeavor has enormous potential among the Presidential programs to meet this serious national problem. It affords an opportunity for the exchange of information among officials who have experienced civil strife firsthand and other experts in the field of social and community relations.

How better to reach workable solutions than to meld such knowledge, develop and refine methods of prevention and control, and finally to search for new methods?

I commend the President for taking effective action during the short, cold winter to avoid another long hot summer. I recommend to my colleagues a reading of the Attorney General's announcement of this program and include it in the RECORD at this point:

RELEASE BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, NOVEMBER 1, 1967

Attorney General Ramsey Clark announced today that the Department of Justice will hold training conferences for city officials on the prevention and control of civil disturbances.

Mr. Clark said the conferences will be held this winter at the direction of President Johnson.

Mayors, police chiefs and other municipal officials from throughout the nation will be invited to attend, the Attorney General said.

"The purpose of the conferences will be to combine knowledge on effective methods of preventing and controlling disturbances, to develop and refine these methods, and to search for new methods," said Mr. Clark.

"The melding of knowledge gained by various officials in various situations in various cities will provide a base for the better maintenance of law and order in our great urban areas.

"It is hoped that this endeavor will decrease any chance of a recurrence of the violence and riots which seared the face of many of our cities last summer."

Among the topics to be covered, Mr. Clark said, will be techniques for controlling disorders, joint operations involving different police jurisdictions and the military, and police-community relations.

Such a series of conferences was recommended to the President by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The President directed the Attorney General to arrange the series.

"These conferences," the President said, "should make maximum use of the skills and experience gained by several agencies of the government, and of local officials who have been successful in preventing or controlling civil disorders."

"As you are well aware, this is a matter of great urgency," the President told the Attorney General. "Effective conferences and consultations with key officials at all levels of government during the winter months require careful planning now."

Mr. Clark said he has scheduled a meeting in Washington, D.C. on November 17 to work out the dates, locations, curriculum and other details of the conferences. Thirteen outstanding police and city leaders from throughout the nation have been invited to attend the planning session. They are:

Arthur Naftalin, Mayor of Minneapolis.

Beverly Briley, Mayor of Nashville, Tennessee.

John Gold, City Manager, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Superintendent James B. Conlisk, Chicago Police Department.

Chief Thomas Reddin, Los Angeles Police Department.

Chief John Layton, Washington, D.C. Police Department.

Chief Curtis Brostron, St. Louis Police Department.

Chief Oliver Kelly, Newark Police Department.

Chief William Hanger, Pontiac, Michigan Police Department.

Chief Herbert Jenkins, Atlanta Police Department.

Colonel Frederick E. Davids, Michigan State Police.

Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Michael N. Canlis, Sheriff of San Joaquin County, Stockton, California.

The conferences will be co-sponsored by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), which will furnish a number of the instructors. The cost of the conferences will be borne by the Department of Justice.

The Department, through its Law Enforcement Assistance program, is already funding several projects to improve law enforcement in urban areas. It has financed two conferences held by the IACP: one in June, 1966 at Indianapolis on police-community relations and another last spring in Memphis on the prevention and control of disturbances.

THE FARM BUREAU

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, while reading Kansas Attorney General Londerholm's report on the Kansas Farm Bureau, the Kansas Farm Bureau Insurance Companies and the Kansas Department of Insurance, I was reminded of the not too inappropriate proverb that "we often give our enemies the means of our own destruction." What was billed as a conclusion that my charge of improprieties between these organizations was unfounded is actually a carefully documented vindication of that charge. And, what is even more ironic, it supplies new and unsolicited support for my conviction that a full-scale investigation is urgently needed.

First, I am of the old fashioned belief that a State regulatory agency—supported by taxpayer dollars—must maintain a scrupulous neutrality in dealing with all of those organizations it is supposed to regulate. Thus, my surprise and concern when I learned that football and basketball tickets paid for by the Farm Bureau Mutual and Kansas Farm Life Insurance Cos. were being used by the commissioner and staff of the Kansas Department of Insurance.

In light of the opportunities for favoritism that this can lead to, I expected nothing less than a complete refutation by the attorney general. But, to my amazement, no such refutation has been made. Instead, the attorney general makes an absurd distinction between the purchase of season tickets for the insurance commissioner and the purchase of season tickets which are offered to the commissioner on a week-to-week basis, and then concludes that the Farm Bureau companies "have offered to make available guest tickets if the commissioner or a member of the staff wished to come up to a game." He then reports that on a few occasions the insurance commissioner, and on many occasions other staff members, have represented the department at the games.

Second, in light of the new evidence he has supplied, I cannot understand how the attorney general could conclude that there is nothing improper about the relationship of the Kansas Farm Bureau and its insurance companies. For the last 5 months, I have been charging that the Farm Bureau represents the interests of the insurance industry and not the interests of the American farmer. If it weren't for his responsibilities to the people of Kansas, I would ask the attorney general to join me in documenting this charge.

For example, I was under the naive impression that Farm Bureau directors were paid for their services out of membership dues or out of other assets of the Farm Bureau. This standard method of compensation would be some assurance of that undivided loyalty which members of an organization have a right to expect of their managers. In the Kansas Farm Bureau however, the attorney general reports that:

> Board members are compensated on a per diem basis and are also reimbursed for their travel expenses. These amounts are paid by the Farm Bureau *which is then reimbursed by the insurance companies in proportion to the services rendered to them by the board members.* (Emphasis added.)

In other words, the salaries and expenses of the board of directors are being paid by the insurance companies and not by the farmers. Since it is the person who signs the paycheck who calls the shots, there could be no clearer evidence that the Farm Bureau people are working for the insurance companies and not for the farmers.

The attorney general supplies considerably more evidence of this blatant overlap of the insurance companies and the Farm Bureau. For example, if the Farm Bureau were concerned with the needs of its members, its legislative department would conduct research, provide information and perform lobbying services for the Kansas farmer—and only the Kansas farmer. Instead, I was dumbfounded to learn that in Kansas, "the Farm Bureau insurance companies do not employ separate research and lobbying services but instead contract with the legislative department of the Farm Bureau to perform these functions for them." The Farm Bureau, in short, is receiving substantial payments from its insurance companies—totalling about 40 percent of the department's budget—to lobby for insurance bills. That is, it spends at least two-fifths of its time buttonholing legislators, testifying before committees, and writing and introducing bills for projects totally unrelated to farming.

I am sure that many Kansas farmers will be surprised to learn that the Farm Bureau rents out its lobbying services to insurance companies that are making its living off the farmer. I would like to know how many other State Farm Bureaus are doing the same thing.

In this so-called exoneration of the Kansas Farm Bureau, the attorney general also reports that it carries on an extensive safety education program throughout the State. I was at a loss to explain what relationship driver education bears to the needs of farmers until I learned who finances this program. The attorney general reports that 97.4 percent of the total safety department budget is contributed by the insurance companies "on the theory that safety education reduces accidents and this keeps down insurance claims and costs." There is, of course, nothing objectionable about the insurance companies conducting such a campaign, but why is it necessary to disguise it as a Farm Bureau project? The boundaries between State Farm Bureaus and their insurance companies are much fuzzier than they should be. Why do they claim to be different organizations for some purposes and one organization for others?

This amazing report to exonerate the Farm Bureau and refute my charges accomplishes neither of these tasks. The highest legal official in the State of Kansas has shown that Farm Bureau insurance companies set aside football and basketball tickets for the Kansas insurance commissioner and that there is an overlap between the Farm Bureau and its insurance companies. I can only conclude that the report of the attorney general confirms my conviction that a full-scale investigation of these activities is urgently needed.

POVERTY PROGRAM A MUST

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, while rejecting the nihilism of black power extremists, we should listen carefully and with respect to the voices of responsible Negro spokesmen. This is especially the case where the war on poverty is concerned, for responsible Negro leadership places the greatest importance upon the successful prosecution of this program.

A very trenchant editorial, entitled "Poverty Program Must," appeared recently in the Washington Afro-American, and because I think it worthy of my colleagues' attention, I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

POVERTY PROGRAM MUST

The real tragedy in the House of Representatives' callous attitude toward the Poverty Bill is not the quibbling over dollar figures or even over amendments to the basic legislation. Rather, the tragedy is to be found in the shocking revelation of the contempt in which an alarming number of Congressmen hold the poor.

Forgotten in the attempts of the Republican reactionaries and the Dixiecrats to either kill the poverty program or so emasculate it as to make it meaningless, are the poor. If these sources had their way, the poor would forever remain exactly as they are, poor. They would continue to be locked up inside the ghetto of the cities and the slums of rural America without any hope of escape.

It is as if the poor have ceased to exist, as if there is no need to continue a program that for the first time in the history of the country, held out the prospect that the poor could be assisted out of the poverty rut through outside help.

The poverty program has never had enough money to give it adequate support, but at least, at the very least, some things of a positive nature were being accomplished.

In Washington, the United Planning Organization, set up neighborhood centers, which provided the poor with a number of services including legal aid, consumer education, employment and training assistance.

Head Start classes were begun, youngsters found employment through the Neighborhood Youth Corps., and at long last, there was a faint ray of light at the end of the long tunnel of poverty.

Now all that is threatened by a narrow-minded Congress that in part is frightened by the idea of poor people becoming articulate members of society, by assaults of the poor on institutions that have never been responsive to their heeds and by the desire to punish all poor people as a lesson to those who have rioted.

Add to this the feeling on the part of some Congressmen that colored people are the chief beneficiaries of the poverty program, and an atmosphere develops in which anything is possible.

An indication of what can develop came last week when the United Planning Organization announced that it was dropping its youth work programs—including part of PRIDE—Because no funds were available.

All across the country, thousands of youths who depended on poverty programs to remain in school, are being thrown out of work because of the inaction of Congress. At least 35 Community Action Agencies have already been forced to shut down and VISTA volunteers have to rely on the charity of others to survive.

This, however, is only a prelude of what is to come if Congress does not approve a poverty bill with at least the $2.06 billion requested by President Johnson. Anything below this amount would severely cripple poverty programs, and would be a sell-out of the poor.

Despite the horrendous consequences of Congressional cuts, in the budget, there is no assurance that Congress really cares enough not to make the cuts. Congress in fact, seems blind to reality.

It seems to have learned nothing at all from the events of the past summer, which revealed the need for jobs, education and housing in the slums, if these events are not to be repeated.

HAWAII'S ROLE OF PREPARING PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR SERVICE "WEST OF EDEN" LAUDED BY JACK VAUGHN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct attention to a major policy address, as excellent in its literary quality as it is inspiring in its message, which was given in Hawaii last week by the Director of the Peace Corps, Jack Hood Vaughn.

In speaking of the significant and vital elements of the Peace Corps, Mr. Vaughn noted particularly the opportunities for further service in the Pacific basin. It is here, he said, that in the decade ahead the people of the Pacific basin countries will take the kind of giant steps the Pacific demands to confront the problems of economic, social, and political development.

The Peace Corps Director also paid great tribute to Hawaii in his speech. He mentioned that 4,000 young men and women had received their training in the islands for overseas service. More than 50 different groups of them have left the island State, destined for service in 11 different countries in East Asia and the Pacific. Said Mr. Vaughn:

Hawaii has seen more volunteers and given more of itself in their preparation, than any other State in the Union.

I take considerable pride in Hawaii's contribution to the work of the Peace Corps as it enters its seventh year of service as a vibrant and effective instrument of peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to enter Mr. Vaughn's memorable speech, "West of Eden," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can be read in its entirety by my colleagues in Congress:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Nov. 8, 1967]

WEST OF EDEN

(Address by Jack Hood Vaughn, Director of the Peace Corps)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I see that I'm billed this evening for a major policy address. I think $5 per person entitles you to some very significant policy indeed, encased in a comfortably brief address befitting the latest fashions: short on surface, long on message.

Actually a mini-skirt, well suited to the wearer, does convey the intention of a policy statement, for the observer becomes fascinated equally with what is and what ain't and it's the blend of both, after all, that makes policy.

I am honored to be with you this evening, on such an auspicious anniversary in political history: on this date, in 1805, Messrs. Lewis and Clark sighted the Pacific Ocean, proving for the first time the contiguity of the American land mass. Congress paid $2,500 for that trip. Some Federal outlay for Pacific exploration, development and defense has continued, although with a certainty at times difficult to predict.

I want to thank all of you for the very warm welcome I have received here. You know, sometimes I wonder whether the generous Hawaiian greeting is not rooted in the historic isolation of the Islands' people, whose forebears traveled so perilously to reach these shores that anyone who followed deserved their sympathy and kindness. I hope the ease of modern travel will never change that wonderful greeting, and the good feeling it generates in the malihini.

Well, friends should not hasten to business, but I think the business of this evening is friendship itself, and the will to make it succeed is powerful enough to move me away from Hawaiian greetings and back to policy.

Let me say at the outset that I find absolutely no evidence that the Hawaiians need some special stimulation—least of all from me—for their enthusiasm about the Peace Corps.

FOUR THOUSAND TRAINED HERE

Four thousand young men and women have been trained for overseas service in these Islands. More than 50 different groups of them have left here, destined for service in 11 different countries in East Asia and the Pacific. Hawaii has seen more volunteers, and given more of itself in their preparation, than any other state in the Union.

It's about time the Peace Corps added "thank you" to "aloha" and since it is one Hawaiian word even I can try: "mahalo."

I count myself very lucky this evening because I believe I have a very simple message to convey. No great dilemmas conjured up to enrich the challenge; no pot of gold, no rainbow.

Simply: The Peace Corps needs Hawaii.

You see—you started something.

You, the teachers or the parents or the training officers or the newsmen or the businessmen or the political leaders or the Peace Corps staff members or the returned volunteers themselves. This Peace Corps, this idea with a thousand American roots, is no longer a "maybe." It's a fact, with a solid record of performance and nothing in sight but growth.

Where you sent one volunteer in 1961, three are asked for now.

Where several joined in 1961—now, more people are leaving school to enter the Peace Corps than to enter any other American institution, except the military.

I can't tell you why they join with any more certainty than they could explain it themselves. Let me assure you of one thing—it's not the draft: the proportion of men and women in the Peace Corps remains the same.

Returned volunteers still face military service. And some, ironically, are actually summoned home after a sizable U.S. investment in their training and transportation, to be drafted, leaving vital tasks undone abroad. Yet still they come, risking their time in return for the chance to serve in this remarkable way.

Do you still ask why? Then I say with Pascal: "Le coeur a ses raisons que la raison ne connait point." (The heart has its reasons, which reason knows nothing of.)

THEY DON'T JUST HAPPEN

But now I would reverse the target and ask the same of you:

Peace Corps don't just happen. They take an act of Congress—repeatedly; they require

solid cash; they need public support, and understanding, and patience.

Why then, did you "join" the Peace Corps?

If I asked you, what's in it for you? You would probably be as confused—yes, even as dismayed and angry as any volunteer.

Let's face it: for Americans, the reason an idea attracts us is sometimes very difficult to articulate without sounding so sugar-coated as to border on the "soft" or worse, "irresponsible."

I like the Peace Corps idea because, with half a lifetime in overseas service, something told me it was "right."

And with an average lifetime of preparation under an American sense of values, something far removed from professional consideration led me to the same conclusion.

The Peace Corps is a particularly robust affirmation of ourselves.

Sometimes volunteers blunder. So do we.

Sometimes they speak up too loudly. Free speech is our way—even at times of trial.

Sometimes they bite off more than they can chew. How did our nation come this far west?

I confess to a good deal of pride in the Peace Corps but I discover almost daily that proximity is no measure of possessiveness. People everywhere seem just as proud of the idea, just as pleased with the young people who have served in it—and frankly, just as secretly relieved that the thing works.

TWO VITAL ELEMENTS

For most Americans, therefore, I think two elements in combination make the Peace Corps something they can live with:

First, identity with its youthful spirit, with the idea of challenge, of curiosity with the self and the world about us; and second, the happy realization that volunteers can get a job done overseas, that they can survive strangeness and become productive, that people and institutions can respond to them—in short, that it works.

I said that such Peace Corps qualities are attractive to most Americans.

And to the Hawaiian Islands?

Where more than here have men and women survived strangeness, become productive, and responded to each other? As in countless other lands, the sun and earth and water fashion circumstance and the human disposition. But where more than here have people more consciously sought to fashion themselves?

I would think it especially easy for Hawaiians to sense the groping, the gentleness, the tolerance and respect for the dignity of others, which successful Peace Corps work entails.

Above all, I think, you would be foremost to understand that tolerance, progress and mutual confidence are just not "happening."

They are wrested in precious niches of human understanding and enlightment, scantily noticed, grudgingly surrendered from ignorance and despair, toiled after, lost, missed and sought after again. None ought to know better than you that paradise is hardly a condition of the firmament. It is an understanding among people.

None ought to know better than you, moreover, that time and events rarely blend just perfectly to encourage such understanding.

And if the circumstances are favorable, then, where are the tools? Where are the eyes and ears to sense just the right moment? Where is the leadership, to judge and quicken the pace? And where is the right "oahu"—the gathering place?

Does the Peace Corps now seem a bit more logical instrument for you? To just such service, volunteers everywhere have turned.

USEFUL TO FELLOW MEN

Four thousand volunteers have ventured west from here, and from them, perhaps more productively than from any other group of Americans, we have learned how to be useful to our fellow men in Asia and the Pacific.

It's nearly 200 years since James Cook. That's rather a long lead time.

I can tell you this: the time is ideal for some unusually productive steps—right now. Volunteers have been very well received in the region. It is our area of greatest growth in the past two years.

Everywhere the theme is the same: Volunteers like where they are; more often than in any other region, they extend their service to complete a job which holds their attention—whether it be fighting to suppress malaria in Thailand, or bringing new math teaching to the Philippines, or preparing the first comprehensive disease survey in Micronesia.

I think their spirit is evident in the words of the volunteer who summed up his work casually: "I cured the blind, healed the sick, and built a 42-story latrine."

The foreign minister of Thailand put it more kindly: "We are all aware of the might and the power of the U.S., but we tend to forget that it was ideas and ideals such as the Peace Corps that made America what it is. That is the secret of your greatness."

I think the happiest side of our effort is that, literally, there are no "Peace Corps" programs in these countries. Volunteers serve where host leaders elect, in programs of local design.

As cautious as any of us at first, now officials overseas are placing volunteers in tougher and more responsible jobs. Equally important—officials overseas are building enough confidence to plan ambitious programs, and muscle them along through their own ranks.

There are veterans present tonight who can recall painfully that such signs of confidence and determination abroad have been rare indeed. And all of us can agree with Ambassador Reischauer's observation, with regard to our own American efforts, that the way one does something is usually as meaningful as what one does.

POLITICAL PRESSURES

These then are happy tidings. But often our efforts are framed in the pressures of political ferment.

This is certainly the case in East Asia. Almost every move the Peace Corps makes in that part of the world, is taken in the footsteps of some courageous leader—a national, regional or local officer who makes it clear to others that he trusts these young foreigners.

Such decisions are not without risk. Often they are made in the face of colonial tradition or the cross currents of ideology; or the complications of insurrection or insurgency.

I am certain that we shall wait many years before Peace Corps volunteers or any other willing hands will be able to grapple with full force in East Asia. Thus while our determination will be sorely tested there, it is our patience which will undergo the greater trial.

Lest there be any here who might mistake my words, let me make very clear that I am not speaking of any intent to curtail programs in East Asia.

Merely, I think we should understand that our friends must find their own path. They must set their own priorities and their own pace. Where they lead, we shall follow as we can. But one does not shove one's friends along dark alleys, nor try to light them from behind lest they stumble in their own shadow.

Darkness, however, suggests another opportunity—and as usual, it is right in front of us.

I dare say there are some Navy veterans here—and many others—who learned that if you would see far off in the darkness, you must shift your focus somewhat below the horizon, because night vision is best from the eye's periphery.

If we were to do this, the more closely to see Asia, we would find ourselves looking right at the islands of the Pacific.

I am proud to say the Pacific Islands have discovered the Peace Corps—in fact, Peace Corps volunteers were the first foreigners the people of Micronesia ever invited to live and work in their islands.

Now Western Samoa, Tonga and Fiji have joined the list of Peace Corps countries—and just recently, the South Pacific Commission issued the first multilateral invitation for Peace Corps volunteers to serve in areas within its jurisdiction.

PACIFIC BASIN ON THE MOVE

The Pacific Basin is on the move. Last month in the meeting of the South Pacific Commission, territorial delegates, with the support of the so-called metropole countries, showed new power. New leaders—young, vigorous, determined and intelligent—have appeared. In the decade ahead they and their people will take the kind of giant steps the Pacific demands to confront problems of economic, social and political development.

We see old enemies in the lists—the same catalogue of challenges facing developing nations everywhere: disease, deprivation, poor education, low productivity.

Yet if I could mark one enemy missing, or at least, not quite so formidable, I think I would name it "despair." These new nations come late to development. But they need not agonize through the post-war years of trial and error. Resources have grown and they are at hand.

Moreover, these nations are not weighted down with the baggage of defense budgets. Unlike the emerging nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the islands are not quite so caught up in the confrontations of ideology and the cold war.

Nor are they plagued with insurgency. Their priorities are clear: economic development outranks political security. Given a period of political stability and dependable leadership, the people of the Pacific will have an ideal opportunity to move forward.

We want to help.

For the Peace Corps, the time could not be better. Pardon the metaphor, but we have already gotten our feet wet. Volunteers in Micronesia already have learned enough to afford relevant insight into the needs of people throughout the Pacific Basin. Programs are already underway in Micronesia in education, health and economic development.

LITTLE TECHNICAL HELP

From elsewhere in the Pacific, we have learned how painfully little technical assistance is presently available: some experts are provided through the United Nations; few others.

We have learned, moreover, that many problems current and approachable in Pacific Basin—health, family planning, for example—are current but not quite so approachable in East Asia, where action for the moment may be delayed. But what we learn in the Pacific surely we can put to use in Asia, when the time is right.

For these and a host of other reasons this audience surely knows as well as I, the Peace Corps is ready right now, to supply as many volunteers as is possible for service in the Pacific Basin. We think their time will be well spent, and their work productive for the people they will serve.

But we cannot do it alone.

Simply, once again: the Peace Corps needs Hawaii.

If we are going to be the very best we can be, west from these Islands, then we are going to need the very best within the Islands.

We know already, what the results can be:

When we undertook to aid in Trust Territory health programs, we knew we would need high level support. We found it here in the University's School of Public Health.

Their involvement at every level of program planning, training and field support has emerged as an outstanding example of professionalism and competence in Peace Corps service abroad.

Under their guidance, volunteers have completed the first population census in the islands, and embarked on the first medical survey every initiated in Micronesia. The results, computed and analyzed here, form the basis for territorywide disease detection and control.

Such a landmark in Peace Corps work and in public health work generally is the quality of effort we shall expect.

Volunteers who have come through Hilo, and more recently through Molokai, have had a little "something extra" in terms of elan. Thus we have sought a broader partnership, culminating in the Peace Corps training institute which we expect to see in full operation by next spring.

And with the School of Public Health, we expect shortly to begin laying out plans for a nation-wide program in population control, requested by the King of Tonga.

Now if we can just get the School of Tropical Agriculture and the East-West Center involved next week at the latest, I'd say we might be off to a promising start.

HAWAII DEEPLY CONCERNED

But don't stop there. You may be a sovereign state, but you are an island people. Surely Hawaiians everywhere can sense the need of their fellows to the west. From Governor Burns, I know how deeply the people of Hawaii are concerned for other peoples in the Pacific.

Some of your remote communities share with Mainland towns many of the problems volunteers will encounter to the west. I hope the people of those communities will welcome volunteers and teach them lessons they will sorely need if they are to be of help on other islands.

I hope your industries can teach us what they have learned of operation in the South Pacific.

Most of all, I pray these Islands will embark with us upon this course in a sense of partnership we earnestly solicit. The job demands the best. The best from you—the faculties, the administrators, the resources, the experience and the imagination. And the best from us—in the young men and women upon whom responsibility, in the end, must fall.

I urge you to teach them well, for we have found already that volunteers heading east from Eden have their eyes opened to new challenges and new responsibilities at home. Already they have infused our cities and school systems and universities with a welcome transfusion rich with ambition and determination to be of service. Perhaps you can gather some back for yourselves.

These volunteers will be the product of our partnership.

But for Hawaii, there are surely other ends in sight. You Island people, your Government, your University—you know you are a very potent force in the Pacific.

Looking west, I think it not unrealistic to mark you the first rays of some very necessary illumination. For a while, perhaps, Peace Corps volunteers can precede you westward, but in time, you may wish to be ahead of them, waiting to teach them their lessons on the scene. New universities are in formation in the Pacific Basin. The University of Hawaii has a prime opportunity now to be of help. That is but one example.

Surely there will be others. I hope we shall learn of them and serve in them together.

DEALING IN HUMAN LIVES

Above all, I hope we supply each other, and the people we serve, with the finest quality at our command. I can tell you from experience that we shall be dealing in human lives, and stimulating very responsive aspirations.

In such an undertaking, we shall not serve our nation well, unless we serve its friends with rare distinction, building patiently, proving our partnership only where results are reckoned: out where people live, seeking a chance to cope such as providence has given them.

This is no task for an evening or for a year. Certainly it is worth a lifetime. It may be worth many, many lives. If in the process, Manoa Valley replaces Pearl Harbor as the ultimate bulwark of American presence in the Pacific, we, and our friends, will be the stronger for it, in the end.

In such a venture, we will be proud to share.

Thank you.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MACGREGOR (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of this week, on account of official business.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of this week, on account of death in family.

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. RYAN, for 10 minutes, tomorrow; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA), for 20 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. QUIE and to include extraneous matter in his remarks made during debate in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. COWGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOW.

Mr. RESNICK.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 320. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to release certain use restrictions on a tract of land in the State of North Carolina in order that such land may be used in connection with a proposed water supply lake, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 633. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening and improving the Foreign Service personnel system of the U.S. Information Agency through establishment of a Foreign Service Information Officer Corp; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2428. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Washington certain lands in the countries of Yakima and Kittitas, Wash., in exchange for certain other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1552. An act to amend the Highway Safety Act of 1966.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5784. An act to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile;

H.R. 5787. An act to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 5788. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 15, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 101. Joint resolution amending title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee certain loans made to the National Maritime Historical Society for the purpose of restoring and returning to the United States the last surviving American square-rigged merchant ship, the *Kaiulani*, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 706. An act to amend section 27 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (Rept. No. 918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1566. An act to amend sections 3 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; with amendment (Rept. No. 919).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 9473. A bill to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges; with amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 10923. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Argos National Fish Hatchery in Indiana to the Izaak Walton League; with amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12638. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for conversion and operation in nonsubsidized service between the west coast of the United States and the territory of Guam; with amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13369. A bill to amend section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; with amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 13439. A bill to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee of conference. H.R. 2. An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 925). 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. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. IRWIN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. MULTER, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 13991. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 13992. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.R. 13993. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain tobacco stems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. OLSEN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. TENZER):

H.R. 13994. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13995. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 13996. A bill to regulate imports of ferroalloys and related products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 13997. A bill to require an applicant for a permit to hold a demonstration, parade, march, or vigil on Federal property or in the District of Columbia to post a bond to cover certain costs of such demonstration, parade, march, or vigil; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 13998. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13999. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in real estate subdivisions sold through the mails and instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce, and to prevent frauds in the sale thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 14000. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize research and demonstration programs for the control of lake pollution and acid and other mine water drainage, and to prevent pollution by oil; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 14001. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 14002. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to authorize a program of research and demonstration for the control of pollution in lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14003. A bill to provide criminal penalties for the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, into interstate commerce of master keys for motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES (for himself, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. GOODELL):

H.R. 14004. A bill to provide an Economic Opportunity Crusade, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 14005. A bill to authorize the disposition by the city of Hot Springs, Ark., of certain property heretofore conveyed to the city by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14006. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other statutes to provide a new maritime program; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 14007. A bill to restrict the mailing of unsolicited credit cards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 581. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 976. Resolution authorizing travel for certain members of the Committee on Education and Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

292. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor Dr. William Beaumont, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14008. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Melillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 14009. A bill for the relief of Ricardo R. Calma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14010. A bill for the relief of Leopoldo R. Trinidad and his wife, Florentia N. Trinidad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 14011. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelino Reysio-Cruz, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14012. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ribaudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 14013. A bill for the relief of Dr. Isaac P. Dionaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 14014. A bill for the relief of Miss Felisa-Adoracion Iglesias Corral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14015. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rogelio J. Barata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14016. A bill for the relief of Dr. Augusto Usategui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14017. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rogelio Giraldo Vidal-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 14018. A bill for the relief of Francisco R. Palma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 14019. A bill for the relief of Juan E. Llovet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 14020. A bill for the relief of Jan Kozlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 14021. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Bibic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 14022. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Nakandakari Kline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol